

**FLOOD AND DRAINAGE
 MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY
 COMMITTEE
 1 NOVEMBER 2013**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR C L STRANGE (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors Mrs V C Ayling (Vice-Chairman), A M Austin, C J T H Brewis, T Bridges, R G Fairman, J R Marriott, C Pain and R A Renshaw.

District Councillors I Carrington (North Kesteven), I G Fleetwood (West Lindsey), D Jackson (Lincoln), R F Leggott (Boston), Mrs F M Martin MBE (East Lindsey) and M D Seymour (South Holland).

External Agencies – A Barron (Environment Agency), D Sisson (Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board), A McGill (Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board), J Glerum (Anglian Water) and R Caudwell (Anglian North Regional Flood and Coastal Committee).

Also in attendance - Councillors C J Davie, Mrs A E Reynolds, A H Turner MBE, JP, D C Hoyes MBE, C E D Mair, P A Robinson and S L W Palmer attended the meeting as observers.

Officers in attendance:-

Steve Blagg (Democratic Services Officer), Andy Gutherson (Head of Planning), David Hickman (Environmental Services Team Leader (Strategy and Partnership), Liz Jones (Scrutiny Officer), Sean Kent (Head of Environmental Services), David Powell (Head of Emergency Planning), Mark Welsh (Floods, Water and Major Developments Manager) and Matthew Waller (Senior Auditor)

20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors M Brookes, J P Churchill and N M Murray, District Councillor B Russell (South Kesteven District Council) and S Markillie (South Holland Drainage Board).

District Councillor I Carrington (North Kesteven District Council) deputised for District Councillor J F Money, for this meeting only.

21 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were no declarations at this stage of the meeting.

22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2013

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 5 September be approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

23 EAST COAST FLOOD GROUP AND EUROPEAN UNION EXCHANGE OF EXPERTS

David Powell presented a report on progress of work of the East Coast Flood Group and the EU Exchange of Experts (Coastal Flooding) Programme which brought together various agencies to plan for a major flood. He stated that it was important to develop local resilience in communities and this was supported by encouraging communities to register to receive communications on action to be taken in the event of a major flood. He sought the support of the Committee to encourage communities to be registered to receive communications about flooding.

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. Did the military charge for their services?
2. The effect on infrastructure of power cuts.
3. What help could Internal Drainage Boards provide in the event of an emergency?
4. The availability of high speed pumps in the event of an emergency?
5. Different levels of erosion on the east coast.
6. The effects of salt water on agricultural land.
7. The need to maintain waterways and equipment.
8. The population was smaller and the military bigger during the 1953 floods.
9. Advice from the Meteorological Office had improved advice since 1953.
10. Work was on-going amongst agencies and the Local Economic Partnership on the strategic importance of Lincolnshire's agriculture industry to the national economy and the need to make a case to the Treasury on its national benefits.
11. The process of depositing sand on the beach for sea defence purposes was welcomed and was good for tourism.
12. The need to communicate with communities about the effects of flooding was welcomed.
13. Had the use of sirens to warn people about flooding been abandoned?
14. All elected Members had a role to play to inform residents about the threat of flooding.
15. There was a need to make the east coast a safe place for investment.
16. Did residents receive a leaflet about the potential for flooding?

Officers responded to the comments made by the Committee:-

1. The cost of the use of military resources was met by central government.
2. Internal Drainage Boards were very important for managing flood defences.
3. The use of water pumps to prevent damage was critical. Work was on-going in connection with their use.
4. Community resilience was an issue as agencies would be overwhelmed if there was a major incident. This area would be examined.

FLOOD AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 NOVEMBER 2013

5. Consultations were taking place with the utilities about the protection of infrastructure.
6. The need to get contaminated agricultural land back into production was important and work was on-going with the University of Lincoln in connection with this area.
7. The effects of beach restoration would be examined at a future meeting.
8. The population had increased and military resources had reduced since the 1953 floods and now there were large numbers of caravans, with many occupied all year.
9. Any help of elected Members to assist with communication on flood issues with residents was welcomed.
10. Sirens to warn residents were no longer used.
11. Agencies had no power to force residents to evacuate their property.

The Chairman thanked the Committee for its comments to this important activity and stated that the issues raised in connection with beach restoration and windblown sand on local communities would be considered at a future meeting..

RESOLVED

- (a) That the report and comments made by the Committee be considered by the East Coast Flood Group.
- (b) That the effects of beach restoration and windblown sand on local communities be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

**24 MONITORING PERFORMANCE UNDER THE JOINT LINCOLNSHIRE
FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

David Hickman presented a report on the development of the draft performance framework for the Joint Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Drainage Management Framework.

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. The priorities listed were appropriate.
2. Acronyms needed to be explained.
3. The objectives were logical.
4. How could the public access and be signposted to documents in connection with flooding?
5. There was no reference to the utilities.
6. The effects of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems needed explanation.

Officers responded:-

1. Acronyms would be explained.
2. The County Council's website would be used to provide information to the public. The agenda and reports of this Committee and information about flood risk were available on the Council's website.
3. The protection of utilities had been included in the statutory plans and the Resilience Forum was also examining the matter.

4

**FLOOD AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 NOVEMBER 2013**

4. Utilities were subject to a separate monitoring and accountability framework, but their contribution to joint projects would be covered as the common works programme was developed and progressed.

5. SUDs were explained. However, there was a lot of work to be done especially in connection with the recovery of charges.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted and comments made by the Committee be considered in the preparation of the performance framework.

25 LOUTH AND HORNCASTLE FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEMES

Andrew Barron presented a report on progress on the implementation of the flood alleviation schemes for Louth and Horncastle.

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. Partnership working and financial support for the schemes was welcomed.
2. Design and build was welcomed.
3. The need to use local contractors.
4. The use of cost benefit analysis.
5. The Internal Drainage Boards supported the Environment Agency in delivery of the Louth and Horncastle schemes. They also understood the impact of using the Internal Drainage Boards' precept for the schemes might have on the maintenance of water courses in their areas.
6. The importance of partnership working to ensure sustainable growth.

Officers explained that cost benefit analysis of capital schemes used by the Treasury was rigorous and that the use of local contractors as part of the larger national contract for the schemes was being investigated.

RESOLVED

That the report and comments made by the Committee be noted.

26 THE FLOOD AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
WORK PROGRAMME

Liz Jones presented the Committee's Work Programme. She stated that it might be necessary for the next meeting to go on into the afternoon due to the amount of business to be considered.

Following an enquiry by the Committee, Mark Welsh stated that a Section 19 report would appear as standing item on the agenda for future meetings of the Committee. Surface Water Flood Risk maps would be considered at the next meeting.

RESOLVED

- (a) That the Work Programme be noted and updated accordingly.
- (b) That future meetings of the Committee be arranged as follows:-

30 January 2014
1 May 2014
18 September 2014
4 December 2014

(at 10am)

27 LIZ JONES, SCRUTINY OFFICER - LEAVING

The Chairman stated that this was Liz Jones's last meeting before taking up a new post in the Council.

RESOLVED

That the Committee place on record its appreciation for the work undertaken by Liz Jones and to wish her well in her new post.

28 SITE VISIT TO FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEMES

In the afternoon the Committee visited various flood alleviation schemes in Louth, the lowland marsh area between Louth and the east coast, Mablethorpe and Trustthorpe.

The meeting closed at 12.00 pm