

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT
 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
 26 FEBRUARY 2018**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR D MCNALLY (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors P A Skinner (Vice-Chairman), W J Aron, T R Ashton, Mrs A M Austin, Mrs W Bowkett, B M Dobson, Mrs C J Lawton, C R Oxby, C E Reid and R A Renshaw.

District Councillors R Austin (Boston Borough Council), Mrs F M Martin MBE (East Lindsey District Council), P Vaughan (City of Lincoln Council), I Carrington (North Kesteven District Council) and I G Fleetwood (West Lindsey District Council).

Officers in attendance:-

Paul Brookes (County Flood Risk Manager), John Cook (Acting Assistant Chief Fire Officer), Katrina Cope (Senior Democratic Services Officer), David Hickman (Growth & Environment Commissioner), Warren Peppard (Flood Risk & Development Manager), Mark Robinson (Senior Coastal Adviser, Environment Agency, Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire area) Claire Rose (Team Leader, Environment Agency), Michelle Scott (Flood Resilience Officer, Environment Agency) and Daniel Steel (Scrutiny Officer).

17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

No apologies for absence were received.

18 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were no declarations of Members' interests made at this point in the proceedings.

19 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FLOOD AND WATER
 MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 23 OCTOBER 2017

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Flood and Drainage Management Scrutiny Committee held on 23 October 2017, be agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the fourth bullet point from the bottom of page 9 having the word '*East*' inserting to read 'South East Lincolnshire Local Plan'.

20 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COUNCILLOR
 FOR ECONOMY AND PLACE AND THE COUNTY COMMISSIONER FOR
 ECONOMY AND PLACE

No announcements were received.

21 LINCOLNSHIRE PARTNERSHIP RESPONSE TO LOCALISED FLOODING

The Committee received a joint presentation from Paul Brookes, Flood Risk Manager and John Cook, Assistant Chief Fire Officer, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, which provided information on the emergency response arrangements for localised flooding.

The presentation advised the Committee that the County Council was a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and as such was responsible for localised flooding where a localised response was required. The response would be made in partnership with Lincolnshire County Council Highways, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, District Councils, Water Companies, Internal Drainage Board and the Environment Agency.

It was highlighted that Fire and Rescue were the County Council's emergency service, who were being increasingly called upon to protect lives, communities and property from dangers other than fire. It was highlighted further that as LLFA the Council wanted to support Fire and Rescue and one the way to enhance the service's capability was to increase pumping capacity.

The Committee was advised that two pumps (located on appropriate trailers) and vehicles had been delivered to Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue in November 2017. Pictures of the said pumps and vehicles had been circulated as part of the agenda for the Committee to view.

During discussion, the Committee raised the following points:-

- Security of pumps – The Committee was advised that the trailers did not have a tracker fitted; however, the trailers did have lockable hitches to prevent them being towed away. Officers agreed to look into the option of a tracker;
- Location of the Pumps – Officers advised that the pumps were based at Gainsborough and Wragby. The two locations had been selected as they were secure locations;
- One member highlighted that when the pumps were deployed some consideration needed to be taken concerning the pumps security. The Committee was advised that when the pumps were deployed they would normally be in a local area within a local community;
- One member of the Committee suggested that a proposal should be made to the Executive Councillor for Economy and Place for the two water pumps to be added to the National Register of Assets. Reassurance was given by officers that if this suggestion was put forward the equipment would only be put forward for use in other areas, if Lincolnshire felt it was safe to do so.

RESOLVED

1. That the presentation concerning Lincolnshire's Partnership to Localised Flooding be received.

FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
26 FEBRUARY 2018

2. That the Executive Councillor for Economy and Place be requested to make arrangement for the two water pumps to be added to the National Register of Assets.

22 ANGLIAN WATER DRAFT WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Committee received a short update from David Hickman, Growth and Environment Commissioner, which advised that the Anglian Water Draft Water Resources Management Plan was expected to be out for consultation from 9 March 2018; and therefore it was more appropriate for the Committee to consider this item at the 29 May 2018 meeting.

RESOLVED

That the update be received.

23 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY UPDATE

The Committee gave consideration to a report from the Environment Agency, which provided the Committee with an update on Environment activities, which included progress on capital schemes.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mark Robinson, Senior Advisor, Environment Agency, Michelle Scott, Flood Resilience Officer, Environment Agency and Claire Rose, Team Leader, Environment Agency.

Officers from the Environment Agency guided the Committee through the report presented and responded to questions raised, which included:-

- Wainfleet Relief Channel – Concern was expressed that work still needed to be completed in order for the fishing to commence. Environment Agency Officers agreed to look into this matter;
- Boston Haven Banks – One member felt that in the first sentence of paragraph 1.2 the word 'centre' needed removing. Officers were happy to remove the word;
- Black Sluice Pumping Station – One member enquired as to what would happen if the Black Sluice IDB were unable to come up with the funding for the new electric pumps. Officers confirmed that the Environment Agency had agreed to continue to maintain the pumping station until June 2018. Some members advised that the importance of agricultural land could not be underestimated. It was highlighted that the IDB was currently trying to secure funding for the pumping station, from the Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Local Levy. The Committee was advised that this was a pot of money held by the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee. It was felt that some lobbying needed to be made to MPs to look into DEFRA funding rules;
- Rationalising the Main River Network Project – Officers confirmed that this was dependent on the outcome of the consultation; and that the Environment

FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 26 FEBRUARY 2018

Agency and Black Sluice IDB were in discussion regarding future maintenance requirements;

Councillor R Austin (Boston Borough Council) wished it to be noted that he was a member of the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board.

- The application of Special Levies issued on District Councils;
- The percentage of disputed claims arising from the Horncastle Improvements. Officers advised that this was an improving picture. It was highlighted that compensation had started to be paid to landowners who had agreed to flood easements, and that other landowners would be compensated in a different manner. The member from East Lindsey advised the Committee that the last update from the Project Board was that all claims were virtually complete except for one who was not engaging; and
- Lincoln Defences – It was noted that work to develop the business case was ongoing, with support from the new Programme Delivery Unit. One member highlighted that the project needed around a further £1.36m; and that to influence others with regard to this scheme, further information needed to be included in the report.

RESOLVED

1. That a representative from the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board be invited to attend the next meeting to provide the Committee with an update relating to the Black Sluice Pumping Station.
2. That for future reports, where a shortfall in funding had been identified, more detailed information should be provided in the report to assist in local lobbying.
3. That local MPs be requested to lobby concerning the Environment Agency criteria relating to assessing the value of land for flood protection.

24 SALTFLEET TO GIBRALTAR POINT STRATEGY REVIEW CONSULTATION

The Committee received a joint presentation from Mark Robinson, Senior Advisor, Environment Agency, Michelle Scott, Flood Resilience Officer, Environment Agency and Claire Rose, Team Leader, Environment Agency concerning the Saltfleet to Gibraltar Point Strategy.

It was reported that the Lincshire project had started in 1994 and had provided flood risk management to homes and businesses in the area since then. The Environment Agency was now reviewing the coastal strategy to cover a larger area between Saltfleet and Gibraltar Point. The public consultation regarding the strategy had commenced on 5 February 2018 and was due to close on 22 March 2018.

It was highlighted that the sea defences between Saltfleet and Gibraltar Point helped to manage the risk of coastal flood to around 20,000 residential homes; 1,700

businesses; 24,500 static caravans; 35,000 hectares of farmland and a bustling tourist industry.

In 1991 the county's first coastal management plan was approved with a sand re-nourishment programme launched in 1994, known as Lincshore. And as a result the beaches had been annually maintained at a healthy level. It was highlighted that Lincshore was reviewed every five years to ensure that it remained a cost-effective and sustainable way of managing coast flood risk in the area.

The Committee was advised that the latest climate change guidance indicated that the present management approach might not be sufficient in the future to reduce coastal flood risk effectively. As a result it was predicted that beach levels would need to be higher, which would involve the need for more sand. It was highlighted that a large area of land behind the defenced was at or below mean sea level; and that major investments had continued to improve sea defences between Mablethorpe and Skegness.

Because of the need to maintain higher beach levels, the Environment Agency was exploring beach nourishment alongside a range of viable alternative options/approaches to ensure that a sustainable and affordable long-term flood risk management solution was maintained along the Lincolnshire coast line.

The Committee was asked to review the six shortlisted strategy options, by completing a copy of the Public Consultation Questionnaire on Strategy Options. The six options are detailed below; and the comments raised were as follows:-

Option 1 Sand on the beach

The Committee was advised that this was what was done currently between Mablethorpe and Skegness to help manage coastal flood risk. It was reported that sand was taken from licensed sites, to replace sand lost through natural erosion and storms. It was highlighted that there were costs attached to this and work was ongoing to try and drive the cost down. One member enquired as to how much the sand costed. The Committee was advised that dependent on variance of sea levels, the cost could be up to £7m a year. The Committee was advised that the sand was obtained from licensed sites owned by a dredging company. Due to increased costs of sand, a suggestion was made as to whether sand should be sourced outside of the 12 mile limit (Crown Estate). Officers advised that the Environment Agency was unable to lobby its sponsor DEFRA. The Committee further suggested that local MP's should be approached to lobby the mechanism for obtaining sand.

Option 2 - Coarser sand, shingle or pebbles

The Committee was advised that at the moment a fine grade of sand was put onto the beaches. This sand offered good protection, but the only disadvantage was that fine sand was easily moved around by wind or wave action. In moving to coarser sand some of the following issues would need to be taken into consideration, such as the beach profile; the cost could be higher if the material was located further away and to the fact that a donor site would have to be sourced, however, it might not need to be replenished as often as it would be less likely to move. It was highlighted that

from an ecological perspective which ever choice was made all would have an impact.

Option 3 - Rock groynes plus sand on the beach

The Senior Advisor Environment Agency advised that rock groynes helped keep sand on the beach by limiting the movement of sand. The Committee was advised that a rock groyne was a line of large rocks stacked on top of each other that generally stretched from the seawall to the shoreline. It was noted that the angle heading out to sea and the spacing between the structures varied depending on the location. It was noted that the initial costs were much higher, but over a ten year period would be cheaper in the long run. Less sand would be required; but natural movement of sand along the coast would change. It was noted further that there was opportunities for additional funding with the formation of marinas and lookout points. One member highlighted a potential health and safety issue with the size and height of the rocks.

Option 4 - Rock groynes and fishtails plus sand on the beach

This option involved the combination of rock groynes and fishtails. The Committee was advised that fishtails were large structures which were used to segment a section of coast, to form large crescent bays along the coastline. It was highlighted that they were very efficient in reducing sand movement and coastal erosion. Again less sand would be required; there would however be a change of landscape/seascape especially with larger fishtails; and the natural movement along the coast would change. It was highlighted that some structures were adapted to make walk ways

Option 5 - Rock groynes, fishtails with different volumes of sand

The Committee was advised that this option was a variance on Option 4 in that it still combined rock groynes, fishtails and sand. But this option provided for placing different volumes of sand to provide varied standards of protection depending on location and funding. Some of the considerations reported were that less sand would be required, and that a localised approach could mean better use of funding and that there were extra opportunities with additional funding for marinas and lookouts.

Option 6 - Rock groynes, fishtails with different frequencies of sand.

Again, this Option was a variance of Option 4 as it sill combined rock groynes, fishtails and sand. The only change would be that consideration would be given to placing sand on the beach at different frequencies/intervals, which would provide varied standards of protection depending on location and funding.

Some concern was raised with regard to the drop in protection in certain locations. Officer advised that major communities would be kept with standard protection. If less sand was used then steps would need to be taken regarding re-alignment. Some members express concern that it was difficult for a lay person to determine different density of sand and grade of gravel etc. A question was asked as to whether gravel would retain more water. Officers advised that gravel had more stability than sand; and was more likely to shift less. The Committee was advised that frequencies were currently annually, but could change to say every 2/4 years; in

FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
26 FEBRUARY 2018

doing this there was an acceptance of the natural movement of sand along the coast and as a result the coast line might change.

Note: Councillor T Ashton wished it to be noted that he was the Portfolio Member Holder for Planning at East Lindsey District Council.

The Flood Resilience Officer invited members of the Committee to encourage family and friends to complete the questionnaire on-line.

In conclusion, the Committee completed their questionnaire individually and agreed that the Executive Councillor for Economy and Place should lobby MP's concerning the cost of sand and the criteria for funding.

RESOLVED

That the Executive Councillor for Economy and Place be requested to contact local MP's regarding the provision of sand for beach nourishment.

25 TO REPORT PROGRESS ON THE INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN THE COUNTY UNDER SECTION 19 OF THE FLOOD & WATER MANAGEMENT ACT 2010 (FWMA)

Consideration was given to a report from Paul Brookes, County Flood Risk Manager, which invited the Committee to consider and comment on the investigations undertaken in the County under Section 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA).

It was reported that in Quarter 3 (October to December 2017), only one new Section 19 investigation had commenced, which affected a single commercial property in Spalding. It was also highlighted that for the same period in 2016, no flood events had been reported. It was noted that the incident in Spalding had occurred just after Christmas, when there had been a period of persistent rain over a few days.

Appendix A to the report presented provided the Committee with a record of current flood investigations in the County, that were being carried out in accordance with Section 19 of the FWMA 2010.

During consideration of Appendix A, the Committee made reference to the following:-

The cleaning of gullies – due to the problems caused by private cars parking over gullies on the cleansing programme, a suggestion was made for a period of notice to be given to residents/district council's that gully cleaning was planned.

RESOLVED

That progress made on investigations undertaken within the County under Section 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 be noted.

26 FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
26 FEBRUARY 2018**

PROGRAMME

The Committee gave consideration to a report from Daniel Steel, Scrutiny Officer, which enabled the members to consider and comment on the content of its work programme for the coming year to ensure that scrutiny activity was focussed on areas of greatest benefit.

The Committee was advised that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on 29 May 2018.

Members of the Committee were invited to put forward items for inclusion in the work programme. One member requested that an item relating to the Black Sluice Pumping Station should be included on the 29 May 2018 agenda and that an invitation should be sent to the Chief Executive of the Black Sluice Drainage Board to attend the May Meeting.

Two further suggestions put forward for the Committee to discuss were: the Internal Drainage Board Levies and the impact on District Councils; and the Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps – Updated.

RESOLVED

That the Flood and Water Management Scrutiny Committee Work Programme, as presented, be agreed subject to the inclusion of the items mentioned above.

The meeting closed at 12.00 pm