



Hampshire
County Council

Hampshire County Council

Environment and Transportation Select Committee

**Flooding 'Light Touch'
Scrutiny Review**

12.01.2010

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Foreword	5
Introduction	6
Terms of Reference	6
Review Organisation	6
Background:	
- National Context	7
- Hampshire Context	11
Findings of the Review:	
- Partnership working underpinning current flood risk management and flood prevention arrangements in Hampshire	12
- Performance since the 2007 floods	15
- Other key issues	16
Conclusions	17
Key Emerging Findings and Recommendations	17

Appendices:

Appendix One: Witnesses Responding to the Review

Appendix Two: Programme for the Review Oral Evidence Meeting in Public

Appendix Three: Background Documents to the Review

Appendix Four: Rivers at Risk of Flooding in Hampshire

Further information regarding this report can be obtained from:

Review Officers: Katie Benton, Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 01962 847336

e-mail: katie.benton@hants.gov.uk

David Crosby, Scrutiny Support Officer

Tel: 01962 847567

e-mail: david.1.crosby@hants.gov.uk

Reports that have been submitted to Council can be downloaded from:

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/scrutiny/scrutiny-committees.htm>

FLOODING SCRUTINY REVIEW REPORT

12.01.2010



Foreword

By Councillor Sharyn Wheale, Chairman of the Scrutiny Review Group

We have learnt that we cannot always prevent flooding – it is a natural event that can have multiple causes, not all of them predictable, with the results sometimes having devastating effects on homes, businesses and infrastructure. What we can do is plan for and manage the risk of flooding, so that we are best prepared for any future emergency events that may occur.

Following the 2007 floods that affected large parts of the United Kingdom, recommendations have been made from central government in order to help us to do this - it is around this that we decided to base our review.

It is clear from our findings that Hampshire County Council has taken full responsibility for local flood risk management, working in partnership with organisations on a national and local level in order to fully assess and plan for the risk of flooding in Hampshire. We have been satisfied that such work is strong, and that steps have been taken to ensure flood management plans and strategies are in place. We have also highlighted areas that warrant further exploration, in order to aid us build a greater understanding of this wide-ranging topic.

I am aware that this review used a light-touch approach, and therefore its emerging findings are based purely on background research and evidence heard during our review group meeting. I am therefore delighted that the Policy & Resources Select Committee have agreed to further explore these findings, and will undertake an in-depth review based on some of the issues highlighted in this report.

I would like to thank the review group members, witnesses and scrutiny officers for their valued input and hard work in completing this review.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sharyn Wheale". The signature is written in a cursive style and is underlined with a single horizontal stroke.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the March 2009 meeting of the Environment and Transportation Select Committee 'Flooding' was adopted as a subject for a light-touch scrutiny review.
- 1.2 The choice of the review topic was influenced by 'The Pitt Review: Lessons learned from the 2007 floods', which suggested that Overview & Scrutiny Committees should 'review work by public sector bodies and essential service providers in order to manage flood risk'.

2. Terms of Reference

2.1 Purpose:

The purpose of the review is to assess the partnership working underpinning current flood risk management and flood prevention arrangements in Hampshire, together with performance since the 2007 floods.

2.2 The review group set its objectives through posing two questions:

- What arrangements are there in Hampshire for agencies to work together to assess and manage local flood risk from all sources, plan for flooding emergencies, and take appropriate preventative measures?
- How has flooding in the county been dealt with since the 2007 floods, and with what success?

3. Review Organisation

3.1 Cllr Sharyn Wheale agreed to lead the scrutiny review group. The full membership was:

- Ian Beagley (Waterloo and Stakes North)
- Adam Carew (Bordon, Whitehill and Lindford)
- Vaughan Clarke (Petersfield Hangers)
- Mark Cooper (Romsey Town)
- Edward Heron (Fordingbridge)
- Geoff Hockley (Fareham Titchfield)
- Rupert Kyrle (Botley and Hedge End)
- Steve Rippon-Swaine (Ringwood)
- Elaine Still (Loddon)
- Marilyn Tucker (Tadley and Baughurst)
- Alan Weeks (Totton North)
- Sharyn Wheale (Fleet)

- 3.2 The review group held its light touch review meeting on the 2 November 2009, where it received presentations from key flooding partners. These partners are listed in **Appendix One**, and are referred to as 'key flooding partners' henceforth.
- 3.3 The evidence was received in a select committee style review, which included evidence gathering through a half day meeting in public in Winchester, in order to receive oral evidence from invited witnesses.

The witnesses who took part in the oral evidence session are listed in Appendix One. The programme for the oral evidence meeting in public is attached as Appendix Two. Background documents used in the review are listed in Appendix Three.

Information about the review, including evidence received, was made available to the public on the Hampshire County Council review webpage –

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/scrutiny/scrutiny-committees/environment-transportation/flooding-review.htm>

- 3.4 Unless stated otherwise, references to Hampshire in this document refer to the administrative area of Hampshire County Council.

4. Background

4.1 National context

- 4.1.1 A flood is an overflowing of water onto an area of land that is normally dry. It can happen at any time, and not all flooding events can be prevented, or controlled. Therefore it is important to understand the types of flooding that occur, and to implement flood management plans in areas that are at risk of flooding, to ensure measures are in place to protect people, infrastructure and essential services.
- 4.1.2 There are four types of flooding that affect the United Kingdom (UK). These are:
- Surface Water Flooding (caused because the volume of water falling or flowing onto a metalled (road/paving) surface overwhelms drainage or sewerage systems.)
 - Coastal Flooding (caused by high tides and/or severe weather breaching defenses and inundating the surrounding dry land areas.)
 - Fluvial (River) Flooding (caused by high tides and/or severe weather inundating the surrounding dry land areas.)
 - Groundwater Flooding (caused by aquifers overflowing in the winter rather than summer months. Exceptional periods of rain can cause groundwater flooding from springs and winterbournes which affect roads and overwhelm drainage systems.)

4.2 2007 Floods

- 4.2.1 Between May and July 2007, over 55,000 homes and businesses were flooded as the UK experienced the wettest weather for those months since 1776.
- 4.2.2 The wet May and early June meant that the ground became saturated and could no longer absorb rainfall. Continuation of wet weather in late June and July caused flash (surface water) flooding in some areas, and excess water subsequently accumulated in rivers (fluvial flooding), causing further damage to already flooded areas. Many areas experienced a month's rainfall in a few hours.
- 4.2.3 The 2007 floods were different to severe floods previously experienced, as a large proportion of the total flooding was due to surface water rather than normally occurring fluvial/coastal flooding.
- 4.2.4 Two-thirds of the properties flooded in the summer of 2007 were affected because drains and gullies were overwhelmed with water. This predominantly affected cities such as Hull and Sheffield, but had wide ranging consequences across towns, villages and individual private properties across the UK.
- 4.2.5 Fluvial flooding was most extensive in the rivers Severn, Thames and Don (South Yorkshire), and their tributaries.
- 4.2.6 A state of emergency was declared in Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, when the Mythe Water Treatment Works were flooded, leaving 350,000 people with the threat of not having access to clean drinking water supplies.
- 4.2.7 There were thirteen deaths caused by the floods. Total claims for insurance totalled £3 billion, although some of those affected did not have insurance. A 2008 BBC poll in Yorkshire, one of the counties affected by the 2007 floods, found that 1 in 5 people admitted to not having been insured.
- 4.2.8 Hampshire was not affected by the 2007 floods to the extent of those counties situated in middle and northern England. There are, however, lessons to be learnt across the Country, and the retrospective reports following the 2007 floods have had major consequences for all organisations involved in flooding assessment, management, planning and prevention.

4.3 The Sir Michael Pitt Review

- 4.3.1 Sir Michael Pitt was asked by Ministers to conduct an independent review of the 2007 flooding emergency, and the national, regional and

local responses to it. The Government specifically asked that the review give a fair assessment of what happened and an outline of the lessons that could be learnt from it.

4.3.2 The Pitt review sought the views of professionals and the public during a consultation exercise lasting three months, during which conferences were held in every region, inviting individuals and groups to share their views. The Pitt Review also held indepth discussions with key national organisations throughout the consultation exercise, as well as receiving written submissions.

4.3.3 The Pitt Review focused on four key areas:

- What the needs of individuals and communities that are at risk or have been affected by flooding are;
- Who can provide effective leadership in helping to change the way flood risk is managed and planned for;
- Who has ownership and responsibility for different areas of flood risk management and planning;
- How organisations can share information and work together.

4.3.4 The interim conclusions of the Pitt Review were published in December 2007, in order for urgent recommendations to be taken into consideration. The final report was published in June 2008. Of the 92 recommendations, the most conclusive findings included that:

- The UK needed to adapt to increasing flood risk, and likelihood of flooding emergencies.
- No single organisation had responsibility for overseeing and planning for Surface Water flooding, which contributed to a large percentage of the flooding in 2007.
- There was a perceived lack of transparency over ownership and responsibility in relation to flood risk and incidences of flooding
- The public affected by the 2007 floods did not feel organisations worked in partnership to address their concerns.
- Not all local authorities had detailed maps and understandings of their drainage and watercourse systems.
- Information and advice on flood mitigation of private properties was confusing, and sometimes conflicting.
- There was limited participation reported in flood warning schemes.
- Community action and resilience plans for flooding emergencies had considerable potential as a way forward in future.

4.3.5 Recommendations 90 and 91 of the report recognised that upper tier Overview and Scrutiny Committees should have a role to play in ensuring organisations with responsibilities towards flood risk are held accountable. It is for this reason that the Environment & Transportation Select Committee initiated a light-touch review of Flooding in Hampshire.

4.4 Response to Pitt Review Recommendations

- 4.4.1 A response to the Pitt Review report and recommendations was made by the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), on behalf of the government, in December 2008.
- 4.4.2 All of the finding and recommendations of the Pitt Review were accepted. DEFRA stated that the government would be taking steps in response the recommendations, and had already taken action on a number of them, given the interim review release the previous year.
- 4.4.3 DEFRA set out agreed funding and delivery expectations for all organisations with responsibility for carrying forward Pitt Review recommendations. It also outlined a key dates timetable, giving deadlines by which recommendations from the review would be implemented.
- 4.4.4 Although DEFRA were able to put measures in place to take forward most of the recommendations from the Pitt Review, the government realised that some needed the backing of legislation in order to provide clarity on who is responsible for managing flood risk. Therefore, proposals were drafted into a Draft Flood & Water Management Bill.

4.5 Flood & Water Management Bill

- 4.5.1 The draft Flood & Water Management Bill was first published in April 2009 for consultation. It was outlined in the Queen's Speech in November 2009, and at the time of the publication of this report, was due to be progressed to the Committee Stage of Parliament.
- 4.5.2 Hampshire County Council responded to the consultation on the draft Bill positively, but had some concerns about funding and resource streams, which has been mirrored by other top-tier local authorities.
- 4.5.3 DEFRA has stated that the Flood and Water Management Bill aims 'to provide better, more sustainable management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses.'
- 4.5.4 The key areas covered by the Bill, which directly relate to flooding are:
- That the Bill will implement the Pitt Review's recommendations needing legislation;
 - That responsibilities for managing all flood risks will be clearly defined; and Local Authorities will have responsibility for surface water flooding;
 - That local people will have greater input to shaping local flood and coastal erosion risk management strategies;
 - That the Environment Agency will have responsibility for the national overview of flood and coastal erosion risk management.
 - That top tier authorities (and therefore Hampshire County Council) will be the lead risk authority for flood risk management.

4.5.5 The Bill must pass through all stages of the House of Commons and the House of Lords before receiving royal assent, and becoming legislation. With the upcoming general election and possible change in government, this will need to occur quickly.

4.6 Hampshire context

4.7 Flooding (including 2007 floods)

4.7.1 An estimated 48,000 properties and 105 villages in Hampshire are at risk of flooding.

4.7.2 From Environment Agency flood risk maps, it is apparent that all of Hampshire's coastline is at a 0.5% chance (or greater) of flooding each year.

4.7.3 There are a number of rivers in the County of Hampshire, notably the Test, Itchen and Hamble, and a large proportion of these have a 1% probability (or greater) of flooding each year. A list of these rivers is attached as **Appendix Four**.

4.7.4 Hampshire is at risk from all of the types of flooding discussed in paragraph 4.1.2. The County experienced high levels of groundwater flooding in the winter of 2000/01, experiences fluvial and coastal flooding after periods of sustained rainfall or adverse weather, and has had isolated occasions of surface water flooding (see paragraph 4.7.8 below).

4.7.5 Following a retrospective review of the response to the 2000/01 groundwater floods, organisations within Hampshire who had an interest in flood risk management formed the 'Hampshire Flood Response Group', in order to work in closer partnership. In co-ordinating this, member organisations of the Group agreed to pool resources and set-up a joint adverse weather office in order to respond to incidences of flooding, and, as such, have received praise at a national level for pioneering flooding partnership work.

4.7.6 As explained in paragraph 4.2.7, Hampshire was not affected by the 2007 floods to the same extent as middle and northern counties in England.

4.7.7 Hampshire did however experience the highest level of rainfall between May and July of 2007 for 200 years. This caused some fluvial flooding and surface water flooding, but not to the extent that County-wide emergency plans were put into action.

4.7.8 The worst affected areas were in the north of the county, most notably Basingstoke, Fleet and Farnborough. Reports in the media stated that some highways experienced surface water flooding of up to 2ft, but most incidences were isolated only to a few highways, and only a small minority of private homes were affected.

4.7.9 In response to the Pitt Review, and the legislation following it (Flood & Water Management Bill), Hampshire County Council (HCC) and its key flooding partners are in the process of setting up the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Flood and Water Management Board (F&WM Board), at which HCC will be the strategic steer. This Board will consolidate all of the existing Flood Groups in Hampshire, in order to have a streamlined approach that reflects recommendations in the Pitt Review report.

5. Findings of the Review Group

5.1 Partnership working underpinning current flood risk management and flood prevention arrangements in Hampshire

5.1.1 The review posed the question of:

“What arrangements are there in Hampshire for agencies to work together to assess and manage local flood risk from all sources, plan for flooding emergencies, and take appropriate preventative measures?”

Salient aspects identified by the review group following oral evidence received from witnesses are:

5.1.2 That all witnesses present at the oral evidence meeting were satisfied that partnership working was strong.

Assessment and Management of Flood Risk

5.1.3 HCC and its key flooding partners are currently working towards the implementation of the relevant recommendations from the Pitt Review. This will be in line with the government timetable, mentioned in paragraph 4.4.3. Progress is being measured in a Hampshire County Council owned action plan.

5.1.4 HCC has taken the lead on managing local flood risk. This has been in place since the agreement in 2001, stated in paragraph 4.7.5, and as such has the support of key flooding partners.

5.1.5 The County Council works closely with the Environment Agency (who have the national overview on all flood risk) and Borough/District Councils in order to produce Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, Shoreline Management and Coastal Defence plans. Surface Water Management plans have been introduced to help reduce the chances of flooding in high risk areas.

5.1.6 A grant of £125,000 has been received by HCC Highways Department from DEFRA in order to assist with the costs involved in forming Surface Water Management plans. This money has been specifically designated for the areas of Basingstoke and Rushmoor, which are at the highest risk of this form of flooding. Bidding for Surface Water

Management plan funding had been taking place concurrently with this Flooding review, which will focus on the Eastleigh area of Hampshire, which is too at high risk of this form of flooding.

- 5.1.7 There are several types of drainage susceptible to flooding in Hampshire. These include:
- Gullies - A gully is a drainage pit covered by an open metal grating located a highway edge. It's purpose is to drain rain water from a road into the sewerage system.
 - Soakaway - A soakaway is a drainage pit covered by a metal cover or sometimes by soil. Its purpose is to allow rain water from buildings to permeate into the surrounding subsoil.
 - Drain - A highway drain is a pipe connecting a gully to the surface water sewer. It's purpose is to carry rain water from the highway gully into the surface water sewerage system.
- 5.1.8 Mapping of flood risk areas and drainage systems is currently ongoing. This mapping includes the type of drainage (such as a gully or soakaway), and aims to identify whether the drainage system is at high risk of flooding because it is ineffective, blocked or in need of repair. The Environment Agency's flood risk models are used to classify if a drainage system is at risk of flooding.
- 5.1.9 So far, 200,000 roadside gullies have been mapped. These gullies are cleansed annually in order to remove debris and blockages that may contribute to flooding. Some of these gullies are identified for multiple cleaning due to their 'at high risk of flooding' status. This costs Hampshire County Council £2 million per annum.
- 5.1.10 Hampshire County Council's Highways department has recently received £800,000 in funding, which will be used in the set-up of 37 drainage and flood mitigation schemes.
- 5.1.11 Drainage networks are not able to be redesigned to cope with the likely increase of flooding incidents, due to funding and resource implications. Therefore when such drainage systems do flood (and therefore flood highways or other infrastructure), other solutions have been explored, such as using roads and private land as flood water storage.
- 5.1.12 In order to explore the feasibility of repairing the most 'at risk of flooding' drains and gullies, a cost benefit / analysis would need to be carried out. A business case would then need to be written in order to attract funding to this area.

Planning for Flooding Emergencies

- 5.1.13 Although strategies are in place to manage the risk of flooding in Hampshire, it is equally important to plan for flooding emergencies, as such events are not always preventable. In order to inform private home and business owners, Hampshire County Council and its Key

Partners have made information available to the public to detail the risk of flooding and measures to be taken in a flooding emergency. This has included articles in Hampshire NOW magazine (the County Council publication for residents) and on Environment Agency and other public organisation websites.

- 5.1.14 A booklet was distributed by flooding partners in 2000 to Parish Councillors in Hampshire, which aimed to inform them of what steps to take in a flooding emergency. This has not been updated since publication nine years ago.
- 5.1.15 Some villages and parishes have been proactive in working together as communities in order to create localised flood plans. This details the procedures such communities would follow in the event of an flooding emergency, for example, evacuating the most vulnerable residents, strategic placement of sandbags, names and contact details of flooding partners, etc. This work was described by the Pitt Review as a potential way forward for flood planning in future.
- 5.1.16 Flood focused information and articles aimed at residents have stressed Hampshire County Council's (and the District/Borough Council's) policies of not distributing sandbags to private home and business owners. Therefore residents are encouraged to invest in their own flood prevention materials, and to use national advice to make their own flooding emergency kits and plans.
- 5.1.17 Concern was expressed by the Environment Agency that following campaigns to increase subscription, there is still low uptake of the Flood Risk Warning System by those private home and business owners in Hampshire in high risk areas. Currently, around 25% of residents (or 12,000 affected homes) at risk of flooding have subscribed.
- 5.1.18 Councils in Hampshire do stock their own sandbags, and Hampshire County Council Highways Department (at their Totton depot) currently have stockpiles of flood defences, including: 4000 sandbags, two sandbag filling machines and flood barriers.
- 5.1.19 Hampshire County Council and its key flooding partners have taken part in emergency exercises in conjunction with both Portsmouth and Southampton City Council in order to test partnership working and emergency event response plans.
- 5.1.20 Should a flooding emergency occur, Hampshire residents would have access to clean drinking water, as such water is drawn from areas that would not be affected by flooding, avoiding the situation described in paragraph 4.2.6.

Flooding Prevention

- 5.1.21 Key flooding partners in Hampshire have been working with local planning authorities in order to ensure, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25), that flood risk is considered throughout the planning process, in order to reduce inappropriate developments in areas at risk of flooding, and avoid direct development in high risk areas. Partners are especially keen for local authorities to use Section 106 funding (now Community Infrastructure Levies) to contribute to community flooding prevention.
- 5.1.22 The Environment Agency are statutory consultees in planning applications in areas of flood risk, but do not have the power to refuse applications. However, they are able to make an objection to local planning authorities if they feel a development is not appropriate.
- 5.1.23 If an Environment Agency objection is not upheld, which happens in roughly 10% of cases, planning decisions are transferred to the Secretary of State, who is represented by the local Government Office (in the case of Hampshire, Government Office for the South East (GOSE)). GOSE then have 21 days to either 'call in' the decision, or to allow the decision to stand. Cases which are subject to 'call in' are transferred to the Planning Inspectorate, which arranges a public inquiry and appoints a Planning Inspector to hear evidence from the applicant, the local planning authority and any other interested parties, including members of the public. The Inspector prepares a report for the Secretary of State, with recommendations as to whether planning permission should be granted. The Secretary of State then makes a final decision.
- 5.1.24 The above procedure applies to major developments (defined as developments of 10 dwellings or more or non-residential development of over 1,000 square metres) which fall within Flood Zones 2 (low to medium risk) or 3 (high risk) or areas in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) which have critical drainage problems and which has been notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency.
- 5.1.25 Witnesses expressed the opinion that Groundwater flooding prevention needs increased investment in Hampshire. As referred to in paragraph 4.7.5, Hampshire is at risk from and has suffered from this type of flooding. It was stressed that finances are tight and resources are finite, and funding has been prioritised accordingly.

5.2 Performance since the 2007 floods

- 5.2.1 The question considered by the review group was, with regard to performance since the 2007 floods:

'How has flooding in the county been dealt with since the 2007 floods, and with what success?'

- 5.2.2 Salient aspects identified by the review group following oral evidence received from witnesses are:

Flooding since 2007

- 5.2.3. Since the floods of 2007, and the initiation of the Pitt Review, there has been significant rainfall experienced by the County of Hampshire.
- 5.2.4 There have been small incidences of flooding since 2007, but not on the scale of the 2007 floods in the middle and northern counties of England, and nothing reflective of the 2001 floods in Hampshire. A majority of the flooding experienced in the past two years has been coastal flooding, which was for the most part caused by adverse weather conditions in February 2009.
- 5.2.5 Post Incident Debriefing (PID) sessions which take place after all flooding events. These promote an opportunity for feedback from all organisations involved.
- 5.2.6 There is regular monitoring of Groundwater levels, which have remained at seasonal norms for the past two years.
- 5.2.7 The Hampshire Flood Response Plan has not been activated in the past two years, and as such it has not been necessary to convene the Flood Co-ordination Cell (the operational cell beneath the Flood Response Group).

5.3 Other key issues

- 5.3.1 Following key questioning and responses from oral evidence, a number of other salient issues arose from the review. These are that:
- 5.3.2 Currently, the Flood Response Group in Hampshire is not accountable to elected Members within the County. There are not plans for member representatives to sit on the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Flood and Water Management board, but the board does plan to report to the Hampshire Senate.
- 5.3.3 The Pitt Review report picked up that there is some confusion from both the public and flooding key partners on who has responsibility and ownership over drainage infrastructure. In Hampshire, the County Council Highways Department has a responsibility for drainage and gullies, adjacent land owners for ditches and water companies for sewerage.
- 5.3.4 It is not clear if all private home and landowners understand their responsibility for maintaining clear ditches. The County Council does have the power to write and inform land owners to clear ditches, but does not have the duty to enforce this.
- 5.3.5 It was suggested in the Pitt Review recommendations that flood risk should be included as part of Home Information Packs for those selling their homes. Witnesses informed the Review Group that private home

owners now have a legal duty to inform prospective buyers of any flood risks affecting their property.

6 Conclusions

6.1 The key questions the review sought answers to were:

- What arrangements are there in Hampshire for agencies to work together to assess and manage local flood risk from all sources, plan for flooding emergencies , and take appropriate preventative measures?
- How has flooding in the county been dealt with since the 2007 floods, and with what success?

6.2 The above questions set, but did not limit, the discussions and scrutiny on the topic of flooding in Hampshire. Therefore the below conclusions and areas for follow-up reflect the issues that arose from the evidence gathering day.

6.3 With regard to partnership working underpinning current flood risk management and flood prevention arrangements in Hampshire, the Review Group concluded:

6.3.1 That witnesses present at the evidence gathering session were satisfied that partnership working between them was strong, and all key flooding partners were working closely in order to implement the Pitt Review recommendations.

6.3.2 That Hampshire County Council were proactive in having taken the lead in the management of local flood risk in 2001, with the full support of its key partners. This has put Hampshire in a position of advantage in progressing the Pitt Review recommendations, some of which had been adopted prior to the review. Work is ongoing, with Hampshire County Council as the lead, in implementing strategies and plans that assess and manage flood risk.

6.3.3 That Hampshire County Council has taken the lead in Surface Water Management Planning, for which responsibility was previously unprescribed. Funding from DEFRA for Surface Water Management Plans has been secured, and at the time of this review, HCC have bid for further grants. Funding and resources reserved for flooding assessment and management will in future be tight, as public finances are reduced following the recession.

6.3.4 Evidence received from witnesses has demonstrated that work to map the drainage systems in Hampshire is underway, and so far over 200,000 gullies have been identified, although some drain locations are unknown, and therefore cannot be mapped. Drainage can add to the risk of flooding, through becoming blocked or

damaged. The cost of repairing the most 'at risk' drainage is unknown.

- 6.3.5 That efforts have been made to educate private home and business owners in Hampshire about their responsibilities, actions to take there is risk of flooding, and what to do in a flooding emergency. Information has been shared through articles placed in local government magazines, and on websites associated with flooding. Despite this, subscription rates to the Environment Agency's 'Flood Risk Warning System' remain low. Booklets were provided to parish councillors, but require updating to reflect current flooding guidance.
 - 6.3.6 That work has been ongoing within small communities in Hampshire to produce local flood plans. The Pitt Review suggests that such plans are potential ways forward for flood planning in the future.
 - 6.3.7 That the Environment Agency are involved in all planning decisions concerning development on areas of flood risk, with the power to refer to regional government, and ultimately to the Secretary of State. Local planning authorities have the power to request funding for flood defences from developers who are building in areas of flood risk.
- 6.4 With regard to performance since the 2007 floods, the Review Group concluded:
- 6.4.1 That although there have been isolated cases of flooding, the Flood Response Plan has not been activated. The success of partnership working since 2007 is therefore yet to be tested. Therefore the success of the measures put in place since this time will only truly happen in the event of a flooding emergency.
- 6.5 With regards to other key lines of enquiry, the following conclusions have been arrived at:
- 6.5.1 That flooding groups within Hampshire County are not currently accountable to elected Members. There are plans for the new streamlined Hampshire & Isle of Wight Flood & Water Management board to report to the Hampshire Senate, but this has yet to be agreed.
- 6.6 The Review Group are aware that this 'light touch' overview & scrutiny review has been limited in its evidence gathering, due to the wish that the topic be explored from a strategic level. The Review Group are pleased that the Policy & Resources Select Committee will be following on from this 'light touch' review, and will be scoping an in-depth review in 2010.
- 6.7 There are a number of areas identified by the Review Group that merit further exploration by the Policy & Resources Select Committee. Taking

the above conclusions into account, the review group presents the following emerging areas as possible lines of enquiry for an in-depth review, and invite the Policy & Resources Select Committee's views and responses to them. Additionally, the Review Group would suggest that the key flooding partners listed in Appendix One are invited to make comment on the feasibility of the below emerging findings:

- That private home and business owners affected by flooding are invited as witnesses to give evidence on the success of partnership working in relation to flood risk assessment, management, planning and prevention in Hampshire.
- That Borough and District Council residents are invited to work with the Environment Agency in order to map flood risk properties.
- That Borough and District Council residents are encouraged to develop community evacuation / resilience plans, in case of a flooding event.
- That further mapping of the gullies and drains owned by Hampshire County Council takes place, in order to risk assess those most likely to contribute to flooding. Borough and District Council residents should be invited to take part in helping to identify those gullies and drains that flood within their locality.
- That accessible information is displayed by all levels of local government relating to ownership and responsibility re drainage, gullies, ditches and sewerage, to enable residents to gain information needed in order to identify and contact those responsible for them.
- That a cost/benefit analysis takes place in order to evaluate the possibility of repairing the most 'at risk of flooding' gullies owned by Hampshire County Council.
- That the amount of investment assigned to groundwater flooding is investigated, and, if needed, funding is designated from the budget to this area.
- That the Hampshire County Council Highways Department ensures it has enough provision in its budget for grant bidding from DEFRA for flood risk management plans and strategies.
- That the new Hampshire & IOW Flood & Water Management Board is accountable to elected Members.
- That the low take-up in Hampshire of the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Warning System by 'at risk of flooding' residents is investigated, and options are identified to promote proactivity, and increase the use, of this system.

- That accessible information is communicated to all residents in Hampshire, which emphasises that they are responsible for protecting their own homes, and how they can do this.

Further to this, the review group made one urgent recommendation during the Flooding Light-Touch session:

- A** That Hampshire County Council Emergency Planning Unit, (in conjunction with its Hampshire Flood Response Group partners), produces for all County, District and Borough Councillors a current handbook which contains information for use in a flooding emergency, including key agencies, roles and responsibilities of such agencies and useful contact numbers / websites.

Appendix One: Those Responding to the Review

Stakeholder group	Organisation
Local Authorities	Hampshire County Council - Emergency Planning Unit Hampshire County Council – Highways and Transport (Environment Department)
Partner Agencies	Environment Agency Southern Water (representing all utility companies)

Appendix Two: Programme for the oral evidence meeting in public

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION SELECT COMMITTEE

FLOODING LIGHT-TOUCH SCRUTINY REVIEW

Select Committee Meeting, Monday 2nd November 2009
Wellington Room, Elizabeth II Court, 10.00 am to 12noon

Timetable and Running Order

Focus:

1. What arrangements are there in Hampshire for agencies to work together to assess and manage local flood risk from all sources, plan for flooding emergencies, and take appropriate preventative measures ?
2. How has flooding in the county been dealt with since the 2007 floods, and with what success?

Time	Key Witness	Written evidence
10.00 – 11.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ian Hoult, Head of Emergency Planning Unit, Hampshire County Council• Kevin Fuller, Highways & Transport Area Director, Hampshire County Council	Presentation
11.00 – 11.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nigel Sell, Flood Incident Management Team Leader, Environment Agency	Presentation
11.30 – 12.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paul Fenton, Resilience Manager, Southern Water	Presentation

Appendix Three: Background Documents

<i>Hampshire documents</i>
Hampshire Flood Response Group. (2007). Hampshire Flood Response Plan.
<i>Regional documents</i>
South East England Regional Assembly. (2006). South East Plan.
<i>National documents</i>
Department for Communities and Local Government. (2008). The Community Infrastructure Levy.
Department for Communities and Local Government. (2006). Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk.
Department for Communities and Local Government. (2009). The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009.
Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. (2008). The Government's Response to Sir Michael Pitt's Review of the Summer 2007 Floods.
Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. (2009). Draft Flood & Water Management Bill.
Environment Agency. (2007). Review of 2007 summer floods.
Pitt, Sir M. (2008). The Pitt Review: Lessons learned from the 2007 floods.
<i>Other documents/sources of information</i>
BBC News (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/south_yorkshire/7445944.stm) (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/6971370.stm) (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/6239828.stm)
Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (www.defra.gov.uk)
Environment Agency (www.environment-agency.gov.uk)
Improvement and Development Agency (www.idea.gov.uk)
Info 4 Local (http://www.info4local.gov.uk/content-by-topic/flooding)
Local Government Association (www.lga.gov.uk)
Parliament 'Progress of Bills' (http://services.parliament.uk/bills/public/2009-10.html)

Appendix Four: Rivers at risk of flooding in Hampshire

(According to Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps, all rivers below have a 1% chance of flooding each year.)

- Avon
- Beaulieu
- Ems
- Hamble
- Itchen
- Lymington
- Meon
- Test (and tributaries)
- Wallington