

# SURREY LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

## ANNEXE A - OBJECTIVE ACTION PLANS

February 2017

# OBJECTIVE ACTION PLANS

## Overview

The action plans contained in this section of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) set out the specific activities that will facilitate achievement of the Strategy's objectives. These action plans are owned by all relevant risk management authorities (RMAs) within Surrey and will be reviewed and republished with any amendments on an ongoing basis.

## Structure of Action Plans

Each objective has its own action plan for delivery. These consist of two sections. The first is the summary document, which outlines the rationale for the objective, perceived benefits and any key pieces of legislation it may relate to. The second section details the main action plan itself. This sets out the tasks, deadlines, challenges, costs and responsible authorities required to achieve the relevant objective.

The plans are presented in a tabular format and group actions into short, medium, long term and ongoing activities. They are intended to be transparent, so that it is easy to understand what actions will be taken to achieve the objectives of the LFRMS. The plans are also subject to ongoing and regular review – should it be deemed that new or additional approaches are required to achieve the objectives, such changes will be incorporated into the plans as appropriate, which will then be republished.

## Assumptions

The action plans have been written in the context of the current levels of funding and resource available. If resource or funding levels were to be reduced, or if significant flooding occurred during the action plan timescales, there may be delays or changes to the plans. Any delays or changes will be recorded in the 'progress review' section of each action plan and deadlines updated as part of ongoing review.

The action plans should be regarded as the 'living' elements of the Strategy that are subject to change.

## Objectives

Objective 1	Our understanding of local and strategic flood risk will be improved through robust data gathering, management, analysis and sharing between RMAs to ensure partnership delivery of works to high risk areas.
Objective 2	RMAs will reduce flood risk by delivering an effective maintenance regime for drainage assets and managing our estates across the County in an environmentally sustainable manner.
Objective 3	We will agree with partners who the RMAs in Surrey are, jointly define their responsibilities and establish clear lines of communication with them to support the delivery of partnership-based flood alleviation projects.
Objective 4	Private owners will be made aware of their riparian responsibilities to maintain drainage assets and watercourses. We will support, promote and enforce these responsibilities.
Objective 5	The residents of Surrey will be supported to improve community resilience. Local people will be empowered to reduce the risk of flooding on both an individual and community level.
Objective 6	We will reduce the risk of flooding to and from all development through local planning policy and processes.
Objective 7	We will reduce flood risk from local sources via a programme of capital works, which will be integrated with the activities of other RMAs.
Objective 8	We will investigate significant flooding incidents in order to feedback recommendations to reduce flood risk.

## Glossary

The table below defines and explains some of the frequently used terminology within this document.

Acronym	Definition
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy – a planning charge which allows local authorities to raise funds from developers which can be used to fund infrastructure projects needed as a result of the development, such as flood alleviation schemes.
CRO	Community Resilience Officer – a role within SCC to assist communities in becoming more resilient, predominately to flooding.
EA	Environment Agency – responsible for managing flood risk from main rivers, the sea and reservoirs.
EOI	Expressions of Interest – initial stage of applying for funding.
FDGiA	Flood Defence Grant in Aid – national funding for flood alleviation schemes.
FG	Flood Action Group – a community group dedicated to proactive FRM.
FRM	Flood Risk Management
FWMA	Flood and Water Management Act (2010)
GIS	Geographical Information Systems – software which allows the capture, management, analysis and presentation of spatial information, such as flood extents, properties etc.
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership – a collection of local businesses and councils set up to help determine local economic priorities and have access to funding to generate growth.
LFRMS	Local Flood Risk Management Strategy – directs long-term FRM in Surrey.
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority – responsible for managing flood risk from ordinary watercourses, surface water and groundwater.
LPA	Local Planning Authority – In Surrey these are the District and Borough Councils responsible for exercising statutory planning functions.
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NFF	National Flood Forum – a national charity dedicated to supporting and representing communities and individuals at risk of flooding.
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework (2012) – sets out the government’s planning policies and how these are expected to be applied.
RFCC	Regional Flood and Coastal Committee- provide governance for the Environment Agency, are made up of members appointed by LLFAs and independent members with relevant experience, and cover all flood risks not including those that water companies are responsible for.
RMA	Risk Management Authority – organisations which have statutory duties under the Flood and Water Management Act (2010).
SCC	Surrey County Council – the LLFA for Surrey.
SNR	Strategic Network Resilience team (within SCC and primarily responsible for coordinating the LLFA duties).
SFAGF	Surrey Flood Action Group Forum – a forum of flood action group members appointed to work together to influence flood risk management in Surrey.
SFRPB	Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board – a local partnership that incorporates representation from all organisations in the County who have a role to play in flood risk management.
SoP	Standard of Protection – often described in terms of the return period of the event, i.e. the wall has a 1 in 100 year standard of protection. This means that the wall will protect land behind it up to the 1 in 100 year flood event, or a flood event with a 1% chance of occurring annually. If the flood event is more severe, then the wall may be overtopped. This does not describe the residual risk of flooding, for instance in the event that the wall experienced a breach.
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems – a less traditional approach to drainage where water is managed in a way which mimics nature, rather than conveying water quickly to watercourses via sewers. SuDS provide benefits such as reduced flood risk, and improved water quality and biodiversity.
WFD	Water Framework Directive (2000)
WG	Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board Working Group – supports the SFRPB and flood risk management through implementing board-agreed outputs.

If you have any queries about the action plans or the wider LFRMS, please get in touch by emailing [flooding.enquiries@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:flooding.enquiries@surreycc.gov.uk)

<b>Objective 1</b>	<b>Our understanding of local and strategic flood risk will be improved through clear data management and sharing between RMAs to ensure partnership delivery of works to high risk areas.</b>
<b>Purpose / Outcome</b>	<p>The purpose of this objective is to be able to use data that is gathered by all RMAs in a more efficient way and to greater effect in prioritising flood risk alleviation works, identifying opportunities to work in partnership, improving awareness of flood risk and assets and informing maintenance to reduce flood risk.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is to produce an annual report which summarises and presents the data gathered throughout the year in a meaningful way that can be used to inform decisions, such as prioritising investigations into those areas which are at risk, highlighting gaps in data capture or quality which could affect confidence in key decision making and use as part of the Communication Plan to engage with RMAs more widely, and flood action groups and members of the public more widely.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	One measure of success for this objective is that data gathered by all RMAs improves over time, in efficiency of managing the data, and improvement in coverage and quality. However most importantly success will be measured as part of an annual reporting process by where this data is used to produce meaningful insights to the SFRPB to review progress against the objectives of the Strategy and inform decision making and joint work programmes.
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	Objective 1 is fundamental link to all the strategy objectives providing a robust evidence base to support analysis and decision making to facilitate the successful delivery of the vision.
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A long term vision: to future proof flood risk requires risk data to factor in climate change.</li> <li>• Catchment-based approach: a holistic approach to flood alleviation (to not increase flood risk further downstream.</li> <li>• Partnership Working: establish data flows from partners into SCC (key dataset that SCC need to collect)</li> <li>• Community Resilience: methods for collating and sharing information on local knowledge of flooding</li> <li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: analytics to identify (in conjunction with district SFRA) areas at need to reduce flood risk. To look at ways to fund flood alleviation schemes in order to improve infrastructure and wellbeing.</li> <li>• SuDS through special planning/development: information on SuDS adoptions and maintenance. Opportunities to build in monitoring into planning applications and into the District / Boroughs local plans e.g. to monitor groundwater levels at large sites prone to groundwater flooding.</li> <li>• Capital Investment: data analytics allows prioritisation of highway capital schemes based on relative risk of sites.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	Publicly funded organisations are under increasing budget pressures. It is therefore imperative that time and resource is invested wisely to provide maximum value for money. Gathering, managing, analysing and presenting / sharing data efficiently and effectively has wide ranging benefits, such as improved confidence in decision making, and is therefore a wise investment by all RMAs. By working together to gather and understand this data, partnership working and an integrated and catchment based approach is promoted. Data is also invaluable in performing many of the statutory duties set out under the FWMA (2010) and other legislation which governs the organisations involved in flood risk management, such as Section 19 flood investigations and keeping an asset register.
<b>What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- avoid duplication of data</li> <li>- a robust and quality assured central store of data which can be used to make decisions with confidence</li> <li>- minimise the risk of making ill-informed decisions on partial or low quality data</li> <li>- facilitate partnership working to achieve common goals</li> <li>- value for money activity</li> <li>- improved awareness of flood risk and significant assets</li> <li>- efficient undertaking of statutory duties, such as Section 19 flood investigations</li> </ul>

Related Policies	<p>Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 all RMAs have a duty to co-operate with each other and to share data. A key theme of the Pitt Review was for flood risk management authorities to work in partnership to deliver flood risk management better to the benefit of their communities.</p> <p>The River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) across the Surrey area agree that data is required to improve flood risk mapping, and the Medway RBMP aims to use citizen scientists to collect data.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks better understanding and documenting of all sources of flood risk through partnership working. It states that Local Plans should be supported by SFRAs and develop policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant RMAs, such as LLFAs and internal drainage boards. Planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment and other characteristics of the area. Strategic Flood Risk Assessments are also reliant on flood risk data to inform emergency planning.</p> <p>Surface Water Management Plans also broadly recommend to enhance the quality and availability of flood incident data to inform flood risk management.</p> <p>The Government is releasing public data to become more transparent and foster innovation. These datasets are available from all central government departments and many other public sector bodies and local authorities. The data can be used by anyone to build useful applications that help society or analyse changes over time. By improving the openness of data it is anticipated that it will lead to an improved understanding of flood risk across the county, and how flood risk management activities are prioritised and agreed on through an open and transparent evidence base.</p>
Related SCC Corporate Priorities	Resident Experience and Wellbeing.
Review Date	September 2017

<b>Objective 1</b>	<b>Our understanding of local and strategic flood risk will be improved through robust data gathering, management, analysis and sharing between RMAs to ensure partnership delivery of works to high risk areas.</b>					
<b>Sub-Objective</b>	Improve the use and quality of data to maximise the value it provides across the different flood risk management responsibilities of all RMAs and other organisations.	Collect, communicate and share data more openly across and within all RMAs and the public in such a way that all appropriately formatted data is openly accessible and understood by all, including its use within flood risk management in Surrey.			Improve the assessment of flood risk using data analysis and modelling in order to prioritise flood risk reduction activities and facilitate informed decision making across all RMAs.	
<b>Current status</b>	Currently RMAs look to improve datasets wherever possible, within resource and regulatory / legislation constraints. This measure seeks to proactively look for opportunities and deliver improvements in a coordinated way.	Data is shared amongst RMAs within Surrey, however this can be limited, or refused in certain instances. This measure seeks to ensure data is shared and communicated more frequently and to greater effect, with sensitivities in mind.			Surrey has a number of datasets which are updated as and when necessary, and are used to prioritise areas at risk of flooding for further investigation or works. This measure seeks to improve those processes in order to inform better decision making.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Ongoing Actions</b>	1 - WG to update progress on <b>Data Review</b> (Obj1 - 1) on a monthly basis alongside the annual reporting.	All RMAs Monthly up to June 2017 when complete. Annual review as part of reporting.	1 - All RMAs to contribute to annual review of data sharing successes and barriers with SFRPB.	All RMAs, Annually	1- SFRPB to lead a programme of work across all RMAs where high risk / priority areas across the county are identified and re-assessed annually. This should include an understanding of how climate change will impact flood risk, and the likely increase in receptors at risk of flooding.	All RMAs, January 2017 onwards
	2- SFRPB to review <b>Baseline FRM database</b> annually and recommend improvements on the back of the annual report.	All RMAs / WG Annually	2 - SFRPB to communicate the annual report on flood data to Surrey Flood Forum who represent the Flood Action Groups and use to influence their local action plans.	All RMAs, Annually	2- WG to produce <b>Annual Report</b> and <b>Joint Agency Work Programme</b> .	December 2017 and annually
	3 - All RMAs to regularly review this action plan to ensure it grasps opportunities such as big data and drone data capture, as technology evolves.	All RMAs / WG Annually				
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability and infrequent responsibility and therefore may get looked over in favour of more urgent tasks. Programme into workload, officer responsibilities and SFRPB meeting agendas.	Resource availability and infrequent responsibility and therefore may get looked over in favour of more urgent tasks. Programme into workload, officer responsibilities and SFRPB meeting agendas.			Resource availability Seek support from RMAs in developing annual reporting and reviewing their own datasets to feed into the data review.	



<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required unless improvements require new methods of collection / analysis / skills / software etc.		Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required unless improvements require new methods of collection / analysis / skills / software etc.		Medium - there is potentially an additional cost in the form of training or additional technology / software. Actions will be completed within existing resources.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Short-term Actions</b>	1 - WG to undertake a thorough <b>Data Review</b> of all data collected / data inflows across Surrey RMAs. This will be the baseline from which success can be measured and informed decisions made.	SFRPB, September 2017	1 - All RMAs to review barriers to and implement solutions to improve data sharing specifically between those who have FRM functions or associated work streams which impact flood risk, such as development planning.	All RMAs, December 2017	1 - All RMAs to support and contribute to Objective 1 actions through the Working Group who will lead delivery of this action plan.	June 2017 onwards
	2- SFRPB to facilitate the identification of other potential (new) data sources and potential purposes to help fulfil FRM functions, for example Local Plans to feed into prioritisation of flood alleviation works.	All RMAs, December 2017	2 - All RMAs to present methods of data collection and SFRPB WG to develop a road map to standardise information collection across RMAs.	All RMAs, December 2017	2- WG to identify <b>high risk flood areas</b> in Surrey e.g. summary of D/B SFRAs and SCC 1km prioritisation mapping.	December 2017 - Annually
	3 - SFRPB to sponsor review of how flood data is used and by whom to refine datasets to better meet their purpose and reduce unnecessary data collection / management.	All RMAs, December 2017	3 - SFRPB to discuss lessons learnt from the Section 19 flood investigation process around data sharing processes and communication of information within the reports. Lessons learnt will be implemented across all RMAs.	All RMAs, June 2018	3 - WG to discuss the data use and where this could be improved in future, and focus on the skills and technology required to reach those ambitions. Present to SFRPB.	SFRPB, December 2017
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability, Coordination and completion of tasks, Competing priorities, Programme into the workload and meeting agendas / terms of reference. Be clear on expectations and deadlines.		Resource availability. Coordination of tasks. Sharing of sensitive data. Programme into the workload and meeting agendas / terms of reference. Clear communication of responsibilities, standards etc. Aggregating data to an appropriate level and abiding by terms and conditions - this will be explained in order to avoid misinterpretation of data.		Resource availability. Programme into the workload and meeting agendas / terms of reference.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required unless improvements require new methods of collection / analysis / skills / software etc.		Medium - there is no additional financial support required although partners may require additional resource to carry out reviews.		Medium - there is no additional financial support required.	

	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Medium-term Actions	1- All RMAs to create a <b>Data Source Matrix</b> . To identify key datasets (current and future) required in order to effectively perform their FRM duties. SFRPB to highlight opportunities to jointly develop or amalgamate data.	All RMAs, SFRPB December 2017	1 - SFRPB to encourage openness to data sharing and facilitate formalising of data sharing relationships across and within all RMAs, (using MoUs), including those not on the Board such as Network Rail alongside members of the public.	All RMAs, Network Rail, Highways England, Southern Water, Gas and Electric providers, Telecoms providers, December 2018	1 - WG to review content for <b>Annual Report and Joint Agency Work Programme</b> (See long term actions 1 and 2).	December 2017 and annually
	2 - <b>Data Integrity</b> : All RMAs and WG to identify gaps in understanding or insight and develop specific action plans for addressing these gaps, i.e. SCC to undertake groundwater flood risk plan, and present this back to the SFRPB for discussion and task allocation.	All RMAs, April 2018	2 - SFRPB to act as a platform for sharing RMA work programmes and identifying opportunities to collaborate, with a long-term view to developing one joint programme of work for all RMAs within Surrey.	All RMAs, Public December 2018	2- SFRPB WG to review where current modelling resource is available across the RMAs or where there are existing skill sets which could be developed or adapted for the benefit of all RMAs.	All RMAs, December 2017
	3 - SFRPB to identify opportunities for RMAs to feed their data into each other's work streams.	July 2018 ongoing.	3 - SFRPB to discuss and review the opportunities to collate and store flood risk information centrally to all RMAs and how this might be achieved.	SCC GIS Team and other RMAs to feed in to the review, December 2019	3 - SNR team to review, with input from all RMAs, best practice in modelling and necessary software required to successfully undertake LLFA role.	January 2018
	4 - All RMAs through improved data sharing practices to seek feedback from all available sources to improve the availability, quality and coverage of the data available.	July 2018 ongoing.	4 - SFRPB to coordinate a programme of awareness raising of data collected by RMAs and for what purposes with the public to encourage further collection and sharing of data and citizen scientists to come forward.	All RMAs, Public, December 2019	4 - SFRPB WG to develop and present skills development action plan to SFRPB and review opportunities for joint training / skills development.	April 2018
					5. WG to collect EA and Catchment Partnership information on water quality improvement / WFD schemes in order to explore overlap funding for flood alleviation	WG December 2017
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability / competing priorities. Clear communication of expectations, responsibilities, deadlines and support available through SFRPB / WG.		Resource availability / competing priorities. Clear communication of expectations, responsibilities, deadlines and support available through SFRPB / WG.		Resource availability / competing priorities. Clear communication of expectations, responsibilities, deadlines and support available through SFRPB / WG.	



<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required unless improvements require new methods of collection / analysis / skills / software etc.		Medium- there is potential additional financial support required for the awareness raising programme and recommendations for having a central data repository / sharing platform. Actions will be completed within existing resources.		Medium - there is potentially an additional cost in the form of training or additional technology / software. Actions will be completed within existing resources.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Long-term Actions</b>	1 - SFRPB to ensure that all RMAs develop a data process / policy which is sufficiently robust to utilise large but infrequent opportunities such as the River Thames Scheme to capture and improve / update data for a broad variety of flood risk management purposes.	All RMAs, December 2018	1 - SFRPB to sponsor the development of a central store of flood risk management relevant data for the benefit of all RMAs and the public in Surrey.	All RMAs, WG, members of the public, 2020	1 - All RMAs to feed into an <b>Annual Report</b> to be presented to the SFRPB on the meaningful insights provided by datasets in order to review progress against the objectives of the Strategy and inform decision making and joint work programmes.	April 2018 onwards
	2 - SFRPB to explore opportunities to involve Citizen Scientists in the improvement of data held across RMAs.	All RMAs, Flood Action Groups, wider communities, December 2018			2 - SFRPB to develop a <b>Joint Work Programme</b> for capital and maintenance informed by the annual reporting on all datasets relevant to flood risk management e.g. highways repairs through to the retrofitting of SuDS (as per Objective 7 action plan) .	September 2018 onwards
					3 - Incorporate appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic modelling as a capability within the SNR team at SCC.	2020
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability / competing priorities. Clear communication of expectations, responsibilities, deadlines and support available through SFRPB.		Resource availability, Coordination of tasks, Skills and knowledge, Programme into the workload. Appoint responsibility for coordination and those who feed in. Clear communication of responsibilities, standards and tasks appointed to key member of staff / contact. One or more of key RMA members of staff to ensure they attend and report on progress at SFRPB meetings. Staff development action plan and finance made available for training.		Resource availability. Coordination of reporting. Skills / knowledge of staff Additional funding for schemes. Programme into the workload. Appoint responsibility for coordination and those who feed in Staff development action plan and finance made available for training. Secure additional and alternative funding sources through Objective 7's action plan.	

<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required unless improvements require new methods of collection / analysis / skills / software etc.	Medium - there is potentially an additional cost in the form of training or additional technology / software. Actions will be completed within exisiting resources.	Medium - there is potentially an additional cost in the form of training or additional technology / software and from an increase in the number of feasible schemes for which additional funding may be required. Actions will be completed within exisiting resources.
<b>Measures of Success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Regular presentations by RMAs to the SFRPB (where objective 1 is on the agenda) and external audiences which shares and celebrates ways in which data improvements have been made together.</li><li>- Recommendations coming out of the annual reporting and feedback implemented successfully. SFRPB to monitor.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Increased transparency and acceptance of flood reduction schemes and their prioritisation (to both RMA and public) through clear and open evidence base.</li><li>- A shared platform for data gathering, QA, presentation and sharing across RMAs and the public.</li><li>- An increase in data coming forward readily as it is better understood what the data is utilised for.</li><li>- All RMAs have an improved understanding of the flood risk in their catchment areas, and residents have an improved understanding of their community level of risk and resilience behaviours / measures.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Improved confidence in decisions made through improvement in quality of data</li><li>- A reduction in resource required to collect, analyse and manage data</li><li>- Increase in the data sharing between RMAs</li><li>- Increase in the number of datasets which are cross-referenced by multiple RMAs</li><li>- Improved confidence in the prioritisation of flood reduction works and increased acceptance of programmes of joint work which is carried out by partners to reduce duplication of effort and value for money spend.</li></ul>
<b>Progress Record</b>			

<b>Objective 2</b>	<b>RMA's will reduce flood risk by delivering an effective maintenance regime for their drainage assets and managing their estates across the County in an environmentally sustainable manner.</b>
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>Key to supporting our objectives to reduce flood risk in the County is the necessity to have all drainage systems clear and operating as effectively as possible. RMA's can spend a significant amount of time, money and resource developing flood alleviation schemes however their positive impact will be significantly reduced if existing drainage assets are not maintained.</p> <p>We will plan and deliver a maintenance schedule for assets owned by RMA's and develop best practice principles to set minimum standards.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is to reduce the risk of flooding through effective maintenance.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	Reduced reactive maintenance costs. Fewer reported flood incidents on RMA assets.
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	<p>Effective maintenance of our drainage assets across the County will in itself reduce the risk of flooding to communities in Surrey. If a gully, drain or ditch is blocked or broken it is not operating to its full potential and will inevitably have a negative impact on flood prevention. It is therefore essential that we make our maintenance regime as robust as possible.</p> <p>By proactively keeping our drainage assets clear and fully functional we will reduce the costs associated with reactive emergency works. A further benefit is that our perception among residents will be improved as we receive fewer reports of blocked or ineffective drainage systems. By having a consistent approach between RMA's the public will gain confidence in our ability to manage flood risk through our existing assets. Once this approach has been established we will use it to inform best practice material and create opportunities to improve the environmental benefits of effective maintenance.</p>
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Long-term vision: the promotion of best practice and guidance will encourage the sharing of information between officers, which will embed this knowledge in teams for the future.</li> <li>• Catchment-based approach: the best practice and guidance we develop will enable officers to take local priorities and sources of flooding into account.</li> <li>• Partnership working: we will work with partner RMA's to develop guidance that supports the objectives of all parties.</li> <li>• Community resilience: by making the maintenance of drainage assets more efficient and consistent based on local feedback (where appropriate), we will reduce the risk of flooding to local communities.</li> <li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: better maintained drainage assets will help to protect the environment and surrounding infrastructure.</li> <li>• Sustainable flood risk management through development: effective maintenance of our own assets will set the standard for developers to follow when they design and install SuDS.</li> <li>• Capital investment: effective drainage will reduce the need for flood alleviation works and help us to accurately prioritise and assess areas of greatest risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	There are a number of pieces of legislation which set out the statutory responsibilities of different RMA's in relation to maintenance, for example the Land Drainage Act, the Highways Act, the Flood and Water Management Act and the Water Act. Maintenance delivers a value for money service in that it extends the life of assets and reduced whole life costs.
<b>What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a reduction in local flood risk</li> <li>- a reduction in whole life costs of assets</li> <li>- improved lifespan on assets</li> <li>- improvement in environmental quality</li> <li>- a reduction in reactive maintenance costs</li> </ul>

<b>Related Policies</b>	<p>SCC's Highways and Transport Asset Management Strategy (2016) - this Strategy highlights the variety of assets that require maintenance under the LLFA and Highways Authority duties, not just drainage and structures such as culverts and bridges, which have a direct relationship with flooding. The Strategy recognises that few of the assets are in a 'as new' state and with limited budgets there is a requirement to prioritise asset management. Drainage has been identified as a high priority by senior Members who were consulted with as part of the Asset Management Strategy. Currently routine maintenance is carried out on gullies, soakaways, ditches and grips, but other drainage assets are dealt with on a reactive basis.</p> <p>National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2011)- maintenance should be carried out using a risk based approach. When maintenance becomes no longer justifiable (in terms of value for money) then some areas may need to reduce their maintenance, seek alternative funding sources / maintenance bodies, or halt maintenance activities all together.</p> <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and Surface Water Management Plans - those published by District and Borough councils broadly agree on the following principles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maintenance should be carried out by the relevant authority or riparian owners,</li> <li>- long-term maintenance of drainage or SuDS should be considered through the planning process,</li> <li>- maintenance should be carried out to agreed standards in a risk based, and prioritised way using evidence as a base for those decisions,</li> <li>- maintenance should be proactive to reduce risk in the most effective way, and</li> <li>- maintenance should be economically proportionate to the asset and level of flood risk if the asset were not to be maintained effectively.</li> </ul> <p>Water Framework Directive (2000) - this directive aims to achieve 'good status' for all ground and surface waters. It is therefore important that maintenance is carried out in an ecologically-friendly way.</p>
<b>Related SCC Corporate Priorities</b>	Caring for our environment, improving our roads, and strengthening our economy.
<b>Review Date</b>	April 2018

Objective 2	RMAs will reduce flood risk by delivering an effective maintenance regime for their drainage assets and managing their estates across the County in an environmentally sustainable manner.							
Sub-Objective	Promote best practice approaches in delivering statutory maintenance duties with partner RMAs.		Improve and update records of our drainage assets.		Deliver an effective maintenance regime for RMA-owned assets.		Ensure maintenance of flood risk management assets is considered at design stage, documented and implemented through an asset maintenance plan.	
Current status	It is often the case that best practice is shared internally within organisations but not externally to or between organisations.		All RMAs have drainage asset data available, however the organisations are all at different levels of coverage, currency, quality and data sharing.		There are currently maintenance plans for RMA assets but they could be improved by establishing best practice and consistency of approach between RMAs.		Maintenance plans are written and implemented however there is more that could be done to ensure all assets have maintenance plans in place, and there is monitoring to understand whether maintenance is being carried out in line with the plan.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Short-term Actions	1 - WG to discuss and report on best practice approaches and materials (incl. requirements of Water Framework Directive).	All RMAs June 2017			1 - RMAs to identify the assets they are responsible for and define the level of maintenance required in line with newly established best practice.	All RMAs Jan 2018	1 - WG to develop best practice guidance for maintenance plans for all assets which reduce flood risk, including SUDS, from design stage making sure to consider the impact of climate change.	All RMAs, December 2017
					2 - SFRPB to strongly encourage all RMAs to identify and implement environmental benefits that can be achieved alongside maintenance requirements.	All RMAs Jan 2018		
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability, agreement and delivery of responsibilities. Programme into SFRPB meeting agendas and calendars of key attendees, defining the benefits of sharing best practice clearly.				Resource availability. Programme into the workload and set expectations.		Resource availability, agreement and delivery of responsibilities. Programme into SFRPB meeting agendas and calendars of key attendees, defining the benefits of sharing best practice clearly.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. Actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.				Medium - there is a possibility that RMAs will identify maintenance requirements that come at a higher cost than existing processes.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. Actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Medium-term Actions	1 - SFRPB to agree best practice approaches and materials as proposed by the WG on delivering maintenance.	All RMAs, July 2017	1 - All RMAs to record asset data which is relevant to flood risk in a centrally owned and maintained dataset (in line with Objective 1's action plan).	All RMAs, 2019	1 - All RMAs to consider their maintenance regimes and review opportunities, through the SFRPB, to work in partnership to share resources / responsibilities to drive efficiencies and deliver value for money.	All RMAs, SFRPB and WG, 2019	1 - SFRPB to agree best practice for preparing maintenance plans at the design stage.	All RMAs, January 2018
	2 - SFRPB to develop and agree promotion plan for approaches (incl. briefings) and materials.	All RMAs, September 2017	2 - SFRPB to support utilising central asset and flood risk data to prioritise areas at greatest risk to improve maintenance planning and methods.	All RMAs, 2019				

	3 - Promote best practice approaches and materials through:  Planning officers, maintenance programme managers, estates/property, schools, National Trust, Thames Water, Surrey Wildlife Trust.	All RMAs, December 2017						
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Coordination of efforts to meet deadlines amongst competing pressures. Resource availability. Lack of uptake / implementation. Programme into the workload and calendars of those involved. Be clear on the benefits of following best practice and support where necessary. Gain upfront commitment from RMAs.		Availability of a suitable platform for shared dataset and coordination of shared data management responsibilities. Follow the actions in the action plan for Objective 1 to review appropriate methods of hosting central data and define clear roles and responsibilities.				Availability / time to review or attend meeting. Programme into meeting schedules and agendas. Ensure key stakeholders attend the meeting. Present the key information at the meeting.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no significant additional resource or financial support required, except for briefing materials and event costs.		Medium - once central dataset has been established there should not be significant resource or cost implications for maintaining it.				Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline



Long-term Actions					1- All RMAs to undertake maintenance in line with their maintenance plans, incorporating best practice and statutory duties.	All RMAs, 2019 onwards	1 - All RMAs to implement maintenance plan best practice and promote best practice approaches to LPAs, developers and other relevant authorities.	All RMAs From 2018 onwards
Challenges and how they will be overcome					Resource / skills availability. Programme into the workload / responsibilities and support those planning and carrying out maintenance.		Resource availability. Lack of uptake / implementation. Programme into the workload and calendars of those involved. Be clear on the benefits of following best practice and support where necessary.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?					Medium - there is a possibility that RMAs will identify maintenance requirements that come at a higher cost than existing processes.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Ongoing Actions	1 - SFRPB to review (through discussion and minuting) best practice approaches to ensure they remain up to date and fit for purpose and are being implemented by the responsible authorities.	All RMAs, Review every 2 years or sooner if changes to national best practice guidance occur.	1 - All RMAs to report annually on asset datasets and progress against action plans to the SFRPB (in line with Objective 1's action plan).	All RMAs, SFRPB Annually	1 - All RMAs to review their maintenance plans annually and incorporate updates to best practice identified by SFRPB where appropriate.	All RMAs, Annually	1 - SFRPB to review (through discussion and minuting) best practice approaches to ensure they remain up to date, fit for purpose and are being implemented by the responsible authorities.	All RMAs, Review every 2 years or sooner if changes to national best practice guidance occur.
							2 - All RMAs and developers to produce maintenance plans for all newly constructed flood risk management assets in line with best practice. LPAs to assess all detailed planning applications in line with best practice.	2018 onwards
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability. Programme into the workload and meeting agendas / terms of reference.		Resource availability. Coordination of reporting. Programme into the workload. Appoint responsibility for coordination and those who feed in.		Resource availability. Programme into the workload.		Infrequent action and therefore may not be carried out. Programme into SFRPB meeting schedule or terms of reference.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. Actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Medium - once central dataset has been established there should not be significant resource or cost implications for maintaining it.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. Actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. Actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
Measures of Success	Best practice material is readily available and those stakeholders which require it are aware of its existence. Information in is useful and being used / reviewed on regular basis. Refresher and review session / communications happen as and when required i.e. new staff members. Maintenance is being carried out effectively in line with maintenance plans and best practice under statutory duties.		SFRPB to discuss and minute the review of progress made against the baseline data catalogue and reported in the annual report developed by all RMAs (as per Objective 1's action plan).		RMAs can apply best practice and demonstrate this knowledge through delivering an effective maintenance regime. RMAs have a clear maintenance plan in place, which is implemented, for each identified asset. Maintenance contributes to a reduction in flood risk and is done in an environmentally sustainable manner and in line with their statutory duties.		All assets have a maintenance plan which is robust and applied, and agreed by all partners prior to be constructed.	
Progress Record								

<b>Objective 3</b>	<b>We will agree with partners who the Risk Management Authorities in Surrey are, jointly define their responsibilities and establish clear lines of communication with them to support the delivery of partnership-based flood alleviation projects.</b>
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>Under the FWMA (2010) RMAs have a duty to co-operate with one another. This legislation divides responsibilities in an ambiguous manner; indeed the 'duty to co-operate' isn't clearly defined but would logically include the sharing of information and resources, where appropriate.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that flooding is an issue that affects everyone across the County and as a result, no single authority should be expected to carry the burden of responding to such events in isolation. A co-ordinated approach between partner RMAs is therefore essential to provide an effective service to Surrey's residents.</p> <p>Feedback from the public suggests that it is not always clear who does what when it comes to flooding emergencies, developing flood alleviation schemes and day-to-day maintenance of watercourses. As a result residents may expend unnecessary time and effort in finding the appropriate authority to support them in resolving a specific problem. To improve our ability to respond to such issues each RMA in the County needs to have a clearly defined role that is mutually agreed in order that we and our residents understand exactly 'who does what' and when.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is that the RMAs and members of the public are clear on what their and other authorities' responsibilities are, in order that they can provide an effective service to members of the public and clearly undertake and communicate these responsibilities.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	A reduction in the number of enquiries from members of the public that are directed towards the wrong RMA. A reduction in the time taken to deliver partnership projects due to an increase in efficiency in cooperating as partners.
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	By clearly defining what each authority's roles and responsibilities are, we will further enhance our fulfilment of this requirement. Flood risk will be reduced by the fact that all RMAs will know exactly what they should do and when during a flood event, meaning that plans and responses will be as effective as possible.
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Long-Term Vision: clearly defined roles for RMAs will make our approach to flood risk management more sustainable and will enable greater forward planning.</li> <li>• Catchment-based Approach: by understanding which relevant authority needs to respond in a specific situation, the management of catchment-based issues will be much more efficient.</li> <li>• Partnership Working: RMAs will be able to work together in a more effective and co-operative manner as a result of understanding each other's roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>• Enhancing Growth: greater co-operation between RMAs will make their preparation for, and activities during, flood events more effective which will reduce the potential negative economic and wellbeing impacts of flooding.</li> <li>• Sustainable Drainage: the sharing of information between RMAs will make the maintenance and implementation of SuDS a more straightforward and efficient process.</li> <li>• Capital investment: RMAs will be able to work together in bidding for joint schemes, which will deliver projects that meet the priorities of all partners and improve the likelihood of obtaining funding.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	<p>The co-operation of RMAs is a statutory requirement under the FWMA (2010).</p> <p>It is also noted from residents feedback that the experience of communicating with RMAs at present can be frustrating in part due to misunderstandings of responsibilities across both RMAs and the public. Improving awareness of the responsibilities of each RMA and also the public themselves will lead to clearer communication and an improved service.</p>
<b>What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improved resident experience in dealing with RMAs.</li> <li>- more efficient delivery of partnership projects which in turn can save both time and money.</li> <li>- clear demonstration of meeting the requirements of the FWMA(2010).</li> <li>- less time wasted as a result of misdirected enquiries</li> </ul>
<b>Related Policies</b>	<p>As stated above, the FWMA declares that RMAs must co-operate with one another and provides definitions of responsibilities, however these are open to interpretation, and lack operational detail. The FWMA also states that in the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy the relevant RMA in the County must be identified and specify the flood and coastal erosion risk management functions that may be exercised by those RMAs.</p> <p>The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2011) states that one of the fundamental guiding principles should be partnership working.</p> <p>Local Plans, SFRAs and SWMPs also identify that partnership working is key to achieving their objectives.</p> <p>The SFRPB is centred around partnership working. This objective will support and improve this approach.</p>
<b>Related SCC Corporate Priorities</b>	Resident experience
<b>Review Date</b>	September 2017

<b>Objective 3</b>	<b>We will agree with partners who the RMAs in Surrey are, jointly define their responsibilities and establish clear lines of communication with them to support the delivery of partnership-based flood alleviation projects.</b>					
<b>Sub-Objective</b>	<b>Define the roles of RMAs with our partners and promote these to the public.</b>		<b>Develop a communications plan for strategic and operational communications between partners.</b>		<b>Review opportunities for future devolution of powers and budgets to RMAs.</b>	
<b>Current status</b>	Although RMAs have a broad understanding of their roles, feedback from residents tells us that there is some inconsistency and therefore this needs to be improved and roles communicated, understood and applied much more clearly.		Currently there is no communications plan in place for the SFRPB. Within Board meetings there are discussions of ongoing schemes by various RMAs to share knowledge and facilitate partnership working.		Future devolution has not been considered as yet, due to long-term timescales	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Short-term Actions</b>	1 - Strategy to set out the roles and responsibilities of all RMAs, (including emergency response in flood events) which is agreed by all partners.	All RMAs, April 2017	1 - SFRPB to review whether communication plans are available from partners as a starting point to developing their own partner communication plan and using as a baseline to monitor progress.	All RMAs, December 2017	1 - SFRPB to keep abreast of devolution updates and issues for local authorities and propose actions to exploit this opportunity as appropriate.	All RMAs Ongoing from July 2017
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	RMAs may disagree with roles/definitions All RMAs to be consulted in development of Strategy		Possible lack of communication plans Willingness of RMAs to share plans with SFRPB SFRPB to encourage sharing of information		Resource availability, inclination and ability to be kept up to date. Programme into officer responsibilities and ensure a number of staff are signed up to range of communications through which updates can be received.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Medium-term Actions</b>	1 - SFRPB to formally approve RMA roles/responsibilities by developing an MoU based on the Strategy (if required)	All RMAs July 2017	1 - SFRPB to coordinate the writing and agreement of a communications plan for all partners.	All RMAs, December 2017		

<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability, unwillingness or inability to change remit or take on additional responsibilities. All RMAs to be consulted in development of Strategy/MoU		Gaining agreement of the communications plan. All RMAs to be consulted in development of communications plan.			
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Medium - refining of RMA roles and responsibilities may compel partners to perform more duties than they were previously.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources.			
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Long-term Actions</b>	1 - RMAs to develop public facing materials outlining agreed roles and responsibilities and share with residents.	All RMAs December 2017	1 - SFRPB to establish a framework and practical processes to ensure all RMAs can be part of decision-making on all new major flood alleviation projects, based on the principles of the communications plan.	All RMAs, June 2018		
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>			Partner buy-in for a framework/processes to enable partners to inform decision making. Framework will be based on previously agreed communications plan. SFRPB to encourage joint working/decision making.			
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>			Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources.			
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Ongoing Actions</b>	1 - SFRPB to regularly review feedback from residents and lessons learnt from flood investigations and reporting whether RMA / SFRPB roles and remits are working as effectively as they can be.	All RMAs July 2017 onwards	1 - SFRPB to monitor and review communications plan effectiveness and uptake, amending as necessary to achieve desired outcome.	All RMAs, December 2017 onwards	1 - All RMAs to keep up to date on Central Government proposals for devolution and how this will be implemented. The LLFA/SCC specifically will consider how potential changes will affect flood risk management responsibilities and funding. This should be considered amidst the future backdrop of funding, legislation, climate change, population growth etc. All RMAs to present back knowledge / updates to the SFRPB.	All RMAs, Ongoing

					2 - SCC to coordinate the update of the Strategy to exploit opportunities and overcome challenges which come out of the devolution proposals. All RMAs to feed in.	All RMAs, Ongoing
Challenges and how they will be overcome	RMAs may disagree with roles/definitions All RMAs to be consulted in refinement of their responsibilities				Resource availability, other competing priorities. Programme into team workload, officer responsibilities and SFRPB meeting agendas.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Medium - refining of RMA roles and responsibilities may compel partners to perform more duties than they were previously.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resources. (N.B. this is subject to change as the impact of devolution is not yet known).	
Measures of Success	All RMAs are clear on their responsibilities and the responsibilities of the other RMAs. Partners communicate and carry out these duties efficiently and effectively so that the public are also aware of the differences in responsibilities and experience an improved, seamless service.		There is an effective communications plan in place for partners to implement and follow.		SFRPB and partners are sufficiently prepared to take on the challenge and opportunity of devolution as and when it appears, with minimal disruption.	
Progress Record						



<b>Objective 4</b>	<b>Private owners will be made aware of their riparian responsibilities to maintain their drainage assets and watercourses. We will support, promote and enforce these responsibilities.</b>
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>The vast majority of the ordinary watercourses across Surrey are located on privately owned land and the relevant owners have a duty under the Land Drainage Act (1991) to maintain ditches, streams and rivers that pass through their property - even if they are piped. This is known as 'riparian responsibility'. Such watercourses help drain local areas and provide storage capacity in times of flooding.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is responsible for consenting works involving structures or obstructions within ordinary watercourses that will affect flow (such as piping ditches or putting in bridges). Consent will only be issued for works where local flood risk will not be increased and will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.</p> <p>RMAs have permissive powers under the Land Drainage Act (1991) to carry out enforcement action that requires riparian landowners to remove blockages and obstructions and ensure the free flow of water through their section of watercourse. Our role, and the purpose of this objective, is to help ensure that riparian owners are aware of their duties and carry them out so that local drainage networks function efficiently.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is for riparian landowners to be more aware of and to undertake their responsibilities so that there is a reduced number of flood incidents as a result of a lack of riparian maintenance.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	A reduction in public enquiries about riparian responsibilities and a reduction in enforcement proceedings. Key riparian assets are maintained to the standard set by relevant guidance/legislation.
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	<p>Achievement of this objective will improve community resilience through reduction in local flood risk. Local watercourses, ditches and other assets will be well-maintained by the owners responsible. This will reduce the financial burden on the County Council and other organisations caused by flooding from poorly maintained watercourses or other assets.</p> <p>The effective operation of the whole network also means that all landowners share collective responsibility to deal with maintenance on their land. Furthermore, there will be more capacity for flood water within local ditches and less likelihood of blockages which further increase local risk.</p> <p>From an ecological perspective, properly maintained local ditches and watercourses will provide a healthier and more diverse local environment for wildlife and local communities. All of this will in turn, heighten awareness of the causes and solutions to local flood risk, and the potential impact of climate change on local flood risk.</p>
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A long-term vision: ongoing management and maintenance of watercourses across Surrey will improve future capacity and reduce local flood risk.</li> <li>• Catchment-based approach: local policies and interventions are based on catchment priorities and levels of flood risk as well as fundamental principles.</li> <li>• Partnership working: we will work with residents, land owners and other RMAs to ensure the land drainage system functions effectively.</li> <li>• Community resilience: we will improve knowledge in communities as to what their responsibilities are and the local risk from watercourses and other assets. We will also ensure all parties recognise the resilience benefits of management and maintenance.</li> <li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: by ensuring development and drainage works do not adversely affect watercourses or the local environment and actively reduce flood risk from local sources, we will encourage the spread of sustainable growth.</li> <li>• Sustainable flood risk management through planning and development: we will ensure responsibilities for maintenance are met and therefore gain the multiple benefits from an effective local 'natural' ditch and watercourse network</li> <li>• Capital investment: we will invest and support communities to deliver riparian actions where required. We will also invest in our own riparian responsibilities and actions to promote awareness of best practice for watercourse maintenance.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	<p>Local Authorities across the country are experiencing budget cuts and Surrey County Council, alongside the District and Borough Councils in Surrey and the EA are facing the same challenges. By improving awareness of riparian responsibilities, there will be a reduced expectation for councils to maintain assets and watercourses that are not within their remit. Improving the public's awareness of riparian responsibilities helps encourage resilience to flooding and reduced flood risk at a local level, through being able to effectively manage their riparian assets. Officer time will also be saved through pro-active engagement, rather than answering ad-hoc customer queries. Riparian responsibilities are a responsibility under the Land Drainage Act (1991).</p>



What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reduced resource pressure on local authorities.</li><li>- Improved community resilience to flooding through well managed riparian assets.</li><li>- Reduction of local flood risk</li><li>- Improvements in partnership working relationships - as while this objective will be primarily led by SCC in its role as the LLFA, RMAs will be required to support its delivery. For example, through identifying local maintenance requirements of the drainage network, supporting enforcement, sharing knowledge of local assets, using byelaws to protect ordinary watercourses, and carrying out their riparian duties as land owners.</li></ul>
Related Policies	<p>The Pitt Review (2007) recommended that local authorities to provide guidance and work with riparian owners to ensure they are clear on their responsibilities.</p> <p>Under common law it is the responsibility of the riparian owner to ensure the watercourse is maintained and kept obstruction free so as to allow water to flow freely downstream. The EA's 'Living on the Edge' document sets out, in detail, what responsibilities landowners have to maintain watercourses.</p> <p>SFRAs promote awareness of riparian responsibilities and set out that they must maintain the watercourse or defence which they are responsible for to a reasonable standard, while the Local Authority or Environment Agency have permissive powers (under the Land Drainage Act 1991) to maintain the watercourse or asset if riparian owner does not meet their obligations. However costs to do this can be recovered.</p>
Related SCC Corporate Priorities	Resident Experience
Review Date	April 2018

Objective 4	Private owners will be made aware of their riparian responsibilities to maintain their drainage assets and watercourses. We will support, promote and enforce these responsibilities.					
Sub-Objective	Develop our knowledge of riparian assets in high risk areas by recording riparian assets on a reactive basis.		Review and improve enforcement and consenting principles, policies and processes.		Promote consenting, enforcement processes and standards to the public, Members and RMAs and encourage implementation of these on a community-wide basis.	
Current status	Currently SCC hold informal knowledge of riparian assets through engagement with community groups however the objective seeks to make this information more accessible and useable.		SCC already have processes in place that are effective; however there is a need to adapt and review these processes as time goes on.		SCC undertake this role currently (and have done since 2010) but following every flood events, there are numerous enquiries and investigations, which are related to a lack of riparian maintenance. This uses resource which could be better spent elsewhere.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Ongoing Actions	1 - RMAs to collect riparian asset information from ongoing work i.e. flooding enquiries, section 19 flood investigations.	All RMAs Ongoing	1 -SCC to review the current enforcement and consenting processes and policies and implement improvements where appropriate (review 2 yearly).	SCC Ongoing	1- RMAs to continue targeted and proportionate enforcement in relation to blockages and lack of maintenance on riparian owned assets.	RMAs Ongoing
			2 - SCC to carry out enforcement and consenting, resolving 90% of cases within 1 year.	SCC Ongoing	2 - SCC to empower other RMAs, LPAs and teams within SCC (i.e. Highways and Countryside Rangers) to advise and promote best practice through developing relationships and the provision of tools and training.	SCC Ongoing
					3 - WG to develop best practice standards and policies for riparian responsibilities including opportunities for water quality improvement as per the WFD.	All RMAs Ongoing
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability / other workload pressures. Potential lack of RMA internal processes to gather the information and share effectively. Ensuring that processes are in place to gather information routinely and make part of regular workload.				Resource availability / other workload pressures. Willingness of RMAs to participate. Ensuring that processes are in place to gather information routinely and make part of regular workload. Promote benefits of actions through SFRPB.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions to be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions to be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required other than event / printing costs. All actions to be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline

Short-term Actions	1 - SFRPB to approve sharing of riparian data between RMAs with a view to it being added to GIS, accessible to all partners.	July 2017	1 - EA/SCC to draft enforcement policies and principles	EA/SCC September 2016	1 - SCC to publish and promote awareness of and implementation of best practice standards and policies for riparian responsibilities, consenting and enforcement internally within SCC and across RMAs.	All RMAs December 2017
			2 - EA to draft consenting and de-culverting policies and principles	EA December 2016	2 - SCC and flood action groups to promote awareness of best practice standards and policies for riparian responsibilities, consenting and enforcement within the community.	All RMAs From December 2017
			3 - SCC to lead consultation on the policies and principles with Members and other RMA partners.	SCC January 2017		
			4 - SCC to seek agreement of the policies and principles from the Planning and Regulatory Committee.	April 2017		
			5 - Publish enforcement, and consenting and de-culverting policies online.	August 2017		
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability Willingness of RMAs to contribute to asset register's development and upkeep. Set targets and deadlines. Use SFRPB to share/allocate work across RMAs.		Resource availability / other workload pressures. Set targets and deadlines.		Recognition of communications / attendance at events to raise awareness. Ability/willingness of flood action groups to participate. Use networks (SFRPB, flood action groups, all RMAs communications teams) to promote benefits.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required other than printing costs.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required other than printing costs.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required other than event / printing costs.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
	1 - SFRPB to review riparian data to improve awareness of assets and input to it's content and prioritisation, from which an agreed and targeted programme of enforcement can be developed by all RMAs.	All RMAs April 2018	1 - SCC to prepare public facing materials that highlight and explain these policies and processes clearly.	SCC September 2017	1 - SFRPB WG to hold awareness raising sessions with local community and business groups. A media campaign will be linked with winter preparedness around riparian responsibility on a yearly basis.	All RMAs. Autumn 2016 and each year subsequently

Medium-term Actions			2 - WG to regularly review and publish public-facing educational materials to raise awareness of riparian responsibilities.	All RMAs Ongoing - review bi-annually.	2 - RMAs to carry out targeted awareness raising through flood action groups to reach a wider community audience.	Relevant local RMAs April 2018
					3 - SCC and flood action groups to signpost larger landowners initially to the maintenance good practice guide.	September 2018
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Poor quality data to inform decisions. Resource availability / attendance at meetings. Improve data quality through actions in the action plan for objective 1. Schedule into meeting agendas and calendars of key attendees.		Communicating technical information in an engaging way. Utilise specialist communication styles and skills.		Appetite for awareness raising sessions. Promotion of sharing knowledge more widely than small select groups of individuals. Use networks (SFRPB, flood action groups, all RMA communications teams) to promote benefits.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional financial support required other than printing costs. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no significant additional financial support required other than printing costs and/or the cost of an expert review/input into the guidance. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required other than modest event costs. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Long-term Actions	1 - SCC to encourage and inform riparian owners in producing their own proactive maintenance plan, based on the best practice guidance.	Riparian owners, December 2018	1 - SCC / SFRPB to undertake regular reviews of progress, principles, policies and processes in line with any industry changes or lessons learnt / feedback.	Feedback from all RMAs utilising policies Bi-annually	1 - All RMAs to undertake regular reviews of maintenance issues with communities. It will be the responsibility of the RMAs to ensure SFRPB are made aware of these issues in order for SCC to identify new high flood risk areas and to ensure policies and best practice guidance are effective and being implemented correctly.	All RMAs Ongoing from December 2018
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Ability / appetite of the public to maintain their riparian assets. Clearly outline the benefits. Suggest ways and develop networks in which it can be a shared responsibility within the local community.		Ensuring the review process is focused and does not become a tick-box exercise by using the SFRPB to scrutinise proposals.		Ensuring there is a framework in which this information can be gathered and shared effectively.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Medium - there is an additional cost to the community to address maintenance. SCC will develop policies to assist financially constrained residents. All actions to be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions to be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	

Measures of Success	Having working asset register which is used to help ensure key riparian assets are maintained. Building knowledge so that policies and standards can be applied effectively to reduce flood risk.	Having a suitable policy in place which enforces riparian responsibilities pragmatically that is reviewed regularly. Having a policy which is robust enough to meet any legal challenges.	An improved awareness across all RMAs of best practice, policies, processes and responsibilities to allow these to be applied consistently and in a risk based manner. In doing this communities will better understand the responsibilities of RMAs alongside their own and be able to implement their own maintenance plans and share this knowledge with others to improve resilience and reduce the flood risk which is as a result of a lack of riparian maintenance.
Progress Record			

<b>Objective 5</b>	<b>The residents and businesses of Surrey will be supported to improve community resilience. Local people will be empowered to reduce the risk of flooding on both an individual and community level.</b>
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>The LFRMS has been written to reduce the impact of flooding on the residents of Surrey. Therefore, residents need to be at the heart of what we do.</p> <p>We will use our knowledge and expertise to support residents to better understand flood risk, their responsibilities and how they can make their home or community more resilient to flooding. By helping residents to become more aware and prepared, we can reduce the impact and disruption flooding causes. To facilitate this we will equip residents to establish Flood Action Groups and community resilience groups in order to facilitate 'self-help'.</p> <p>Once self-sufficient Flood Action Groups have been established we will develop a 'Surrey Flood Action Group Forum', which will bring representatives from these groups together in order to share their knowledge and experience. The Chairman of the Surrey Flood Action Group Forum will then be invited to sit on the SFRPB in order to influence its priorities and assist the Board in maintaining a community focus.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is for all communities which are at risk of, or impacted by flooding to become more resilient, and where there is appetite to have self-sustaining flood action groups which report and work with the RMAs on flood risk management across Surrey.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	Community groups are engaged, self-sufficient and able to take the lead on a range of local flood resilience activities.
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	<p>Achievement of this objective will reduce the impact of flooding on communities by making them more prepared for when it happens. By using engagement activities to educate residents as to what their responsibilities are, and how they can better protect their properties, the effects of flooding can be alleviated.</p> <p>At present there is a perception among residents that Local Authorities have a duty to address any and all sources of flooding across the County - this is not the case. This misconception is through no fault of the public and the LLFA can use its influence to educate residents as to what everyone's respective responsibilities are. By increasing this awareness the time and effort spent on resolving complaints based on misunderstandings around 'who does what' will be reduced.</p>
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A long-term vision: communities will be provided with ongoing support and will be educated to share their knowledge with each other.</li> <li>• Catchment-based approach: communities will be identified on the basis of their local sources of flooding/catchment conditions.</li> <li>• Partnership working: we will work closely with residents to help make their local communities more resilient to flooding.</li> <li>• Community resilience: by educating residents as to what their responsibilities are and how they can better prepare for flooding, local communities will become more resilient.</li> <li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: the knowledge shared with residents will equip them to protect the natural environment and wellbeing of their local communities.</li> <li>• Sustainable flood risk management through planning and development: we will educate residents as to their riparian responsibilities for watercourse maintenance, which will assist in improving drainage in local communities.</li> <li>• Capital investment: we will use our engagement activities as an opportunity to consider feedback from local residents as to which areas are in need of resilience works, and to work with partner RMAs to assess alternative funding sources.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	Publicly funded organisations are under increasing budget pressures. It is therefore imperative that time and resource is invested wisely to provide maximum value for money. Local Authorities are therefore looking to empower local communities to improve their own resilience to flooding in order to reduce the impact of flooding when it does happen. Communities can also reduce their risk of flooding through undertaking their riparian responsibilities effectively (see Objective 4's action plan) and identifying where these responsibilities have not been fulfilled in their community.
<b>What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improve community resilience</li> <li>- empower residents</li> <li>- provide a clear method for residents to engage with RMAs</li> <li>- provide community groups with peer to peer support</li> <li>- promote self-sufficiency to allow local authorities to put more resource into large scale, strategic priorities</li> </ul>



<b>Related Policies</b>	<p>The National Flood and Coastal Erosion and Risk Management Strategy (2011) states that localism is at the heart of the Strategy, especially in times where there is a limit to what Central Government can achieve alone. One of the guiding principles of flood risk management is community focus, through which communities can have improved awareness of their flood risk and allow them to inform local approaches to flood risk management in order to meet their needs.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) also takes account of developments which are beneficial to the community through the exception test. Proposed developments that are at risk of flooding can move forward if the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community, which outweigh the flood risk.</p> <p>The Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009) encourages community scale action due to the number of properties at risk of flooding in the Thames catchment. It also advocates strategic planning as a key tool in achieving community needs and managing risk in a more sustainable way. This is also echoed in Local Plans alongside the Community Infrastructure Levy which can be used to fund community infrastructure projects.</p> <p>The River Basin Management Plans advocate community empowerment projects and listening to and addressing the needs of the community.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, which inform local plans, encourage awareness of flood risk, community based measures to reduce the risk of property flooding and improved preparedness.</p> <p>The SCC Corporate Strategy places a large emphasis on resident experience, stating that the Council will 'enhance opportunities for residents to influence and shape Council services'. This objective provides such an opportunity.</p>
<b>Related SCC Corporate Priorities</b>	Resident experience
<b>Review Date</b>	April 2018

Objective 5	The residents and businesses of Surrey will be supported to improve community resilience. Local people will be empowered to reduce the risk of flooding on both an individual and community level.							
Sub-Objective	Assess and prioritise flood action group locations and encourage communities to establish such groups in areas of need.		Develop and improve RMA engagement methods with Flood Action Groups, including training and public facing information/materials.		Develop a governance structure for a county-wide forum for Surrey Flood Action Groups.		Promote resilience planning as a core tool for community groups and support such groups with response and recovery following a flood event.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Current status	Across Surrey there are already a number of flood action groups that are well established and engaged. RMA awareness of these groups needs to be formalised.		Currently the engagement with the public is predominately reactive and informal, however the aim is to move to a formal and structured way of engaging regularly.		Held initial discussions with the NFF about developing governance structure.		There is a Community Resilience Officer (CRO) who currently works with communities to develop and implement resilience plans. When this fixed term contract comes to an end, RMAs want to make sure communities follow and update them on an ongoing basis.	
Short-term Actions	1 - SCC to establish framework with NFF to support the process of identifying and establishing new community groups with support of NFF.	SCC, NFF Ongoing from August 2016	1 - RMAs to work with flood action groups in identifying information/training gaps for individual communities on a case by case basis.	Surrey Prepared, all RMAs, flood action groups April 2018/Ongoing as new groups emerge	1 - SCC to hold workshop with NFF to capture data and good practice from other Local Authorities where a county wide flood forum has been implemented.	SCC, NFF September 2016	1 - SCC to ensure existing work on resilience planning for communities is centrally captured from CRO prior to contract ending to ensure that continued support can be provided.	SCC, CRO, flood action groups December 2016
	2 - SCC to complete mapping to confirm locations and priorities of established flood action groups in order to prioritise those in greatest need of support.	Flood action groups, June 2017						
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Availability of NFF Resource availability Allowing NFF sufficient time and forewarning to prepare for the work asked of them.		Resource availability Plan ahead and programme into workload.		N/A - action completed		Availability of resource. Loss of knowledge. Plan ahead and programme into workload. Capture knowledge centrally before the fixed term contract ends.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required. All actions will be completed within existing NFF consultancy arrangement.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - financial and resource cost to be covered in existing NFF consultancy arrangement		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
	1- All flood action groups to be encouraged to develop clear action plans from a common template.	SCC, flood action groups December 2017	1 - Surrey Prepared and RMAs to develop the engagement materials and training as per short-term action 1 above.	All RMAs From April 2018	1- Flood action groups to identify appropriate representatives (with support of SCC) to participate in SFAGF.	District and Borough Councils, Surrey Association of Parish & Town Councils (SALC), Surrey Prepared December 2018	1 - SCC to support existing groups to become self sufficient and continue promoting and strengthening resilience planning, encouraging regular updates (particularly during recovery following a flood event) and dissemination.	SCC, flood action groups From April 2017

Medium-term Actions	2- SFRPB to agree principles/criteria setting out the required characteristics for a flood action group to join the SFAGF.	SCC, flood action groups, SFRPB December 2017			2 - Appoint a Member Champion who can support and promote formation of SFAGF.	SCC, SALC, Surrey Prepared Jan 2019	2- SCC to ensure all flood action groups that have a resilience plan in place are implementing their plan and sharing it with other residents so that awareness of resilience measures and actions is improved.	SCC, flood action groups April 2018
	3 - SCC and SFRPB to encourage flood action groups to contribute to SFAGF (see Measure 1)	All RMAs, Flood action groups From Jan 2018			3 - SCC to hold initial meeting of SFAGF members to set purpose, direction, terms of reference and objectives. SFAGF members will disseminate this to flood action groups.	SFAGF, flood action groups, SALC, Surrey Prepared April 2019		
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Initial reluctance from flood action groups to move to another format of operation and structured action planning. Emergence of new groups that don't meet required characteristics for SFAGF. Sharing examples and best practice and the benefits of working in this way.		Resource availability Budget for distribution of any paper based materials or engagement events. Programme into workload and meeting schedule, along with discussions about budget and resource.		Reluctance from hard to reach groups, to engage in the SFAGF. Ensure regular engagement with all groups and ensure they are aware of the benefits and examples of best practice.		Methods of sharing resilience planning information and knowledge effectively. Bring in relevant experience to advise on methods or similar experiences.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Medium - there is potential additional financial support required for printing of materials and training of staff. Medium - resource. Focus material on high profile issues and seek input from partner RMAs.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. Medium - resource. Ensure that Surrey Flood Action Group Forum becomes self-sufficient.		Medium - there is potential additional financial support required for expert support and/or review of the community resilience plans to ensure they are appropriate. Actions will be completed within existing RMA resource however this will be time-intensive.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Long-term Actions	1 - SCC to support all currently existing flood action groups to become self-sufficient.	Flood action groups, SFRPB January 2019			1 - SCC to monitor and support implementation of SFAGF.	SCC, Flood action groups, SFRPB Ongoing from April 2019	1 - RMAs to signpost flood action groups (and their communities) towards gaining additional knowledge and skills to implement the resilience plans effectively.	All RMAs, Flood action groups From January 2018
							2 - EA to work towards having all residents in areas at risk of flooding, signed up to the flood warning service.	SFRPB Flood action groups 2020

<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Getting fresh perspective on wider community issues. Proactively identifying key stakeholders that would contribute positively to the development of the flood action group and their forward plans.				Resource availability to proactively support. Ensuring involvement of RTS project team Need for an effective Chairman of SFAGF. Programme in time to have regular catch ups with key members of the groups to track progress and support as necessary. Engage with RTS project team at early stage of SFAGF formation. Assist residents in establishing criteria for selection of suitable Chairman.		Resource / budget availability Appetite for training, knowledge and skills upgrades Resident awareness of flood warning service Effective communication of risks, flood warning service and benefits of improving knowledge and skills.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.				Low - there is no additional financial support required. The SFAGF will be self-sufficient and therefore minimal additional resource will be required.		Medium - there is potential additional financial support required in the form of training costs. Medium - resource. Prioritise developing those skills and knowledge which will facilitate flood action groups becoming self-sufficient most effectively.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Ongoing Actions</b>	1 - RMAs to monitor effectiveness of flood action groups and their contributions to SFAGF (see measure 1).	Flood action groups, SFRPB, Ongoing	1 - SFRPB and Surrey Prepared to regularly review engagement materials and training to assess whether they are still relevant, correct and effective. Update as required.	Flood action groups, all RMAs, Ongoing	1 - Lead members of SFAGF appointed to the SFRPB to share information from the group to be used to influence SFRPB priorities.	Flood action groups SFRPB TBC	1 - SCC to continue to work with flood action groups in supporting the delivery and updates of their resilience plans particularly following flood events.	Flood action groups, all RMAs, Ongoing
							2- SFRPB and SFAGF to promote resilience planning as a core tool for community groups.	Flood action groups, Ongoing (from April 2017)
							3 - All RMAs to support communities during flood emergencies, and during the recovery phases following a flood event.	Flood action groups, Ongoing
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>					SFAGF priorities don't align with that of SFRPB as a result of local bias/lack of strategic view. Manage expectations of SFAGF members and provide appropriate training, educational materials and flooding data.		Resource availability Uptake of resilience planning as a tool Ability to gather and share information in an effective and efficient manner during and after flood events. Monitor and review the implementation of actions to identify challenges and mitigations.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Medium - there is potential additional financial and resource support required where re-printing of materials and delivery of training is required.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. Medium - resource. Processes should be optimised in order to reduce additional resource required for the ongoing actions above.	

Measures of Success	Success in the future would be having identified all appropriate locations for flood action groups and for them to have become self-sufficient, with clear action plans which are being delivered successfully by working in a collaborative and partnership manner with other RMAs through the SFAGF and SFRPB.	Feedback from flood action groups and residents that they are finding the materials and information provided useful and communities / individuals are able to understand and apply it appropriately. A reduction in flooding enquires from residents, or flood action groups relating to the topics of engagement materials and events such as riparian maintenance.	A successful and working governance structure evidenced by feedback from the flood action groups. The governance structure promotes self-sustaining networks.	Enable residents to help themselves and their communities in a flood event, with support from RMAs as necessary. All flood action groups to have a resilience plan, which relevant members of the community are aware of and understand how to implement. Following flood incidents, residents feedback on the implementation of flood action group resilience plans will improve year on year. Lessons learnt from this feedback will be implemented.
Progress Record				



Objective 6	We will reduce the risk of flooding to and from development through local planning policy and processes.
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order (2015) has been amended to make Surrey County Council, in its capacity as LLFA, a statutory consultee on surface water management drainage issues for all new major developments. These changes came into effect from 15 April 2015.</p> <p>Surrey's role as LLFA is to provide a technical assessment and statutory consultee response regarding the surface water drainage proposals for all major planning applications across the Planning Authorities within Surrey. Consultees have 21 days in which to make this assessment and SCC as LLFA process over 400 applications per year. SCC assess whether the proposed drainage system meets the 14 National Standards for SuDS , advise on the level of flood risk and provide a recommendation (including suitable conditions) as to whether the planning authority should approve the application or not. SCC also offer pre-application advice to developers.</p> <p>SCC are able to provide a catchment-based strategic view to new developments across the County and try to reduce the cumulative impacts of increased impermeable areas and urbanisation. By using its statutory consultee role SCC can provide advice to influence development in a way that reduces flood risk.</p> <p>Final planning decisions about whether a new development should go ahead as proposed are ultimately made by the Local Planning Authority (the Districts and Boroughs or SCC for Minerals, Waste and Schools). Decisions are judged against set policy (nationally or through Local Plans etc.) statements and so LLFA input into the wording of those local plans and planning documents can help achieve this objective.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is that no new development increases flood risk and existing development plans will also be encouraged to contribute to reducing flood risk.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	<p>No new development should increase flood risk.</p> <p>There is a reduction in the number of existing properties / developments / infrastructure at risk of flooding.</p>
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk across the County will be reduced as a result of all new developments using SuDS and ensuring flood risk is considered throughout the lifetime of the development.</li> <li>• Opportunities to reduce local flood risk through development and retrofit SuDS will be identified and taken where possible.</li> <li>• Opportunities to integrate amenity areas and environmental benefits on new developments through using SuDS will be identified and taken where possible.</li> <li>• Impacts from urbanisation (including water quality effects) will be mitigated and changes to surface water risk from climate change will be considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A long-term vision: advice for planners covers the surface water impacts of development across a 100 year (residential) or 75 year (commercial) timeframe. The aim is to ensure that approved development manages flood risk throughout its lifetime both on and off-site. SCC will reduce the impact of our schemes and estates on local drainage networks</li> <li>• Catchment-based approach: catchment-based assessments will be included in Local Plans and cumulative impacts of development considered across a catchment area.</li> <li>• Partnership working: LPAs are the ultimate decision makers and LLFA advice helps them make decisions that consider the impacts of development upon flood risk and local drainage.</li> <li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: sustainable development enhances growth through social and economic development. Well designed schemes help reduce local flood risk and improve the local environment. Regeneration opportunities are also identified.</li> <li>• Sustainable flood risk management through planning and development: we will ensure national SuDS standards are met on all major developments and sustainable drainage is a consideration made on all SCC schemes</li> <li>• Capital investment: we will ensure capital investment is sustainable with regards to drainage and flood risk, and does not increase local flood risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	<p>The population of Surrey is expected to continue to grow, and in order to be able to accommodate this growth in a sustainable manner, all opportunities need to be taken to reduce the risk of flooding from all new developments in order to reduce flood risk overall. In addition, new developments and their developers are subject to a planning charge called the community infrastructure level (CIL) which can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure projects including flood alleviation schemes. Seeking other sources of funding, such as the CIL, which does not come from the public purse, means that more money can be invested into reducing flood risk than is available through public sources. In targeting new developments, we are seeking to prevent development from flooding in the first instance, rather than having to deal or manage the consequences of flooding which is more costly, resource intensive and distressing.</p>



What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Utilising development opportunities effectively to reduce flood risk to the development itself and local or neighbouring areas.</li><li>- Utilising existing developments when changes occur to seek improved management of flood risk through policies.</li><li>- Opportunity to utilise additional funding to support flood risk management.</li><li>- Sustainable development.</li><li>- Flood resilience increased at developments which are at risk of flooding to reduce the impact and costs/disruption.</li><li>- Enabling sustainable growth without increasing flood risk to or from new developments.</li></ul>
Related Policies	<p>The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2011) aims to make sure that flood risk management partners work together to achieve environmental gains alongside economic and social gains, consistent with the principles of sustainable development. The Strategy also seeks to achieve the objective of reducing the threat of flooding by avoiding inappropriate development in areas of flood risk and managing land carefully elsewhere to avoid increasing the risk of flooding, The Strategy states that one of the guiding principles of the national capital allocation system is that the general taxpayer should not pay to protect new developments in areas at risk of flooding, now or in the future.</p> <p>The NPPF focusses on achieving sustainable development. It states that new development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, which includes increased flood risk, and that risks can be managed throughout the design life of the development. Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. This is known as the sequential, risk-based approach. This is to protect people and property against flood risk. It can also safeguard land from development that is required for current and future flood risk management. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. Where development is necessary in flood risk areas, it should be made safe and ensure it does not increase flood risk elsewhere. The planning system should be used to reduce flood risk overall through taking opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding. For the long-term, where climate change is expected to increase the risk of flooding and therefore existing development may not be sustainable, opportunities should be sought through the planning system to facilitate the relocation of those developments to more sustainable locations. The NPPF advocates a proportionate approach for minor developments and that through pre-application discussions between consenting bodies would enable early consideration of fundamental issues and whether developments are acceptable in principle.</p> <p>All Local Plans developed by LPAs are aligned to the NPPF or are in the process of updating Local Plans.</p> <p>In December 2014 the UK government released their response to the consultation exercise that was carried out as to the use of the planning system, alongside the FWMA (2010). In summary, the government expect local planning policies and consultations to ensure that SuDS for the management of runoff are in place for all major new developemtns (equivalent to 10 dwellings or more), unless they are demonstrated to be inappropriate. National standards for SuDS were published in 2015 - all SuDS should adhere to these as a minimum (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/415773/sustainable-drainage-technical-standards.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/415773/sustainable-drainage-technical-standards.pdf</a>).</p>
Related SCC Corporate Priorities	Resident safety
Review Date	April 2018

Objective 6	We will reduce the risk of flooding to and from development through local planning policy and processes.					
Sub-Objective	Undertake a robust statutory consultee role on flood risk management through influencing policy and advising LPAs.		Take viable opportunities to utilise existing and new development to reduce flood risk.		Educate planning officers, Members and developers on flood risk and drainage, particularly SuDS and environmentally beneficial measures.	
Current status	SCC currently undertakes the statutory consultee role for surface water flood risk and has done since 2015. The EA undertake the statutory consultee role for fluvial and sea flooding. Water and Sewerage companies provided a statutory consultee role in relation to connecting in developments to the existing sewer network. This objective seeks to continually improve the role in order to achieve the objective.		SCC currently provide advice to developers and LPAs to reduce surface water flood risk through the use of SuDS on new major developments. The EA and water and sewerage companies also provide advice on request in relation to their statutory consultee roles. This objective is designed to proactively identify and take more opportunities to reduce flood risk, not only through planning but also other avenues.		SCC currently undertakes informal education of officers and other key stakeholders on an ad-hoc basis. This objective will improve awareness and provide information in order for LPAs and committees to make informed decisions on SuDS and reduce flood risk using opportunities presented by new developments.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Current Actions	1- LPAs to ensure that flood risk does not increase from minor developments.	SCC, Ongoing	1 - SCC and LPAs to use prioritised flood risk areas to seek out and identify development opportunities for flood reduction through partner working.	LPAs, SCC Ongoing	1 - EA and SCC to develop good working relationships with planning officers and committee members.	EA, SCC LPA Planning Officers and Planning Committee members, Ongoing
	2 - SCC to continue to provide statutory consultee responses and advice on new developments and compliance against national standards for SuDS, alongside local planning policy and best practice.	SCC Ongoing	2 - LPAs and SCC seek to ensure that only developments that meet the requirements of the NPPF and national SuDS standards are given planning approval.	LPAs, SCC Ongoing	2 - SCC to continue to provide informal training and advice to planning officers within Surrey.	LPA Ongoing
	3 - SCC to clearly set out their expectations of developers and planners during SuDS consultations .	Ongoing	3- Relevant consultees to continue to proactively and reactively provide responses to consultations and the development of planning documents such as Local Plans, SFRAs, and other relevant local planning documents.	EA, LPAs, SCC Ongoing	3 - SCC to hold 'Introduction to SuDS' session for planning officers and members.	LPA March 2017
	4 - LPAs and statutory consultees to provide pre-application advice when requested.	LPAs, Developers, Ongoing	4 - SCC to undertake a scoping exercise to understand where SuDS are feasible on SCC estates.	SCC Ongoing		
	5- EA and Water Utilities to continue in their remit as statutory consultees for planning for all new developments regarding flooding.	EA, Water Utilities Ongoing				

	6 - SCC to investigate and establish a process / framework which allows them to influence the Local Plan and LPA policies early on in their development and regularly moving forwards to ensure use of SuDS and prevent increases in local flood risk from all development, taking account of climate change.	LPA's, Ongoing				
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Balancing resource with the peaks and troughs of the workload / planning deadlines. LPA technical expertise around flood risk. New role and skillset to SCC. Statutory responsibility so will be prioritised. Programme into team workload. SCC to engage planning officers in LPAs through the 'Introduction to SuDS' session (see sub-objective 3, short term action 2).		Creating a network and process by which all viable opportunities are identified. Monitoring of planning applications which are approved without meeting the appropriate standards. Use SFRPB to co-ordinate and monitor work Programme into team workload.		Making time for relationship building. Programme into role's priorities.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional financial support required. SCC charges for pre-application advice which generates revenue to support the cost of the statutory consultee role. Medium resource cost should demand increase as team are currently working to capacity.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Short-term Actions	1 - LPAs to review how effectively flood risk and resilience is being considered on minor planning applications and implement improvements based on review outcomes.	LPAs, August 2017	1 - LPAs and statutory consultees to review existing networks and methods / processes for identifying new minor and major developments which have the potential to contribute to a reduction in flood risk and develop a mechanism to record and facilitate identifying opportunities to reduce flood risk through development.	LPAs, statutory consultees September 2017	1- SCC to seek feedback from LPAs on the level of engagement and service provided through the statutory consultee role and improve where possible.	SCC, LPAs February 2017, annually onwards
	1 - All RMAs / statutory consultees to provide guidance and support to LPAs for minor development decision making around flood risk and resilience.	All RMAs September 2017	2 - SCC to identify where high risk areas of surface and groundwater flooding exist currently and in the future with climate change, and where catchment-wide solutions may provide benefits to inform application of existing LPA policies and identify opportunities.	SFRPB working group, LPAs, flood action groups and local authority maintenance engineers. October 2017	2 - SFRPB WG to carry out work to understand the range of awareness across the relevant stakeholders.	LPAs, Members, Developers June 2017
	3- SCC to review, update and improve SuDS proforma and website pages and to provide clear advice on requirements.	SCC December 2017	3 - LPA to review and identify local policy, guidance and evidence (as above) which can be used to mitigate impacts of development in high risk flooding areas and utilise opportunities to reduce local flood risk through local (re) development.	LPA November 2017	3 - SFRPB to set up working group of planning officers to help deliver this action plan and ensure integration of the planning system with flood risk management in Surrey.	LPAs, September 2017
			4 - LPAs to assess CIL for opportunities to fund/support flood alleviation schemes.	LPAs December 2017	4 - SCC to consult with the relevant stakeholders during the development of the SuDS guidance to ensure it provides them with the information required.	SCC, LPAs, Members, Developers September 2017

			5 - SCC to review published LPAs Local Plans and associated documents such as Strategic Housing (& Employment) Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA / SHELAA) and Infrastructure Delivery Plans to identify, record and share with the SFRPB short-term opportunities to reduce flood risk through development.	SCC, LPAs, SFRPB, January 2018		
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability, LPA technical expertise around flood risk. Programme into the team workload. SCC to engage planning officers in LPAs through the 'Introduction to SuDS' session (see sub-objective 3, short term action 2).		Resource availability, Programme into the team workload.		Resource availability, attendance at meetings / events. Programme into team workload and/or professional development reviews. Encourage Members to engage early with SuDS team when they have flood issues or developments on the horizon.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional financial support required. Medium resource cost - establishment of additional planning WG may take a significant amount of time, but will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Medium-term Actions</b>	1 - WG to produce local SuDS guidance in consultation with developers, experts and planning officers.	WG, LPAs, experts and Developers, December 2017	1- LPAs to update SFRA's with the support of SCC and their high flood risk areas evidence base (see short-term actions above).	LPAs, SCC January 2018 onwards when SFRA's require updates.	1 -SFRPB WG to disseminate and promote SuDS guidance and policies internally within their own organisations and externally to the relevant stakeholders.	February 2018
	2- SCC to identify gaps in statutory responses to planning applications regarding flood risk. SFRPB to discuss how to address gaps such as groundwater in planning application responses.	SCC, Working Group of Planning Officers December 2017	2 - SCC (SNR team) to investigate the current awareness and use of SuDS within SCC and following that facilitate the implementation the use of SuDS across all appropriate new SCC schemes, including highways.	SCC April 2018 onwards	2 - SCC to establish a programme of advising and briefing Planning Officers, Members and developers on the benefits of SuDS and the opportunities presented by CIL and how this can be used to manage flood risk across the county to inform their decision making around planning applications.	September 2018
	3- SFRPB WG to develop standing advice for groundwater flooding.	February 2018 Working Group of Planning Officers.	3 - LPAs to proactively engage with one another and the SFRPB to understand / review their collective policy, guidance and evidence (e.g.. local plans and supplementary planning documents) and ensure that development and flood risk management plans are aligned.	LPAs, SFRPB / All RMAs June 2018		
	4 - LPAs to review, with support of SCC, developments' success in implementing sustainable drainage and flood risk mitigation measures. LPAs will develop a process to identify whether developments have successfully constructed and utilised SuDS to drive benefits and capture / share this information moving forwards.	LPAs, SCC April 2018	4 - SCC to produce guidance for the identification of opportunities (both on new assets / developments and retrofitting on existing) and the design, procurement and inclusion of SuDS within all appropriate schemes. Guidance to be made available to partner RMAs.	LPAs December 2018		



			5 - RMAs to identify, record and review opportunities for retrofitting SuDS across Surrey on their assets and estates, targeting high priority areas (identified as part of Objective 1 action plan and short-term actions above) in partnership with other authorities.	All RMAs, February 2019		
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Timescales of the strategic planning cycle. Consultation and approval timescales. Resource availability. Avoiding bias in developing guidance.  Amend work plan to fit with planning cycle and other timescales Ensure input to guidance from wide range of RMAs via SFRPB WG		Timescales of the strategic planning cycle. Appetite for change. Perceptions around the complexity and cost of SuDS. Resource availability.  Programme into team workload/priorities Amend work plan to fit with planning cycle Use SFRPB to promote awareness and benefits of SuDS		Resource availability, attendance at meetings / events. Programme into team workload / team priorities.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Medium - there is potential additional financial and resource support required from seeking the skills of experts and/or developers.		Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required, except for events and printing expenses.		Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required, except for events and printing expenses.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Long-term Actions</b>	1 - SCC to monitor and report to SFRPB the number of developments which are approved contrary to SCC SuDS advice and work to reduce this number.	LPA's, September 2018	1 - RMAs to take all opportunities (identified jointly by all RMAs) to ensure all development meets best practice and national standards/guidance as a minimum to reduce flood risk.	All RMAs, Members, Developers. 2020	1 - SCC to monitor knowledge levels across relevant stakeholders and ensure they meet the minimum required to undertake their role. Specifically ensuring LPA planning officers understand the roles and responsibilities of RMAs in relation to flood risk management on being recruited / as part of their induction.	2020 onwards
	2 - SFRPB WG to review existing LPA policies on flood risk and drainage, identify gaps between these and national standards, and consult with LPAs / jointly develop and update policies to reduce flood risk through development. This will be timed to coincide with the LPA policy review cycle.	WG, Members, SFRPB, Working Group of Planning Officers. December 2018	2 - All RMAs to work together to ensure that responses to planning applications are coordinated and that the ultimate objective of new development not increasing local flood risk is met, with any exceptions being reported to the SFRPB.	All RMAs, LPAs, SFRPB 2020	2- SCC to roll out regular updates on policy, guidance, technical knowledge and refreshers for relevant stakeholders	2020 onwards
			3 - RMAs to monitor development opportunities and known flood risk areas to understand flood risk to developments and record total number of opportunities being utilised to reduce flood risk, and where this is not happening, understand the reasons behind this and work to minimise these occurrences.	LPAs, all RMAs, 2020	3 - Develop a GIS tool and capability within relevant teams which identifies areas at risk of flooding, and ongoing / future development so that spotting opportunities to reduce flood risk through development is made easier and more effective.	2020 onwards
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability, timescales of strategic planning cycle. Data availability for monitoring developments. Amend work plan to fit with planning cycle. Agreed reporting periods and mechanisms, good working relationships and understanding of each other's goals and objectives.		Identifying all viable opportunities. Identifying and refining a mechanism which allows RMAs to coordinate planning application responses. Working together to identify all viable opportunities and reviewing them jointly. SFRPB to review potential mechanisms to achieve coordination of responses.		Resource Availability / availability of attendees. Programming into responsibilities of Officers and reviewing alternative formats for update / refresher sessions i.e. webinars.	

<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	Low - there is no additional financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	Low - there is no additional financial or resource support required except for potential event and printing costs.
<b>Measures of Success</b>	New development does not increase flood risk. The number of new developments which go ahead, despite SCC advice will reduce year on year.	Reduce flood risk on-site and downstream / in neighbouring areas by utilising development to implement flood risk reduction measures, or through seeking contributions to CIL which can be used to provide wider flood risk management solutions. This will be done in collaboration with RMAs and partners such as LPAs.	All RMAs, partners and Members are aware of their responsibilities and have the knowledge to carry them out effectively in relation to understanding and promoting the benefits of SuDS. This will facilitate informed decisions which will in turn reduce flood risk to and from new developments.
<b>Progress Record</b>			



<b>Objective 7</b>	<b>We will reduce flood risk from all sources via a programme of capital works, which will be integrated with the activities of other Risk Management Authorities</b>
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>The LLFA for Surrey, is responsible for managing the risk of flooding from surface water, ordinary watercourses and groundwater. This overlaps with the role as highways authority to manage the risk of flooding on the highway and from highway drainage. The most direct way to manage flood risk is through the delivery of capital schemes to reduce the likelihood of significant flooding occurring and/or reduce the impact of flooding on infrastructure, properties and safety risks to the public.</p> <p>This objective will establish a programme of capital works that is efficient and delivers as much benefit as possible. However, in order to achieve this, a governance structure that sets out how the works will be planned and ultimately constructed is required.</p> <p>Works will be initially identified and taken forward on a priority basis by the LLFA according to its own criteria (which are outlined as part of the strategy). However, once prioritised these works will be taken to the SFRPB in order to give partners the opportunity to scrutinise and influence the process, with confirmation of works following this discussion. This process encourages partnership working and a coordinated approach to risk management.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	<p>There will be a reduction in the risk of flooding as a result of the partnership programme of capital works. Where there is modelling available, this will be measured through the testing of options to demonstrate the success of capital works (see Objective 1's Action Plan).</p>
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	<p>This objective has a direct effect on the vision of the strategy as through a programme of capital works there is a reduction in flood risk through less disruption to the transport network, reduced safety risk to residents and a reduction in the number of properties at risk of flooding.</p>
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A long-term vision: we are continually developing different programmes of flood risk management schemes looking at the next five years and beyond, with a view to linking all programmes into a single, integrated programme where shared priorities and resources will result in significant cost savings and opportunities to deliver additional benefits.</li><li>• Catchment-based approach: the upstream and downstream implications of a proposed scheme within its wider catchment are assessed to ensure that potential negative impacts of scheme delivery are avoided. Capital works will seek to achieve environmental benefits alongside flood risk mitigation.</li><li>• Partnership working: we involve RMA partners in the development of schemes where they have shared interests in managing flood risk. We contribute to partner's schemes where we feel it will assist in managing local flood risk.</li><li>• Community resilience: we consult with resident groups to gather additional historic flooding information and report on the progress of schemes and studies so that the public understand what benefits will be delivered and what community resilience measures still need to be addressed.</li><li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: our schemes look to reduce the economic impact of flooding and avoid discouraging future economic growth.</li><li>• Sustainable flood risk management through planning and development: SuDS solutions are always considered as part of the options assessment for a flood risk management scheme with the attenuation of water flows being the preferred option where feasible.</li><li>• Capital investment: we look to improve on existing drainage systems and ensure that all schemes achieve the highest standard of protection from flooding that is economically viable and takes account of climate change.</li></ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	<p>There are inherent difficulties in delivering flood risk management schemes such as limited knowledge on the condition of drainage assets, in-house expertise to identify and design cost-effective solutions, and of course, resource implications for the larger scale schemes. However, these difficulties can be overcome with new data gathering and recording methods, access to consultants and contractors with the necessary capabilities to assist with scheme delivery and taking advantage of opportunities for government funding and partnership working with our partners. By adopting a longer-term, more phased approach to capital scheme development (rather than reviewing our programme on an annual basis) we will also be able to take more complex and effective schemes forward on a much more cost effective basis. This allows the development and construction of flood alleviation schemes that the County needs while at the same time allowing partner RMAs (through the SFRPB) to influence, support or scrutinise the works that are taken forward by another RMA.</p>

<b>What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?</b>	<p>The direct benefits of achieving this objective are improved resident experience with less disruption to the transport network, less safety risk to residents and a reduction in the number of properties and infrastructure assets at risk of flooding.</p> <p>The cost savings from innovative approaches, securing funding contributions and joint working with partners will allow more schemes to be developed and delivered, resulting in an ever increasing reduction in flood risk.</p>
<b>Related Policies</b>	<p>The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2011) sets out guiding principles about the national capital allocation system for flood risk management which are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some national funding will be available to all potential projects;</li> <li>• funds from central government should prioritise those most at risk and least able to help themselves;</li> <li>• all flood risk management projects should be treated equally;</li> <li>• the general taxpayer should not pay to protect new development in areas at risk of flooding, now or in the future;</li> <li>• greater local input and decision making should not come at the expense of a stable and long term pipeline of projects; and</li> <li>• all investment should be made within a nationally consistent framework.</li> </ul> <p>The Strategy emphasises that the prevention of all flooding is not possible. In addition with budget pressures faced by many organisations, it is important therefore to prioritise capital investment in those communities and areas which are at greatest risk and are least able to afford to help themselves. It is not possible to develop capital schemes in every area at risk of flooding. It also encourages other forms of investment, such as CIL, in addition to government funding to allow more communities to benefit from flood risk management schemes.</p>
<b>Related SCC Corporate Priorities</b>	Resident safety and experience. Caring for our environment, improving our roads, and strengthening our economy.
<b>Review Date</b>	April 2018

Objective 7	We will reduce flood risk from all sources via a programme of capital works, which will be integrated with the activities of other Risk Management Authorities							
Sub-Objective	Establish and implement best practice on integrating flood risk reduction into all feasible SCC capital schemes.		Establish and implement best practice for integrating flood risk reduction and water quality improvement into all feasible capital schemes across all RMAs via a single, joint capital programme.		Identify new funding sources and innovative methods for securing funding for flood alleviation schemes. Explore opportunities with other sectors to enhance economic growth, environmental benefits and wellbeing through flood alleviation schemes.		Ensure all drainage assets, where feasible, are retrofitted or replaced with SuDS to manage the quantity and quality of water in a more sustainable way.	
Current status	A single draft integrated SCC capital programme has been developed alongside principles by which to identify opportunities to collaborate on programmes of work. This will be implemented.		Currently the SFRPB scrutinises and makes decisions on the FDGiA scheme programmes. The aim of this measure is to scrutinise more holistically and consider all aspects of flood risk management work across all RMAs in Surrey.		Across all RMAs there are some who are doing this and others who are not, or who are someway towards this objective. The objective seeks to ensure that all RMAs are doing this and are aware and empowered to seek out best practice in seeking and securing alternative funding sources.		Across the RMAs that are responsible for drainage systems, there is an increasing trend to consider and utilise SuDS as opposed to traditional drainage measures i.e. pipes. However there is more to be done in encouraging the uptake of SuDS.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Short-term Actions	1 - SCC (SNR Team) to write drainage works design principles (including SuDS) for SCC Highways Team (cross-reference-see objective 6's action plan).	SCC August 2017	1 - SFRPB to steer the gathering and mapping of all the work programmes of partner RMAs to share publicly.	SFRPB April 2017 onwards	1 - SCC (SNR Team) to identify and record funding opportunities and limitations/risks of projects currently ongoing within SCC.	SCC April 2017	1- SCC to assess and prioritise which of their drainage assets would benefit from retrofitting of SuDS.	SCC Ongoing
	2 - SCC (SNR Team) to share the drainage design principles with other internal and external teams as appropriate.	SCC October 2017	2 - SCC to discuss and amend all appropriate internal capital programmes to align with partner work programmes and encourage other RMAs to do the same.	SCC April 2017 onwards	2 - SFRPB to encourage all partner RMAs to identify and record funding opportunities and limitations/risks of projects currently ongoing.	SFRPB September 2017	2- SFRPB to encourage and support other RMAs to assess and prioritise which of their drainage assets would benefit from retrofitting of SuDS and then present their findings back to the SFRPB. These can then be added onto the joint capital works programme.	SFRPB Ongoing
	3 - SCC (SNR Team) to capture the number of capital schemes currently on the programme and ongoing within SCC and identify how many of those consider the possibility of flood risk reduction and other benefits such as improvement to water quality. This will form a baseline from which to measure success against this objective.	SCC December 2017	3 - SFRPB and WG to draft principles/policies and processes to facilitate cross-RMA opportunities for flood risk management to be identified, developed, partnership funded and constructed.	SFRPB, WG September 2017			3 - SCC to include SuDS retrofitting into the joint RMA capital works programme and encourage and support other RMAs to do the same.	SCC September 2017 onwards
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability Programme into workload and priorities of Officers.		Resource availability Programme into workload and SFRPB meeting agendas.		Resource availability Programme into workload and SFRPB meeting agendas.		Resource availability, RMA willingness / availability to carry out a similar exercise. Programme into workload and priorities of Officers. Be clear on the reasons behind task and expectations of RMAs in using SuDS.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required.		Medium - There is no additional resource required. There is no additional financial support required to undertake the actions, but additional costs may be required to implement the new programme which achieves multiple benefits.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline

Medium-term Actions	1 - SCC teams to develop inter-working team behaviours, practices and joint processes which facilitate the efficient and timely identification and funding of opportunities to integrate flood risk reduction and wider benefits into all capital schemes. SCC to share successes and lessons learnt with other RMAs to empower them to do the same (where applicable).	All RMAs January 2018	1 - SCC to review existing programme and encourage the inclusion of more long-term schemes so that the programme becomes more phased.	SCC December 2017	1 - SCC (SNR Team) to share process and knowledge of identifying and recording funding opportunities, and limitations / risks of projects with internal teams and external organisations who undertake capital works.	SCC April 2018	1 - SCC to draft policy and reporting guidance on programming the retrofitting SuDS and consult with SFRPB / all RMAs.	SCC December 2017
			2 - SFRPB to act as a platform for influencing capital programmes of all RMAs to align more closely with partners' and the RFCC's programmes, the vision of the Strategy, and in line with its principles, such as ensuring sustainability and climate change is taken account of.	SFRPB December 2017			2 -All relevant RMAs to share and implement policy within their own organisations.	All RMAs June 2018
Challenges and how they will be overcome	Resource availability. Buy in from other SCC internal teams and other RMAs. Time constrained funding contributions. Clearly state the benefits of adopting processes / best practice: potential new funding, improving value for money and reducing flood risk to residents, roads etc. Flexible programmes and processes / principles in place to allow opportunities to be grasped within timeframes.		Buy in from other SCC internal teams and other RMAs. Time constrained funding contributions. Clearly state the benefits: programming longer term, and jointly developing programmes and delivering schemes as partners is more cost-effective and reduces the pressure on individual organisations. Flexible programmes and processes / principles in place to allow opportunities to be grasped within timeframes.				Resource availability. Buy in from other SCC internal teams and other RMAs. Programme into team workload and SFRPB meeting schedule. Be clear on the benefits: the policy will provide a clear expectation and method for SuDS inclusion on drainage schemes which are generally cheaper and have additional benefits, when compared to tradition drainage schemes.	
What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required and there is the potential that additional funding could be secured.		Medium - There is no additional resource required. There is no additional financial support required to undertake the actions, but additional costs may be required to implement the new programme which achieves multiple benefits.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required and there is the potential that additional funding could be secured.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required.	
	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
Long-term Actions	1 - SCC to develop and undertake an internal, phased, joint capital works programme for the county which will allow capital schemes to achieve multiple benefits and achieve value for money spend.	SCC July 2019	1 - SFRPB WG to facilitate RMAs jointly developing a work programme and SFRPB to scrutinise (either to agree further phases or collate evidence to demonstrate why schemes on hold or cancelled) joint work programme supported by a central dataset which prioritises capital schemes (see Objective 1 Action Plan).	SFRPB, WG September 2018	1 - SFRPB to develop relationships with other sectors who have responsibilities for capital works or asset management, such as Network Rail, to seek opportunities to integrate FRM and other wider benefits with their work.	SFRPB January 2019	1 - SFRPB to discuss and agree on a method of monitoring the uptake of retrofitting of SuDS to measure the success against this objective.	All RMAs, December 2018
			2 - SFRPB to ensure partner RMAs deliver joint programme to agreed timeframes.	SFRPB September 2018	2 - SFRPB to encourage and support all RMAs to seek alternative funding for at least half of all flood risk related capital schemes. Demonstrated through EOI submissions for alternative funding.	SFRPB 2020		



<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Resource availability. Buy in from other SCC internal teams. Programme into team workload, team leader priorities and role descriptions. Be clear on the benefits of working in this way and having a joint programme.		Resource availability. Buy in from other SCC internal teams and other RMAs. Clearly state the benefits: programming longer term, risk based, and jointly developing programmes and delivering schemes as partners is more cost-effective and reduces the pressure on individual organisations. Agreeing provisional resources and funding contributions to a scheme based on confirmation of future benefits to RMA.		Differing priorities between organisations. Develop relationships based on mutually beneficial work. Seek proportionate contributions dependant on impact / benefits of flood risk reduction.		Finding readily available data or encouraging teams / organisations to produce additional reporting. Challenging cases where retrofitting of SuDS has not been carried out and why to feed into future learning / encouraging uptake of SuDS measures.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low -Small amount of additional resource may be required from partners to develop joint programme. there is no additional financial support required unless the dataset will be hosted on a platform which requires financial input.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required and there is the potential that additional funding could be secured.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>	<b>Action for Lead RMA</b>	<b>Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline</b>
<b>Ongoing Actions</b>	1 - SCC (SNR Team) to monitor and review progress against objective and baseline.	SCC December 2017 onwards	1 - Lead RMA for schemes to bring together Project Boards to identify opportunities for multiple benefits and contributions from all relevant RMAs.	RMAs April 2017 onwards	1 - All RMAs to review new funding sources regularly and present to the SFRPB to improve awareness and feedback lessons learnt from funding applications.	All RMAs Ongoing	1 - SFRPB to review the policy on retrofitting SuDS in order to ensure it is fit for purpose and being implemented by all relevant RMAs.	All RMAs, Annually
			2 - SFRPB to review the development and implementation of the joint RMA capital programme annually. Lessons learnt will be implemented on a regular basis.	September 2018 onwards	2 - SCC to seek new opportunities and innovative methods of identifying and achieving wider benefits of capital schemes and securing funding sources.	SCC Ongoing		
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Infrequent responsibility and therefore may get looked over in favour of more urgent tasks. Programme into workload and SFRPB meeting agendas.		Infrequent responsibility and therefore may get looked over in favour of more urgent tasks. Programme into workload and SFRPB meeting agendas.		Resource availability and infrequent responsibility and therefore may get looked over in favour of more urgent tasks. Programme into workload, officer responsibilities and SFRPB meeting agendas.		Infrequent responsibility and therefore may get looked over in favour of more urgent tasks. Programme into workload and SFRPB meeting agendas.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required and there is the opportunity to seek and secure new sources of funding to manage and reduce flood risk.		Low - there is no additional resource or financial support required. All actions will be completed within existing RMA resource.	
<b>Measures of Success</b>	Identifying all feasible opportunities to integrate the separate SCC capital programs together to realise the benefits of integrating flood risk reduction on all possible capital programmes, including highways and other infrastructure.		Identifying all feasible opportunities to integrate the programs together to realise the benefits of partnership working such as improved efficiency, multiple benefits of capital schemes and reduced costs to individual RMAs.		Continuing to identify and present all opportunities for the improvement of methods to identify and assess benefits of flood risk management schemes and identifying / securing funding sources to the SFRPB in order to raise awareness of these amongst all RMAs and therefore able to take advantage of the opportunities, where appropriate. Continuing to increase the number of infrastructure schemes which seek to mitigate flood risk and provide wider benefits. Increase the number of schemes identified and constructed which include alternative sources of funding.		For all RMAs who have responsibility of drainage systems to have a policy in place which prioritises drainage schemes which have the opportunity to use SuDS in order to encourage their uptake. An increase, year on year, in the number of SuDS schemes identified and constructed.	
<b>Progress Record</b>								

<b>Objective 8</b>	<b>We will investigate significant flooding incidents in order to make recommendations that help to reduce flood risk.</b>
<b>Purpose and Outcome</b>	<p>The purpose of this objective is to investigate flooding, this is a statutory requirement under the FWMA (2010) and they are commonly referred to as Section 19 investigations. Investigating flooding helps us to understand the sources and causes of flooding. This in turn helps us to better reduce the risk of flooding, through planning appropriate development, designing appropriate flood alleviation schemes or other measures to reduce the risk of flooding, and improving the way we plan for and respond to flooding emergencies.</p> <p>The outcome of this objective is for section 19 flood investigations to become a more useful tool in improving the way flood risk and flooding incidents are managed in Surrey.</p>
<b>Overarching Measure of Success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding is investigated promptly by SCC with the assistance of RMAs.</li> <li>• All RMAs have collectively carried out their flood risk management functions successfully which has resulted in a reduction in the impact of the flooding.</li> <li>• All RMAs have successfully implemented any recommendations arising out of previous section 19 investigations.</li> <li>• The Section 19 reporting process is quicker and more efficient than before.</li> <li>• Responsibilities and functions of RMAs are accurately reported.</li> </ul>
<b>How does the Objective meet the Strategy Vision for 2032?</b>	Achievement of this objective is a requirement under the FWMA (2010). By reviewing processes for writing Section 19 reports on a regular basis we will ensure that they keep pace with the latest flood data and that this data can be used to identify and prioritise areas with the greatest flood risk. Furthermore, this information will not just be used to inform 'hard' engineering options for flood alleviation schemes – it will also guide 'soft' options such as community resilience and maintenance, and we will share this information with local communities.
<b>Which of the Strategy Principles does the action support and how?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A long-term vision: Section 19 reports are an ongoing responsibility and we will review our process in a way that adapts to future issues.</li> <li>• Catchment-based approach: flooded locations are reviewed on a geographical or catchment basis in Section 19 reports.</li> <li>• Partnership working: whenever we conduct a Section 19 investigation, we will consult with partner RMAs to ensure we use the most accurate data possible and agree recommendations that benefit all parties.</li> <li>• Community Resilience: By providing communities with an improved awareness of flood risk and mechanisms, we can improve their resilience to flooding and their ability to influence flood risk management in Surrey.</li> <li>• Enhancing growth and wellbeing: the lessons learned and recommendations agreed from flood investigations will serve to better protect residents, the economy and the environment.</li> <li>• Sustainable flood risk management through planning and development: data gathered following and during flood events will be used to enhance understanding of the flood risks in the surrounding area and influence planning processes accordingly.</li> <li>• Capital investment: data gathered following and during the flood event will be used to help prioritise capital works for the areas that are most in need.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Context / Justification</b>	<p>It is a statutory responsibility of an LLFA to investigate and publish the findings of flooding incidents. Section 19 of the FWMA (2010) states that:</p> <p>“On becoming aware of a flood in its area, a lead local flood authority must, to the extent that it considers it necessary or appropriate, investigate which risk management authorities have relevant flood risk management functions, and whether each of those risk management authorities has exercised, or is proposing to exercise, those functions in response to the flood”. It is important to note that these investigations do not apportion blame or hold any one individual or authority to account for any flooding.</p> <p>In addition it is equally important for us to use the Section 19 process as an opportunity to learn lessons and analyse the evidence gathered from these reports in order to review and prioritise our approach to flood risk management more effectively.</p>
<b>What are the benefits of achieving the Objective?</b>	SCC, in consultation with its partners, published a number of Section 19 investigations following the severe floods of 2013/14. This exercise enabled us to establish a set process for writing and developing the reports but also gave us the opportunity to record and agree recommendations to further strengthen our response to future flood events. Investigating any future flooding allows a better understanding of flood mechanisms, and therefore promotes improvements to the way that flooding is responded to and managed.



Related Policies	<p>Section 19 of the FWMA (2010), as above, sets out the duty of a LLFA to investigate flood incidents.</p> <p>In order to mitigate and reduce flood risk, we must understand flooding. The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2012) states that "We cannot control nature, however we can better understand risk and therefore improve society's resilience to environmental risks". In addition the government will work with partners and communities to reduce the threat of flooding through understanding the risks of flooding, working together to put in place long-term plans to manage these risks and making sure that other plans take account of them.</p> <p>SCC's Highways and Transport Asset Management Strategy (2016) - this Strategy highlights the variety of assets which require maintenance under the LLFA and Highways Authority duties. Section 19 reports will need to recommend maintenance actions that align with this Strategy.</p>
Related SCC Corporate Priorities	Wellbeing, Resident experience
Review Date	April 2018

Objective 8	We will investigate significant flooding incidents in order to make recommendations that help to reduce flood risk.			
Sub-Objective	Review our section 19 investigation procedures to maximise the efficiency of the process and the value gained from it.		Use new data obtained from section 19 investigations to inform the prioritisation process for flood risk management or resilience works.	
Current status	SCC have completed and published two rounds of Section 19's and have been continually improving the process through internal review. Feedback from the RMAs involved in the first round of Section 19's has been received and implemented.		Currently information is presented in the section 19 reports but benefit would be gained from establishing a clear process to ensure that the implementation of recommendations and lessons learnt, which are evidenced based, impacts positively on future flood alleviation schemes.	
Actions	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline	Action for Lead RMA	Partner RMAs, Stakeholders, Deadline
	1 - SFRPB to agree on goals and outcomes of section 19 investigations aligned to the statutory requirements of the FWMA (2010).	All RMAs September 2017	1 - SFRPB to review what and how data is gathered through section 19 investigations and collated / analysed across RMAs to inform decisions and programmes. This is part of the data review being carried out under the action plan for Objective 1.	All RMAs December 2017
	2- SCC to review the existing template and procedure for section 19 reports (including triggers and post investigation process to implement recommendations).	SCC December 2017	2 - SFRPB to organise the collation of data coming out of section 19 investigations into a central dataset, as per Objective 1's action plan.	All RMAs, Ongoing

	3 - SFRPB to review section 19 procedure every two years to ensure it remains up to date.	All RMAs Ongoing	3 - SFRPB to review the data collected and encourage RMAs to use it in the prioritisation of capital works schemes, routine maintenance activities and any other flood risk management or resilience activities (where appropriate).	All RMAs Ongoing
<b>Challenges and how they will be overcome</b>	Availability and appetite of all RMAs. Be clear on the benefits of a streamlined process. Section 19 investigations are a statutory obligation.		Appetite of RMAs. Not all Section 19s will have recommendations relating to capital works and maintenance. Section 19 investigations are a statutory obligation. Manage public expectations of the recommendations coming out of section 19 investigations; they will not all result in capital works however a suite of options will be considered.	
<b>What is the cost (finance or resource) of achieving this action and how will this be met?</b>	Low - action will be completed within existing officer resource as part of work on S19 reports. No major additional cost implications.		Medium - action will be completed within existing officer resource as part of work on S19 reports although there may be additional cost associated with new central dataset platform.	
<b>Measures of Success</b>	A reduction in the resource and time required to undertake flood investigations. Investigations leading to meaningful recommendations which reduce or mitigate the risk of flooding.		Improving the quantity, quality and coverage of data. Demonstrable impact of S19 recommendations influencing prioritisation process for capital works and maintenance.	
<b>Progress Record</b>				

This page is intentionally left blank