



Environment and Transport Select Committee
12 January 2012

**Lead Local Flood Authority –
Responding to legislative requirements**

Purpose of the report: Scrutiny of Services and Budgets/ Policy Development and Review

To update the Select Committee on Surrey County Council's preparation for and implementation of flood risk management legislation; and actions relating to previous Member Task Groups and the Flood Risk Management Member Seminar.

Introduction:

1. In December 2009, the Flood Risk Regulations identified Surrey County Council as the 'lead local flood authority'. The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 places duties on all lead local flood authorities. Commencement of the act, which is in stages, began on 1 October 2010.
2. The role is mainly a strategic one. It is about better planning to reduce the risk of flooding and complements ongoing operational activity. It is about flood risk from surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses.
3. The Select Committee made a number of recommendations in January 2011, including ongoing monitoring of recommendations made by the Pitt Review Monitoring Task Group (2009) and Flooding Task Group (2008).
4. This report will also update the Select Committee on issues raised by Members at the Flood Risk Management Member Seminar in July 2011.

Lead Local Flood Authority Responsibilities:

5. As 'lead local flood authority' (LLFA) Surrey County Council has a number of legislative responsibilities. This report will focus on the following:
 - A duty to cooperate with other authorities on the flood risk management role.

ITEM 8

- A duty to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for flood risk management in the local area.
- A drainage-approving role.
- A duty to maintain a register of structures likely to have a significant effect on flood risk.

Duty to cooperate

6. Legislation identifies 'risk management authorities', which in Surrey are the 12 Surrey local authorities, the water utility companies and the Environment Agency. We have brought these bodies together as the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board (the board). As recommended by the Pitt Review Monitoring Task Group, the board will ensure there is a strategic approach to flood risk management in Surrey. Annex 1 outlines the board's terms of reference.
7. The board, chaired by the Assistant Director Highways, will provide an annual progress report to the Select Committee and Environment and Infrastructure Directorate Leadership Team.
8. The Select Committee is asked to consider and comment on the board's terms of reference.

Surrey Flood Risk Management Strategy

9. The Surrey local flood risk management strategy (the strategy) will provide a coherent overview of flood risk management in Surrey.
10. The board has agreed a strategy statement (Annex 2). This outlines Surrey's approach to the strategy, and its contents and objectives. In summary the objectives are:
 - Make it easier for risk management authorities to work together – including clarifying roles and responsibilities and enabling joint working.
 - Present a clear overview of levels of risk throughout the county – the strategy will be 'integrated' and cover all forms of flooding. This reflects a partnership approach and goes beyond what Surrey County Council is required to do.
 - Provide a robust approach to prioritising schemes and spending – including principles for prioritisation and exploring potential means of funding.
 - Support the flood risk management work of Surrey local authorities – including promoting best practice in planning policy and sustainable development.
 - Agree a coordinated communications approach – to include a focus on coordinated community resilience activities and working with existing community groups.
11. The strategy will build on Surrey County Council's Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (2011). It will reflect previous work, including scrutiny by the Pitt Review Monitoring Task Group (2009) and Flooding Task Group

(2008). In accordance with the legislation, it will take account of the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (July 2011).

12. Surrey County Council is required to consult the public on the countywide strategy. Consultation will be held in two stages. The first stage from January – March 2012 will be used to inform the drafting of the document. This will be guided by a questionnaire. A second phase of consultation will seek comments on the draft strategy itself. Those with an interest in flood risk, including relevant community groups, parish councils, residents' associations and members will be involved.
13. The completed strategy and an accompanying summary document will be available for scrutiny in summer 2012.

Drainage approving role

14. Officers have tested a range of options for a Surrey Drainage Approving Body (SAB). The preferred option is delegation to a consortium of local authorities. This avoids delays in the planning system and retains existing skills and capacity.
15. A working model will be developed in 2012. Implementation is dependent on commencement of the duty, likely to be in autumn 2012.

Asset register

16. In accordance with the legislation, the 'lead local flood authority' is required to maintain a register of structures or features likely to have a significant effect on flood risk. Asset Planning Group is completing the register and it will be published on Surrey County Council's website.

Scrutiny of Services:

17. In January 2010, the Environment and Economy Select Committee resolved that future reporting on the recommendations from previous Member Task Groups on flood risk would focus on requirements reflected in legislation. A summary of the recommendations and updates on their delivery has been included in Annex 3.
18. The Select Committee Chairman chaired a Member Seminar on Flood Risk in July 2011. It introduced Surrey County Council's new role and responsibilities and how the role complemented that of other agencies. A workshop session increased officer understanding of the issues raised by residents.
19. The main points raised during the seminar are highlighted in Annex 4. Many of the points highlighted will be resolved through the strategy process and operational activity.

The Lower Thames Flood Risk Management Strategy

20. Surrey County Council was consulted on the Lower Thames strategy in 2009. Since then, Government's funding mechanisms have changed. There is now an estimated £116 million shortfall. It is unrealistic to expect small communities to fund this shortfall.
21. The Environment Agency wants to find a novel and innovative approach to funding implementation of the Lower Thames strategy. It has convened a group of local authority officers in the Lower Thames area. Surrey County Council is a key stakeholder.
22. The scheme has a far wider reach than just communities in the Lower Thames floodplain. In a major flood event, motorway closures would disrupt the economy. We want big business and utility companies to make a full contribution. The Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee has a key role to play in securing funding.
23. Communities should clearly see the benefits of investment. We want the Environment Agency to work in partnership on cost reduction, and 'packaging' within the scheme. Clear timescales for stages of implementation are needed. Once all avenues of Government and private sector funding have been exploited, there may be some potential for community 'beneficiaries' to contribute to costs via developer contributions. It is unlikely substantial top-up funds can be raised through developer contributions, given low levels of development in Surrey and competing political priorities.

Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee

24. The Environment Agency has established regional flood and coastal committees (RFCCs) under the legislation. The Thames RFCC area includes most of Surrey. A small area in the southern part of Surrey is covered by the Southern RFCC. Councillor Denise Turner-Stewart represents Surrey on the Thames RFCC. There is no Surrey representation on the Southern RFCC. The Thames RFCC committee seeks to:
 - Ensure there are coherent plans for identifying, communicating and managing flood and coastal erosion risks across catchments and shorelines.
 - Promote efficient, targeted and risk-based investment in flood and coastal erosion risk management and optimises value for money and benefits for local communities.
 - Provide a link between the Environment Agency, lead local flood authorities, other risk management authorities, and other relevant bodies. This will engender mutual understanding of flood and coastal erosion risks in its area.
25. The Thames RFCC sets a local levy for which Surrey County Council pays around £1 million per annum. The exact amount depends on which

levy option the Thames RFCC selects. Surrey County Council is the largest single local authority contributor.

26. The Thames RFCC has agreed a £10 million levy fund for a programme of investment in 2012/ 13. Subject to final national approval this programme of works will include schemes in Guildford (Pirbright), Runnymede (Lyne and Chilsey Green), Epsom & Ewell (Stoneleigh Area Drainage Scheme, Langley Vale Flood Alleviation Scheme and Stew Pond Restoration and Flood Alleviation Scheme), Surrey Heath (Lightwater Surface Water Flood Reduction Scheme), Tandridge (Hamsey Green Flood Reduction Scheme) and Woking (Rive Ditch Flood Alleviation Scheme).

Surface water management plans

27. Surrey County Council is working with Woking Borough Council and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council on developing surface water management plans. These areas were selected because of their position on the 2009 *Defra National Rank Order of Settlements Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding*.
28. Partners will use the plans as a framework to understand the causes of surface water flooding. Then to agree cost effective ways of managing surface water flood risk.

Conclusions:

29. Surrey County Council takes flood risk seriously. We are responding to the challenges presented by the legislation accordingly.

Financial and value for money implications

30. The role of lead local flood authority is funded by a non-ring fenced area based grant.
31. Government undertakes to fund maintenance of new surface water drainage systems (where across more than one property) to 2018.
32. The identification of new flood mitigation schemes may place a new burden on capital budgets if 100% funding is not secured from Government funding.

Equalities implications

33. None identified at present although allowance will need to be made for vulnerable people who typically recover less quickly and are less prepared for flooding incidents.

Risk management implications

34. The legislation purposefully moves flood risk management to a risk-based approach. The role and responsibilities are being implemented in close cooperation with Emergency Management.

Implications for the Council's priorities or Community Strategy

35. Implementation of the legislation will contribute towards achieving Council priorities and support delivery of the Community Strategy, including:
- SPP Priority G: Help people achieve more sustainable lifestyles.
 - SPP Priority H: Create better, more sustainable developments that deliver more social, environmental and economic benefits.
 - SPP Priority I: Improve public confidence in the ability of public services to keep Surrey safe, prepare for emergencies and reduce crime and anti-social behaviours.

Recommendations:

36. That the Select Committee:
- a) Considers and comments on the work undertaken to date on the lead local flood authority role and associated activity.
 - b) Considers and comments on the strategy statement for the Surrey local flood risk management strategy.
 - c) Considers the terms of reference for the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board.

Next steps:

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to sign off terms of reference for the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board.

Report contacts: Lee McQuade and Deborah Fox, Strategy Group, Environment and Infrastructure Directorate.

Mark Howarth and Peter Agent, Asset Planning Group, Environment and Infrastructure Directorate.

Contact details: 020 8541 7604/ lee.mcquade@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/ background papers: Environment and Economy Select Committee Reports 12 January 2010 and 19 January 2011. Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Flood Risk Regulations 2009.

Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board

Draft Terms of Reference – November 2011

Purpose

To provide strategic leadership on local flood risk management in Surrey.

Objectives

In broad terms, the purpose of the Partnership Board is to ensure there is a strategic approach to flood risk management within Surrey under which partners work towards a joint understanding of local flood risk and an alignment of priorities and investment.

It also constitutes a parent body for other more localised functional groups (planning, technical, resilience etc) to provide progress reports, seek direction or request resolution to policy concerns.

Specific Aims

- Ensure effective collaboration between partners by sharing data, information and resources in order to review organisational policies and procedures and provide advice on flood risk management matters within Surrey.
- To ensure that each organisation is aware of the scope of their partners' roles and responsibilities and to promote mutual support wherever possible.
- To provide advice and review progress in implementing the Flood and Water Management Act and the new responsibilities for Surrey County Council as a Lead Local Flood Authority.
- Agree investment priorities and prioritise work programmes
- To enhance the capability of communities to prepare, respond and recover from flooding incidents. This includes raising awareness of flood risk and promoting community self-help.
- To explore partnership funding opportunities, which may facilitate more, cost-effective solutions to managing flood risk and to ensure that money is spent in the most efficient way.
- To ensure that there are robust links to other forums involved in flood risk at both a regional and local level in order to help shape policy and funding and ensure consistency in approach where relevant.
- To help build a better knowledge base amongst Surrey County Council, district and borough staff, councillors and residents.
- To effectively communicate the outcomes of the meetings with councillors, committees, officer groups and members of the public.

Membership

The core membership will consist of appropriate representation from the following Risk Management Authorities/organisations:

- Surrey County Council
- Surrey District and Borough representatives (to reflect areas with the greatest flood risk)
 - Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
 - Guildford Borough Council
 - Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
 - Runnymede Borough Council
- Environment Agency
- Thames Water
- Surrey Fire & Rescue

Papers may also need to be circulated to the following, with invited attendance as necessary:

- Highways Agency
- Network Rail
- Surrey Police

- Southern Water
- UK Power Networks
- Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board
- National Trust
- Basingstoke Canal Authority
- Ministry of Defence
- Other districts and boroughs

Chair and Secretariat

The Partnership Board will be chaired by Jason Russell (Assistant Director Operations, Highways and Countryside at Surrey County Council).

Surrey County Council will provide the Secretariat to the Forum and will arrange for the minutes of the meetings to be circulated.

Frequency of Meetings

The Partnership Board will meet quarterly, to ensure that adequate discussion is taking place and that appropriate progress is made. This frequency will be reviewed as necessary with the possibility of ad hoc meetings as needs dictate.

Reporting

The Partnership Board will provide an annual progress report to the Environment and Transport Select Committee and Directorate Leadership Team.

The outcomes and decisions of the Partnership Board will feed into the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC).

The Partnership Board will receive quarterly reports from each of the LLFA's operational groups that provide:

- Updates on the groups' work programmes and key issues for review and endorsement;
- Assurance that liaison is working and that partners are fulfilling their commitments;
- Recommendations for actions which the senior officers need to focus further attention on.

Strategy Group

Flood Risk Management Strategy Statement - DRAFT

November 2011

1. Surrey is a county with a high risk of flooding that has experienced several major flooding events in the last 10 years, notably in 2000, 2003 and summer 2007. Much of this has occurred in the floodplain of the Lower Thames Valley and its tributaries. There are also many localised spots prone to surface water flooding. In general terms, the lowlands are prone to river type flooding whereas along the base of the Downs and the Lower Greensand hills, flash flooding from surface water is a major concern.
2. We cannot stop all forms of flooding in Surrey from happening. Extreme weather events appear to be on the rise and many of our existing homes and businesses are built in the floodplain. However, through the Surrey Flood Risk Management Strategy (FRMS or the Strategy) we can coordinate our services so that both flood risk is reduced and that the aftermath of flooding is as minimal as can be. The Surrey FRMS must present a coherent policy for flood risk management.
3. Affected residents and businesses may not differentiate between different sources of flooding; the impact is their key concern. Surrey's FRMS will therefore illustrate the risks from all sources of flooding within the county. It will also provide an integrated overview of scheme delivery and a high level financial picture of the funding situation across all types of flood risk.
4. However, local sources of flooding: surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses are a new area of focus for the Lead Local Flood Authority and as a priority the Surrey FRMS must communicate the objectives, priorities and proposed actions in relation to this area.
5. A large amount of information exists on the varying levels of flood risk throughout Surrey and therefore priority geographical areas for action. The Environment Agency flood maps inform the district and borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and Development Plan documents. Existing strategies such as the Lower Thames Flood Risk Management Strategy and the Wey Strategy, also highlight fluvial priority areas in Runnymede, Spelthorne, Elmbridge, Guildford and Waverley.
6. Surrey County Council's recent work on the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment has identified the 11 Surrey towns at greatest risk from surface water flooding. These areas are based on the number of people, non-residential and critical services at risk. Detailed Surface Water Management Plans for the highest scoring areas of Woking and Byfleet, and Epsom and Ewell have built on this data to enable schemes to be identified.
7. It is not anticipated that the Surrey FRMS will provide any detail on risk areas resulting from reservoir breaches due to the low probability of this occurrence.
8. In addition to levels of risk, it will be necessary to consider other factors when prioritising mitigation activities within the Surrey FRMS. Important considerations to explore include cost benefit analysis, the impact on areas of deprivation and identification of potential beneficiaries including businesses.

9. By considering all sources of risk, the Surrey FRMS will be a vehicle through which partners can agree what can be done about each source over time. The Surrey FRMS will recognise that at a local level, smaller-scale solutions are more fundable.
10. Importantly, the Surrey FRMS must also reflect the aims and objectives of the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (the National Strategy). The overall aim of which is to “ensure that flooding and coastal erosion risks are well-managed and coordinated, so their impacts are minimised”. Coordination in the case of the Surrey FRMS means presenting high-level information on priority activities, whilst reflecting that delivery will be through individual Risk Management Authorities or working collectively where appropriate.
11. Early discussion suggests there are key objectives that the Surrey FRMS should focus on. Broadly these reflect principles within the national Strategy.

1. Make it easier for Risk Management Authorities to work together

12. The Surrey FRMS will bring together all Risk Management Authorities in partnership to work towards coordinated flood risk management. The roles and responsibilities of all Risk Management Authorities will be agreed and detailed and the Surrey FRMS will explain any measures that have been put in place to enable joint working. There is a desire that the Strategy encourages the consideration of flood risk impact by all relevant departments of local authorities. Councillors will be involved through consultation with Local Committees and Surrey County Council Committees.
13. The Surrey FRMS will sit above an action plan, which will detail the priority activities of each Risk Management Authority and highlight what will be achieved through joint working. Designs and detailed costings for schemes will not be included in the Surrey FRMS.

2. Present a clear overview of levels of risk throughout the county

14. The Surrey FRMS will present spatially an overview of the levels of local risk for all sources of flooding. Information will be provided at a catchment level as recommended in the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (National Strategy). This assessment of levels of risk also needs to capture information on historic flood events. The Surrey FRMS will set out how we plan to build on the data already collected.
15. We are keen for the Surrey FRMS to reflect residents’ concerns, whilst recognising that more vulnerable residents may be less able to protect themselves from flooding.

3. Provide a robust approach to prioritising schemes and spending

16. We must recognise that we are working with at best the same or less government funding. The Risk Management Authorities will take every opportunity to seek additional funding, individually and together. The Strategy will facilitate the delivery of quick wins, as well as supporting large-scale infrastructure improvements. It will provide principles for prioritisation of schemes, and also explore new sources of funding. The Strategy will also highlight how private sector monies could be used.
17. However, the Surrey FRMS will also set out clearly what Risk Management Authorities cannot afford to do. Alternative sources of funding appear limited. Any schemes proposed are unlikely to get 100% funding through the national funding mechanisms. No new capital

funding has been identified as yet. It is unlikely substantial top-up funds can be raised through developer contributions, given low levels of development in Surrey and competing political priorities.

18. The Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (TRFCC) leads the regional funding programme. The Surrey County Council Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment will submit an annual programme of projects to the regional programme.

4. Support the flood risk management work of districts and boroughs

19. The Surrey FRMS will be an opportunity to promote sustainability and best practice, by reflecting on the flooding policies that could be used more consistently across the county. Presentation of information at catchment level will provide a strategic overview and enable greater consideration of cross border issues.
20. The latest position on the SUDS Approval Body will be included. The preferred option at present is that a consortium of local authorities delivers the role, including adoption and maintenance. Where uncertainty remains, such as around the transfer of the consenting role for ordinary watercourses, the Strategy will set out future work that required.

5. Agree a coordinated communication approach

21. The Surrey FRMS must highlight that some risk will always remain and that people and properties in flood-risk areas should be prepared for flooding. There will be a strong focus on coordinated local resilience activities and information will be provided on how Risk Management Authorities are promoting this.
22. We aim to optimise communication activities being delivered by all partners and make use of Risk Management Authorities' links with existing community groups. This will be the main approach to community engagement. We aim to recognise the approaches used by successful community groups in Surrey, whilst understanding that their perspective is influenced by local events. We will encourage community groups to work collaboratively with maintenance teams.
23. The Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment has a 6-year cycle and it is felt that the Strategy should be in line with this. However, it recognised that over this period there will be significant increases in flooding data as additional Surface Water Management Plans and the Register of Structures are completed. We will set out how the Surrey FRMS can be updated to include this additional information.
24. At the least, the Surrey FRMS requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment scoping report to enable consideration of the wider environmental impacts.

For further information please contact Judith Jenkins, Judith.Jenkins@surreycc.gov.uk

[To the top](#)

**Annex 3: 2011/ 12 Action on Recommendations of Surrey County Council
Member Task Groups on Flood Risk Management (2008/9)¹.**

<p>Recommendation 1: The county council should develop a Surrey flooding board, to coordinate the activities of the range of organisations involved in flood risk.</p>	<p>The Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board (Partnership Board) was established in September 2011. The Board includes representatives from Risk Management Authorities.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: The county council should establish a post of flood risk manager to work to the Director-level lead.</p>	<p>The Asset Planning Group Manager is coordinating the work. A cross county council officer group continues to meet to ensure partnership working and maximise benefits.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11: A countywide grouping of borough and district planning officers should be convened to consider the issue of flooding and planning.</p>	<p>Countywide planning officer groups already exist and issues on flood risk are being addressed as necessary through the Surrey Planning Officers Association and Planning Working Group. In addition, the Asset Planning Group convenes meetings of borough and district drainage engineers on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12: Surrey's select committees should take responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the Pitt Review recommendations.</p>	<p>The second report was submitted to the Environment and Economy Select Committee on 19 January 2011. This report is the third. Ongoing annual reports will come from the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board (recommendation 13).</p>
<p>Recommendation 13: The proposed flooding board should take responsibility for preparing an annual summary of progress in managing flood risk.</p>	<p>The Partnership Board will provide an annual progress report to the Environment and Transport Select Committee and Environment and Infrastructure Directorate Leadership Team.</p>
<p>Recommendation 15: Local authorities should positively tackle local problems of flooding by working with all relevant parties, establishing ownership and legal responsibility.</p>	<p>The Asset Planning Group already works with boroughs and districts, communities, relevant flood forums and local flooding groups to positively tackle local problems. Part of the council's new role concerns investigating rare or intense rainfall events that result in flooding and also, where necessary, establishing ownership and legal responsibilities for asset maintenance off the public highway. The identification of key assets is a matter currently being progressed by Asset Planning Group and an initial asset register will be published in the near future with updates to follow on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Recommendation 18: Local surface water</p>	<p>The county council is supporting work on surface water management plans for Woking</p>

¹ Government report of the Pitt Review 2007; Surrey County Council Flooding Task Group 2008; and Surrey County Council Pitt Review Monitoring Task Group 2009.

management plans, as set out under PPS25 and coordinated by local authorities, should provide the basis for managing all local flood risk.	and Epsom & Ewell. These are an opportunity to gain experience on the scope and issues that arise and lead to development of best practice for use elsewhere in the county. This will be reflected in the Strategy. Schemes from the plans have been included in the RFCC funding programme.
Recommendation 19: Local authorities should assess and, if appropriate, enhance their technical capabilities to deliver a wide range of responsibilities in relation to local flood risk management.	The current focus is on making better use of existing resources in partnership. The Environment Agency is providing capacity building training for LLFAs. This action is ongoing.
Recommendation A1: The Executive (now Cabinet) commits to continued investment of £1.2m capital for the next 3 years to address the problem of 'wetspots' in the county.	Surrey Highways funded £1.2 million of drainage capital drainage schemes in the first 3 years. This was reduced to £776,000 in 2011-12 in line with other cuts, but has been increased to £786,000 in the next financial year.
Recommendation A13: The Highway Service in conjunction with the Environment Agency considers drafting a policy on SuDS including their use, cost and benefits to the county.	The LLFA's SuDS responsibilities have not yet commenced. National guidance is expected in 2012. Surrey drainage officers are developing Surrey wide generic guidance on surface water drainage requirements based on pre-planning advice developed by Runnymede Borough Council.
Recommendation A14: Borough and district councils prepare supplementary planning documents on SuDS that give guidance on how the planning authority would expect these features to be incorporated into development schemes.	Correctly designed SuDS are the preferred drainage option for the county council and all borough and district authorities. Surrey drainage officers are developing Surrey-wide generic guidance on surface water drainage requirements.
Recommendation A16: The council instructs its contractors to inspect ditches and advise the county of problems so that it may in turn inform the national or local LDA who can inform the landowner or serve a notice after a period.	Considerable work has been undertaken with partners to identify and plot highway ditches across the county. Asset Planning Group has now produced a preliminary asset inventory that will be circulated to boroughs and districts in the new year.
Recommendation A19: A jointly branded leaflet alerting residents of the steps they can take to protect themselves against flooding.	Flooding is included as part of generic emergency management communications. Alert systems include Floodline and Surrey Alert. Residents' views on flood risk management will inform the Strategy.
Recommendation B1: The Highway Service regularly shares information contained in the 'wetspots' database with all the borough and	Asset Planning Group shares information and discusses proposed drainage works with borough and district partners at the annual 'wetspot' revision meetings. The updated database will continue to be published annually and the information shared widely.

<p>district councils so that they can fulfil their role as planning authority as effectively as possible.</p>	
<p>Recommendation B2: The ‘wetspots’ database, as well as available information on the highways drainage asset, be shared with partners. This could form the basis on which local action plans are formulated. This could include working collaboratively with parish councils and residents’ associations.</p>	<p>Surrey Highways are currently represented on a number of local flood forums and regularly engage with parish councils and residents’ associations on flooding issues in their areas. Asset Planning Group will further assist in the sharing of information and data with other partners and stakeholders, including districts and boroughs.</p>
<p>Recommendation B3: The council should approach the borough and district councils to establish whether joint-working arrangements for street cleaning and gully cleaning could be put in place in the future.</p>	<p>The Flooding Task Group previously raised this initiative and every district and borough was contacted. At that time, there were a number of issues that prevented progress but further work is ongoing.</p>
<p>Recommendation B4: Officers work closely with borough, district, parish councils and residents’ associations to establish a working partnership to support riparian owners.</p>	<p>Working with riparian owners currently takes place on a reactive basis and will be progressed with the identification of more riparian owners. This will be reflected in the Surrey Flood Risk Management Strategy (Strategy).</p>

Annex 4: Flood risk member seminar (25 July 2011): key issues

During a workshop session county council members were asked what issues local residents raised with them. The points raised are summarised below.

Issue raised	Response
<p>Roles and responsibilities: Confusion regarding the respective roles and responsibilities of flood risk agencies. Need to understand what the council does/ does not do and encourage people to help themselves.</p>	<p>The Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (Strategy) will clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of flood risk management agencies. It will outline what agencies do and don't do and determine means by which communities can help themselves. This will build on existing activity including new Surrey County Council webpages on flood risk management.</p>
<p>Knowledge: Residents have a lack of knowledge on different types of flooding. Maps aid understanding but residents are not aware of the information available and how to access it. However, residents don't need too much detail, they don't care. Need to clarify and simplify reporting procedures - a single point of contact</p>	<p>The Strategy will set out the local context in terms of types of flooding. It will include maps but also link to further information where appropriate and reporting procedures. As part of this the Strategy will be completed in close consultation with colleagues in emergency management and other colleagues who already communicate with residents regarding flood risk.</p>
<p>Insurance: Concern that people are not reporting flooding events for fear of being put on flood risk maps and increasing insurance premiums.</p>	<p>Insurance companies are likely to calculate insurance rates based on flood risk in the future. This may produce behaviour change.</p>
<p>SuDS: Role and responsibilities regarding Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) and how they might be applied in certain areas.</p>	<p>Surrey drainage officers are developing Surrey wide generic guidance on surface water drainage requirements based on pre-planning advice developed by Runnymede Borough Council.</p>
<p>Planning: The county council and Environment Agency should ascertain whether they can do things differently to help local planning authorities prevent inappropriate development, for example, bring influence on boroughs and districts to prioritise flood risk in considering applications.</p>	<p>The Strategy and flood risk planning issues will be discussed with Surrey planning officers.</p>
<p>Gullies: Clarity re gully clearing. No schedules for gully clearance, maintenance and a lack of information on the replacement programme.</p>	<p>Gully cleaning schedules are available on the Surrey County Council website. Drainage maintenance works are generally indicated on the members' bulletins if they are of a significant</p>

	nature.
Thames Barrier: If it is closed it will cause upstream flooding and London communities are prioritised in terms of flood prevention.	The Environment Agency noted at the seminar that closing the barrier would not cause flooding upstream and that gates and locks were not shut upstream to protect areas downstream (in London).
Wetspots: The wetspot list is not complete. Councillors would like a copy of the list with an indication of what is being done about the problem. Provide members with information relating to their division only. Members could then take a list of known wet spots to resident groups and they could add to them with their local knowledge. Time delay between logging issues and physical improvement on the ground (no proactive communication).	The wetspot list is a live document and is continually being updated by the highways maintenance engineers and borough officers. Wetspot ward lists are being produced and will be issued in the near future. Annual lists of capital drainage schemes are available on the Surrey County Council web pages.
Land ownership/ ditches: Ownership of ditches needs to be clarified so that efforts to ensure they are cleared can be more effective. Semi-urban areas owners don't understand who is responsible. There is a need to engage the farming community.	Officers will progress this once resources become available. The NFU will be consulted during the Strategy consultation.
Community groups: Residents have knowledge and understanding of local issues. Parish councils and community groups have wide ranging experience. However, we cannot treat groups in a uniform way.	Officers will consult a wide range of community representatives on the Strategy and involve those with an active interest in flood risk management. The Asset Planning Group will continue to work with active flood forums.
Digital media: Facebook/ Email/ Twitter are means of engagement but not available to all. Online flood reporting systems – only for IT literate. Should only be one of many ways of communicating. Could post out comms to relevant addresses, use inserts re flooding in newspapers/ magazines.	Electronic means of communication such as the county council website and Twitter will and are already being exploited. Other forms of communication will also be used. For example, although mainly electronic, the Strategy consultation will include public events and information will be included in Surrey Matters. The Strategy consultation will seek feedback on what sort of information/ communication is required.
Members: Use members and tap into local knowledge: A conduit for two-way communications.	We will consult with members and will reflect on the role of members in the Strategy.