

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT  
 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
 17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

Councillors P A Skinner (Vice-Chairman), W J Aron, T R Ashton, Mrs A M Austin, Mrs W Bowkett, B M Dobson, R A Renshaw and L Wootten.

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

External Agencies –

Councillors C J Davie, D McNally and David Sisson (Lindsey Marsh Internal Drainage Board), attended the meeting as observers.

Officers in attendance:-

Deborah Campbell (Environment Agency), Katrina Cope (Senior Democratic Services Officer), David Hickman (Growth & Environment Commissioner), Daniel Steel (Scrutiny Officer), Warren Peppard (Flood Risk & Development Manager), Matthew Harrison (Senior Commissioning Officer - Flood Risk, Environment Agency), Lucy Marshall (Humber Planning Specialist), Helen Todd (Environment Agency) and Steve Cox (Management Advisor, Environment Agency).

**36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS**

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors B Adams, Mrs C J Lawton, C R Oxby, C E Reid and B Russell (South Kesteven District Council).

It was noted that the Chief Executive, having received notice under Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Committee and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, had appointed Councillor L Wootten to replace Councillor B Adams for this meeting only.

**37 DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLORS INTERESTS**

Councillor P Vaughan (City of Lincoln Council) wished it to be noted that he was a member of a Drainage Board.

**38 MINUTES OF THE FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 29 MAY 2018**

RESOLVED

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

That the minutes of the Flood and Drainage Management Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 29 May 2018, be agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**39 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS  
AND LEAD OFFICERS**

The Chairman invited Executive Councillors and Lead Officers to provide the Committee with any announcements.

Councillor C J Davie, Executive Councillor for Economy and Place advised the Committee of the following:-

- The Environment Agency Board meeting was due to be held on 26 and 27 September 2018;
- That construction of the Boston barrier would help grow the coastal economy; and
- That the Flood & Coastal Risk Strategy was a key opportunity to have input into national priorities.

**40 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY UPDATE**

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

Particular reference was made to the recent incident at the Boston Barrier, which had seen seepage through the bank in the vicinity of the Boston Barrier works. The Committee was advised that the incident had occurred during piling works carried out to increase the strength and stability of the bank. It was noted that some of the work had been completed prior to the high tide, however, the clay material that had been removed from the bank had not been reinstated at that time, which had led to localised seepage. The Committee was advised further that the Environment Agency had been working with the Contractors to identify the lessons learnt from the incident.

Some members who had attended the scene expressed their concerns relating to the matter, and particular reference was made to the attitude of the contractors who had been unaware of the high tide; and to the lack of Environment Agency personnel available on site to reassure residents. Local members felt that the whole incident had been 'played down and dismissed as being one of things that could happen'.

The Committee was advised flood alerts had not been issued, as a tidal surge or abnormal tides had not been predicted. It was highlighted that local residents had been 'terrified' by the incident, particularly those living in close proximity, as they had been scared that the bank was going to collapse.

One of the local members highlighted the following points:-

- The need for better communication between all parties;

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

- A question was asked as to whether residents who had goods damaged by the water would receive compensation from the contractors;
- A request was made for every household along the section of Wyberton Low Road to be visited to give them an opportunity to raise their concerns;
- Concern was expressed that most of the properties under the cover of the bank were rented and occupied by residents with a poor knowledge of the English language. A request was made for an interpreter to accompany those making the above requested visits;
- A request was also made for the operators on the Floodline number to be made fully aware of the correct procedure in such circumstances.

The Environment Agency reassured the Committee that the risks had been low; and that the structural integrity of the bank had not been compromised. Confirmation was given that in this instance, the reason for the seepage had been because the clay had not been reinstated. It was confirmed that lessons had been learnt; and that actions had already been put in to place to prevent them happening again.

Other points raised by the Committee in relation to the report were as follows:-

- The need to consider and include Economic Development and Resilience in future projects; some members welcomed an update from the Environment Agency Board. The Committee was advised that issues were known to the Environment Agency, particular issues quoted included all year round occupancy in caravans to help retain skilled workers. It was noted that the Environment Agency would have to assess the level of risk; spatial planning; development along the coast; and restrictions on properties in flood risk areas; and
- Horncastle and Louth Improvements – One member enquired as to whether the project had come in on budget and whether issues with the landowners had been resolved. The Committee was advised that both improvement projects had come in well within budget. Confirmation was given that there was no rebate. It was reported there was still one outstanding land remediation issue at Louth.

#### RESOLVED

That the Environment Agency update be received.

#### 41 SALTFLEET TO GIBRALTAR POINT STRATEGY UPDATE

The Committee received a short presentation from Steven Coe, Flood and Coastal Risk Management Advisor, which provided the Committee with an overview of the Flood & Coastal Risk Management Funding and Benefit Apportionment.

The Committee was advised that every project or strategy needed to identify the sources of funding as part of its business case. And that the amount of GiA funding related to the benefits the project would bring. It was noted that the GiA was calculated through the use of the partnership funding calculator, which considered: homes better protected; homes in deprived areas; economic benefits; and wildlife

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

benefits. It was highlighted that houses protected was very important, as the payment rates were higher than for economic benefits.

It was reported that some houses were at risk from more than one source of flooding for example tidal, fluvial and surface water. It was noted that houses and benefits could not be double counted between separate projects to address these risks; and that the Environment Agency (EA) worked closely with other management authorities to accommodate their investment needs. It was noted further that to address the double counting issue, there were options available for example benefits apportionment.

The Committee was advised that any approach to apportioning benefits of Flood Coastal Risk Management Projects the EA worked very closely with all the Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) involved to understand the flood risk in their area; their objectives for managing; and their future programme of works. Where it was not possible to readily separate areas affected by different sources of responsibilities for flood risk, separate economic assessments could be carried out. This would be done with the benefits and outcomes of proposed works being apportioned to the different sources or Risk Management Authorities using the ratio of annual average avoided damage from one source, to the rest. It was noted that this approach was useful in areas of widespread multi-source flooding.

An example of the Environment Agency's approach was provided at the meeting, which split the sources of flooding into coastal and rainfall.

In conclusion, the Committee was advised that next steps included further development of the Benefits Apportionment Plan; sign-off from each of the Risk Management Authorities; submission alongside the strategy in early 2019 for approval.

The Committee was advised further that the advantages of taking a strategic approach were that there was agreement with all the RMAs; the assessment of risk was apportioned to ensure fairness; double counting was avoided; the RMAs had clarity when developing projects; and that high level testing had shown that the proposed apportionment was compatible with RMA projects.

During a short discussion reference was made for the need to include the importance of arable land. Confirmation was given that this was built in to the economic set of criteria for Lincolnshire. It was highlighted that the scrutiny committee had already written to the government regarding partnership funding arrangements. It was noted that criteria was being reviewed and that previously weighting had been given to land, which was now given to people and property. The Committee was advised that the rules of apportionment were Treasury Rules and not Environment Agency rules.

**RESOLVED**

That the presentation concerning the Flood & Coastal Risk Management Funding and Benefits Apportionment be received.

**42     REVIEWING THE JOINT LINCOLNSHIRE FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

The Committee received a short presentation from David Hickman, Growth and Environment Commissioner, which summarised the progress being made with the development of the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Strategy.

It was highlighted that the enablers for this to happen included: government legislation and support; partnership within the flood and water management family, finance, infrastructure, developers etc; access to finance and clarity of roles; better provision and use of evidence, innovation, technology science and data; behaviour and societal changes.

Reference was made to the guiding principles involved in working together to manage flooding and coastal change; and to the timelines for the development of the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy. It was expected that the final version of the Strategy would be laid before Parliament in November 2019.

Matthew Harrison, Senior Commissioning Officer Flood Risk provided the Committee with an update on the review of the Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Water Management Strategy.

The presentation made reference to:

- The Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Water Management Partnership, which comprised of the Lincolnshire County Council; Environment Agency; 14 Internal Drainage Boards; seven District Councils; two Water Companies; the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee and Emergency Planning and Response;
- The role of all the partners;
- The Joint Partnership Strategy and Action Plan;
- Capital Works, reference was made to Stamp End in 2007; Partnership working to deliver the Horncastle and Louth Flood Alleviation Schemes;
- Capital Investment Programme 2015 to 2021;
- Better co-ordinated use of resources;
- The Opportunity of the GLLEP;
- Water Management Plan;
- The development of a strategic approach; and
- Moving forward to achieve benefits locally to provide an area resilient to flood risk and water issues with a long term strategic vision – with local benefits.

During a short discussion, the Committee members raised the following issues:-

- Members welcomed the more strategic approach to economic development and the need for its integration in to the strategy;
- The importance of Internal Drainage Boards and District Councils in the Partnership;

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

- The need for more detailed feedback regarding the risk of flooding in to Development Control Planning Committees. Officers advised that in 2012 a multi-agency framework had been developed, (which was still in operation) which provided the planning authorities with an opportunity to assemble a group of all relevant risk management authorities to consider flood risk as a result of major developments.

The Chairman on behalf of the Committee extended his thanks to both presentations.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the presentation concerning the Development of the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy be noted.
2. That the presentation relating to the review of the Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Water Management Strategy be noted.

**43 HUMBER STRATEGY COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

The Committee received a joint presentation from Helen Todd and Lucy Marshall from the Environment Agency, which provided an update on the current status of the Humber Strategy Comprehensive Review.

The Committee was advised that the purpose of the comprehensive review was to redefine the strategic approach to managing tidal flood risk in the Humber over the next 100 years; and to achieve collective agreement from 12 local authority partners and the Humber Local Enterprise Partnership.

It was reported that it was hoped that the Strategy would be finalised in early 2021.

The presentation made reference to the start-up and objectives; the long list of options; the short list to preferred option; the strategy and the implementation. The Committee was advised that a draft set of strategic approaches had been presented to the Officer Group in July. From this, there had been agreement for an overall pathway approach; and to three strategic approaches in principle. It was noted that further work was to be done on the definitions and wording for each strategic approach. Agreement would then be sought to the strategic approaches which would be considered further by all 12 local authorities.

The Committee was advised that the Living with the Tide – proposed strategic approaches were: containing the tide; keeping out the tide; and accommodating the tide.

The next steps highlighted to the Committee were that there would have to be agreement to the strategic approach; and that social, economic, technical, environmental appraisals would be informed by local needs and priorities; that the preferred approach would be identified in the Autumn of 2019. The Committee noted that funding and investment would be developed around the preferred approach; the

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

engagement would be extended; and that schemes would continue to be delivered within the six year programme.

Questions raised by members of the Committee included the use of tidal energy (Which was one of the long list of options) and the option of a barrage in the outer estuary. Officers confirmed that they had been looking at the Thames Barrier and other barriers in Europe. It was highlighted that cost had not been used as a limiter; and to the fact that cost might not allow this option to happen in the future.

The Chairman extended thanks on behalf of the Committee to the two presenters.

**RESOLVED**

That the presentation relating to the Humber Strategy Comprehensive Review be received.

**44     TO REPORT PROGRESS ON THE INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN THE COUNTY UNDER SECTION 19 OF THE FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT ACT 2010**

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.

Warren Peppard, Flood Risk and Development Manager advised the Committee that during the period 1 April 2018 to 31 August 2018 there had been three flood investigations in April; five investigations affecting 11 properties in June due to isolated showers; three investigations affecting eight properties in July; and a further six investigations in to the flooding of eight residences in August. In total there were 17 investigations during the period, affecting 31 properties and the highways network. It was noted that all the investigations were in connection with surface water.

Officers agreed to respond after the meeting to queries raised by two members of the Committee.

Appendix A to the report provided the Committee with a record of current investigations in the County that were being carried out in accordance with Section 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

**RESOLVED**

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

**45     FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

**FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
17 SEPTEMBER 2018**

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, to ensure that scrutiny activity was focussed on areas of greatest benefit.

Pages 58 and 59 of the report provided the Committee with a copy of the work programme for the Flood and Water Management Scrutiny Committee up to 28 May 2019.

During a short discussion, members of the Committee put forward the following items for consideration on a future agenda:-

- Leakage Programme – Anglian Water.
- Water Resources East Project – Update

Some members of the Committee felt that a letter should be sent to Anglian Water inviting them to attend the next meeting; as their presence at meetings was valued.

**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 12.17 pm