

ANNEX C SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The flooding task group (FTG) recommends that the Executive passes this report to the Head of Highways to work up an action plan that takes into account the recommendations made in this report and summarised below. The FTG recommends that the Executive then agrees this action plan with the Head of Service and monitors it on a regular basis with support from the Select Committees.

In order to prioritise and manage the recommendations made by the FTG, each has been allocated a prioritisation code from one to four (written beneath each recommendation). The timelines for initiation of each code are set out below. The Committee asks that the Executive consider these prioritisation codes in conjunction with the recommendations themselves.

Code 1: Immediate action on approval by Executive.

Code 2: Start process of action within six months.

Code 3: Start process of action within 12 months.

Code 4: Start process of action within 18 months (allowing for coordination of recommendations from the Pitt Review).

A– Recommendations pertaining to Surrey County Council

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---------------|
| A1 | <i>FTG recommends that the Executive commits to continued investment of £1.2m capital for the next 3 years to address the problem of wetspots in the County.</i> | (8.3) |
| | Code 1 recommendation. | |
| A2 | <i>The FTG felt that the Executive should ask that the Highways Service ascertain if there is a financial case for investing more resources into the Materials Group Team / drainage inventory crew over a fixed period of time to carry out this important mapping work to improve the data information held by the County. Not only will this expedite the large gaps in knowledge of the County's drainage systems but will help to reduce the amount of flooding schemes the County is financing that it is not directly responsible for.</i> | (9.5) |
| | Code 1 recommendation. | |
| A3 | <i>With respect to the mapping of drainage data, the FTG strongly recommends that the Service establishes which Borough and District Councils are planning to carry out this work or have completed this work, so that this information can be shared where it is available or a joint approach agreed where it is not.</i> | (9.6) |
| | Code 2 recommendation. | |
| A4 | <i>The FTG recommends that regular briefing/training sessions would benefit call centre staff to enable them to collect the most pertinent information on flooding incidents to ensure engineers are able to provide an appropriate response in a timely manner.</i> | (10.4) |
| | Code 2 recommendation. | |
| A5 | <i>FTG recommends that the proper process is followed through the Contact Centre when reporting a flooding incident and that members and officers are reminded of this process. As part of this process it is recommended that a proforma be distributed to members to enable them to consistently report flooding incidents via email.</i> | (10.5) |
| | Code 2 recommendation. | |
| A6 | <i>The FTG recommends that the database of "wetspots" is made available to the County Council Contingency Planning Team in order that they have the latest information on potential flooding areas in planning their responses to emergency issues across the County.</i> | (10.7) |
| | Code 1 recommendation. | |

- A7** *The FTG recommends that the Head of Highways investigates whether savings could be made by aligning the contract specification to ensure that the Council is achieving value for money for the services it receives.* **(11.4)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- The FTG recommends that the gully-cleaning contractor issues monthly reports to Area Highways managers as well as Ringway and Carillion, confirming which gullies have been cleaned and a list of gullies that are still not working correctly.* **(11.5)**
- A8** *The FTG felt that in order to make the mapping process as effective as possible and provide value for money, the drainage mapping team should work in conjunction with the maintenance teams to build on the information known about the highway drainage system in Surrey. It is accepted that where a gully / pipe is blocked this will entail a revisit but the overall effect will be to produce a more comprehensive body of information on problem gullies.* **(11.9)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- A9** *The FTG felt that Community Highway Officers (CHOs) should receive additional training on drainage issues and to ensure that this training programme forms part of the CHO induction. The FTG recommends that the service considers this when setting training budgets for next year.* **(11.10)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- A10** *However the FTG recommends that the service continues to build up information on individual gullies so that gully cleaning programmes in the County, and hence the resources available, are better targeted in the future.* **(11.11)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- A11** *Cleaning ditches routinely was a practice that ceased several years ago. As flooding problems become more prevalent, the FTG recommends that a regular cyclical ditch-cleaning programme should be considered before the situation gets much worse.* **(12.3)**
Code 3 recommendation.
- A12** *The FTG therefore recommends that the Highway Service in conjunction with the Environment Agency consider drafting a policy on SUDS including their use, cost and benefits to the County.* **(13.3)**
Code 4 recommendation.
- A13** *The FTG therefore recommends that the County Council ensures that SUDS are included in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Local Development Frameworks and that 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.* **(13.4)**
Code 4 recommendation.
- A14** *With respect to using section 106 agreements for drainage infrastructure, the FTG recommends that SCC assess all highways related development opportunities to ensure that issues relating to drainage infrastructure are addressed to mitigate flooding risks in the future.* **(14.6)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- A15** *The FTG recommends that 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.* **(15.2)**
Code 4 recommendation.

- A16** *The FTG note that the new dropped kerb initiative is already in the current SCC design guide but are not convinced that the new contractors will know about it or uphold it. It is therefore recommended that the design guide is annually reviewed and relaunched.* (16.2)
Code 2 recommendation.
- A17** *The FTG recommends that more comprehensive information on the duties of riparian owners is published on SCC website as well as LDA websites and that Borough and District Councils share their knowledge of riparian owners across the County.* (16.3)
Code 2 recommendation.
- A18** *The FTG recommends a jointly branded leaflet alerting residents of the steps they can take to protect themselves against flooding.* (16.4)
Code 1 recommendation.
- A19** *The FTG recommends spending small sums of money on signposting particular areas of flooding where the cost of drainage works is out of proportion and have little impact on reducing flooding.* (16.5)
Code 3 recommendation.
- A20** *If the Executive agrees that ongoing capital investment is needed, the FTG believes that it would be advantageous for the Transport and Environment and Economy Select Committees to undertake bi-annual scrutiny reports of the schemes, their effectiveness and examination and reprioritisation of the 'wetspots' list so that they can report to the Executive accordingly.* (18.2)
Code 3 recommendation (TSC 20 Oct 08 – E & E 30 Oct 08)

B – Recommendations for improved partnership working

- B1** *The FTG strongly recommends that the Highway Service regularly shares information contained in the wetspots database with all the Borough and District Councils so that they can fulfil their role as planning authority as effectively as possible.* (10.2)
Code 1 recommendation.
- B2** *The FTG recommends that the wetspots database as well as available information on the highways drainage asset be shared with partners such as the Borough and District Councils, the Environment Agency and Thames Water. The FTG recommends that this could form the basis on which local action plans are formulated between agencies where properties or businesses are at a significant risk of flooding. This could include working collaboratively with Parish Councils and Residents Associations as well as individual property owners.* (10.6)
Code 1 recommendation.
The FTG recommends that the Local Committees are the suitable body to monitor incidents and local action plans on a periodic basis.
Code 3 recommendation.
- B3** *The FTG recommends that 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.* (11.8)
Code 2 recommendation.
- B4** *FTG recommends that officers work closely with Borough / District / Parish Councils and Residents Associations to establish a working partnership to support Riparian owners, to ensure that they are aware of their duties and that there are local action plans in place for each wetspot area on their land.* (12.1)
Code 3 recommendation.

- B5** *The FTG is keen for the authority to build on this knowledge and recommends that the Highways Authority continues to work closely with Borough and District Councils to maintain a database on ditch ownership as well as sharing ditch-cleaning programmes.* **(12.2)**
Code 4 recommendation.
- B6** *The FTG recommends that Borough and District Councils work proactively with Thames Water to ensure that the demand on their sewerage network is taken into account at outline planning stage and to allow them time to plan any necessary water infrastructure improvements irrespective of the number of properties in the development. The FTG would also encourage Thames Water to take a proactive stance towards the Borough and District Councils by providing them with information on problem areas where this is known.* **(14.2)**
Code 1 recommendation.
- B7** *The FTG would encourage Borough and District Councils to investigate the possibility of sharing drainage expertise across the County through jointly funded operations. This might help to increase the amount of times and the quality in which flooding and drainage issues are taken into account when considering planning application for smaller developments.* **(14.4)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- B8** *The FTG recommends that the Borough and Districts Councils as the planning authorities, as well as Thames Water, request NHBC flow plans when they are produced to ensure that the relevant organisation properly consider how new developments affect their respective drainage networks.* **(14.5)**
Code 2 recommendation.
- B9** *(On using section 106 agreements for drainage infrastructure) The FTG would urge planning authorities to exercise this power in all cases where it is possible to do so.* **(14.6)**
Code 1 recommendation.
- B10** *The FTG recommends that more comprehensive information on the duties of riparian owners is published on SCC website as well as LDA websites and that Boroughs and Districts share their knowledge of riparian owners across the County.* **(16.3)**
Code 1 recommendation.
- B11** *(On the approach of the Hogsmill Integrated Drainage Pilot) The FTG believes that the approach taken by HIUDPS is the right one and recommends that the Council investigate how this approach might be taken for each of the catchments in Surrey.* **(17.3)**
Code 3 recommendation.
- B12** *The FTG believes that the HIUDPS provides a strong basis for 'Joint Flood Action Groups' to be set up across Surrey for each catchment area. They would complement and coordinate, rather than replace, the existing local partnerships that already meet to address flooding issues. Each flooding action group would be responsible for devising a 'Joint Flood Action Plan' and would be the delivery vehicle for implementation. They would be the forum in which all issues pertaining to partnership working on flood risk could be addressed (e.g. information sharing, joint planning, use of SUDS etc...). It is proposed that they would meet quarterly to establish and then implement Joint Action Plans and each organisation would bring the following contribution.* **(17.4)**
Code 3 recommendation.