Wyre Flood Forum
15 September 2016
Wyre Civic Centre, 1pm

Agenda

1. Introduction.
2. Apologies.
3. Minutes of previous meeting.
5. Flooding December 2015 update.
6. What’s going on in the Region.
   a) United Utilities.
   b) Environment Agency.
   c) Wyre Borough Council.
   d) Lancashire County Council.
   e) Natural England.
   - Updates.
   - Churchtown
   - Cleveleys.
   - Hambleton.
   - St Michaels
   - Preesall.
   - Stalmine.
   - Thornton Action Group (TAG).
10. Any Other Business
11. Operation of Garstang and Catterall Flood Basins
    - Presentation by Paul Bond (Environment Agency)
12. Proposed date of Next Meeting –
    1pm, Thursday 8 December 2016.
Wyre Flood Forum

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 15 September 2016 at the Civic Centre, Poulton

Attendance

**Present:**
- Carl Green (CG) - Wyre Council (Chairman)
- Cllr Roger Berry (RB) - Wyre Councillor (Hardhorn with Highcross Ward)
- Cllr Philip Orme (PO) - Wyre Councillor (Preesall Ward)
- Cllr Lynn Walmsley (LW) - Wyre Councillor (Marsh Mill Ward)
- Cllr Lady Dulcie Atkins (DA) - Wyre Councillor (Garstang Ward)
- Cllr Alice Collinson (AC) - Wyre Councillor (Garstang Ward)
- Cllr Sue Pimbley (SP) - Wyre Councillor (Great Eccleston Ward)
- David Thow (DT) - Wyre Councillor (WC)
- Paul Long (PL) - Wyre Council
- John Blundell (JB) - Wyre Council
- Andrew Robinson - Wyre Council
- Diane Taylor (DT) - Lancashire County Council (LCC)
- Elizabeth Lowe (EL) - Lancashire County Council
- Graham Wilcock (GW) - Lancashire County Council
- Joe Gilmour (JG) - Garstang Town Council
- Ray Hesketh - Garstang Town Council
- Diane Andrews - Out Rawcliffe Parish Council
- Neil Cookson - Pilling Parish Council
- Tom Reilly - Preesall Town Council
- Paul Bond (PB) - Environment Agency (EA)
- Pippa Hodgkins (PH) - Environment Agency
- Louise Maxwell - Environment Agency
- Julia Mulloy - Environment Agency
- Kev Williams (KW) - United Utilities (UU)
- Dan Blacow (DB) - United Utilities
- Iain Johnstone (IJ) - Fleetwood Civic Society
- Irene Homer (IH) - Thornton Action Group (TAG)
- Phil Jenkins (PJ) - TAG
- Peter Gore (PG) - TAG
- Eddie Waring - TAG
- Roger Weatherall (RW) - Churchtown Flood Defence Group (FDG)
- Robert Hogg (RH) - Churchtown FDG
- Siriol Hogg (SH) - Churchtown FDG
- Pamela Nickols (PN) - St.Michaels Flood Action Group (FLAG)
- John Nickols (JN) - St.Michaels FLAG
- Brian Laverty (BL) - Garstang
- Daniel Fowler - Garstang
- Yvonne Kirkby (YK) - Hambleton
- Paul Flintoff (PF) - Tarnacree
- Andrew Hull - Winmarleigh
- Adam Sutcliffe (AS) - Winmarleigh
Apologies:
Cllr Tom Balmain
Sandra Perkins
Roy Peaker
Roy Bassnett
Rob Mackie
Nicola Beale
June Jackson
Mike Tucker
Edward Greenwood
Richard Rhodes

Wyre Councillor (Garstang Ward)
Garstang Town Council
Hambleton Parish Council
Myerscough and Bilsborrow Parish Council
Environment Agency
Stalmine Parish Council
Stalmine
Fleetwood
Natural England
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th><strong>Introduction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>CG welcomed everyone to the meeting and everyone introduced themselves to the Forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th><strong>Apologies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Apologies were received as noted on Attendance Sheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th><strong>Minutes of previous meeting, 26 May 2016 – Matters</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>CG went through the Minutes from the previous meeting; matters arising included;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1.1 | Page 5; item 4.1 – Dog signs on Fleetwood Beach.  
IJ wished to clarify that he is looking for the Council to erect signs which indicate where on Fleetwood beach/promenade it is permitted to walk dogs. He considered that this gave a more positive image rather than showing where dogs are banned.  
CG confirmed that new signs are to be introduced along the full length of the sea defences and these would include details where dogs may be exercised. He offered to forward details of the proposed signs to IJ once these have been finalised. |
| 3.1.2 | Page 7; item 6.6 – Broadwater Pumping Station  
IJ asked what works had been done on the pumping station to remove the misconnections. CG referred him to the UU Pre-Meeting Reports which detailed the works (see item 6.1) |
| 3.1.3 | Page 6; item 6.2 – Flooding to Rawcliffe Road, St.Michaels  
JN noted that residents on Rawcliffe Road dispute that flooding outside their properties is due to the brook adjacent to Doverstones; they consider that the pumped foul sewer from Great Eccleston is a contributory factor in the flooding. |
| 3.1.4 | Page 7; item 6.5 – Flooding to Rawcliffe Road, St.Michaels  
KW confirmed that he had met with residents and DB, PL and PH on site to look at the problem and potential resolution. It is considered that the flooding problem is related to the highway drainage and the watercourse to the side of Doverstones. He added that modelling works of the drainage system showed that the UU system was capable of dealing with drainage flows as designed and that flooding was not attributable to the drainage system. Further investigation works may be needed to determine a resolution.  
PN asked what was being done to stop surface water entering the local sewers; could the combined system not be separated?  
DB explained that the combined system in St Michaels is an open system to allow rainwater from properties to enter and splitting the system would be a huge project involving changes to all properties in St Michaels. This would not be a practical solution. |
DB noted that influences outside of UU’s control were the main contributing factor to surcharging of the sewers ie overland flooding. He added that the solution would be to stop water entering the system at source by discharging surface water to local watercourses.

CG noted that the issue had been added to the Making Space for Water Group meeting as a “hot spot” area and would be discussed at that meeting.

SH noted that combined drainage systems are no longer used on new developments and that UU would not separate existing combined systems as the cost was too prohibitive.

DB said that UU needed to focus on genuine problem areas; sewers are currently taking surface water from areas that UU has no responsibility for.

SH noted that flooding victims did not care where the water comes from.

3.1.5 Page 9; item 6.12 – Branksome Ave’, Thornton
LW asked for an update on drainage works on Branksome Ave fields; she asked if the Chair could guarantee that, if necessary, the field would be pumped out again this winter. CG said that, if necessary, and subject to consent from UU to discharge via their surface water network, this work would be done.

PL informed the Forum that investigation works were continuing to find an alternative means of draining the site.

PG noted that water levels on the site were already 18” higher than the same time last year.

3.1.6 Page 11; item 7.4 – Garstang Flood Barrier
PH reported that she had not been made aware of any faults with the Garstang barrier.

3.1.6 Page 15; item 8.4d – Planning Applications
SP asked whether the EA were consulted on planning applications in Preston and Lancaster as these could have a significant influence on properties in the Wyre area.

CG noted that both the EA and LCC were statutory consultees on planning application in all three areas. He added that conditions were put on planning applications to prevent flooding of the site or neighbouring properties.

BL thought that if new developments were obliged to put in improved drainage facilities then flood defences would improve over time. CG agreed but noted that there is no requirement for any developer to provide betterment in respect of flooding issues, only that any development should not worsen existing flooding conditions
4. **Planning**

4.1 DT gave a brief summary of the planning process undertaken by Wyre Council.


There is a presumption in favour of development unless the harm arising from that development significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits. For certain types of harm, however (for example flood risk) the policy is that development should be restricted and permission can be refused.

The Local Authority can only assure that impact from any site is neutral – a developer cannot be required to improve or solve pre-existing problems.

No development should take place in Flood Zone 2 or 3 unless there is no alternative site available in a Zone of lower flood risk. For development in FZ2 or FZ3 the development must pass a Sequential Test which determines whether an alternative site is available in a lower flood zone. If the development passes the Sequential Test it must then go on to pass an Exception Test ie does the development provide sufficient benefit to be allowed.

Planning Officers have to balance all relevant issues when considering an application; highways, drainage etc must have regard to expert advice from consultees when making decisions. On flood risk issues they consult with EA, LCC, UU and Wyre Engineers. These consultees look at all drainage issues and any Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) of the proposed site to determine whether the site is at risk of flooding or causing a flooding issue elsewhere. The aim of any assessment is to ensure that the risk of flooding from surface water is no greater than for the undeveloped site; this may require the developer to provide on-site attenuation and/or to discharge from the site at a controlled rate. If a flooding issue cannot be overcome or controlled then the planning application can be refused.

The Council often receives applications seeking permission only for the principle of development (where no details of the actual development proposed are provided); if the principle of development is acceptable then surface water (or other issues) is dealt with by condition that full plans are presented later before development can start.

4.2 JN expressed concern that developers undertook development works and then left site; he added that there is a need for attenuation facilities to be maintained throughout the life of the development. DT replied that Wyre Council does have the resources to manage all conditions put onto a scheme. He added that where a potential breach is reported these are investigated.
| 4.3 | PN asked whether developers could be made to provide funds to undertake maintenance for the life of the development. EL replied that Government Policy had been to make the Lead Local Flooding Authority (in this case LCC) a SuDS Approval Body. The SAB would have to adopt and maintain any approved SuDS scheme. The scheme was dropped in September 2014. LCC now require that evidence is provided to prove that finance is available to maintain attenuation schemes. In addition, property deeds must show that maintenance responsibilities will reside with residents. |
| 4.4 | JN queried the statement that planners cannot force developers to undertake improvement works; section 106 agreements made with the developers could force them to improve highways. DT replied that such agreements could only be made to mitigate the development only. With regard to flooding developers are asked to prove that the development does not add surface water to an existing system thus making things worse. |
| 4.5 | BL noted that local concerned about flooding should raise their concerns with the local MPs. |
| 4.6 | PF noted that the development for mineral extraction at Sharples Quarry, St Michaels is having a detrimental effect on flooding to the A586 and asked that this be investigated. It was agreed this be considered by the Making Space for Water Group. |
| 4.7 | IJ noted that it was critical that the Planning Department communicated better with drainage engineers to ensure that any drainage issues were properly resolved before permission was granted. |
| 4.8 | RH raised concerns with the FRA that accompanied planning applications; he said that these were often written and assessed by persons with little or no local knowledge. Further, he was concerned that the FRA must only model rainfall for a six hour event. CG replied that the aim of the FRA was to ensure that any site would be mimicking greenfield run-off rates; the FRA asks for a scheme to meet a 1 in 100 year event that lasts for six hours without causing any flooding issues. Any difference in volumes beyond the six hours should be restricted to a discharge of 2 l/s/ha. PN added that it was ludicrous that the six hour rule was used. |
| 4.9 | DT noted that LCC were only consulted on major development schemes and that FRAs were not required for small developments (under 1 Ha) in Flood Zone 1. |

### 5. Fylde Peninsula Management Group

**5.1**  Last meeting held 20 July 2016 – Rea Psillidou (Planning) and Cllr Roger Berry represented Wyre.

**5.1.1 Action Plan**

- The Bathing Waters Action Plan has been redrafted and will be shared with Partners soon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.2 Progress Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No update from Turning Tides group – there is some discussion about Defra’s approach to the start and end of the bathing water season. There is some uncertainty how Brexit will affect bathing water legislation and Defra are awaiting advice from the new government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.3 Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • The Partnership will be supporting the campaigns #dayatthebeach and #binitforbeaches.  
  #dayatthebeach will focus around a specific date in August encouraging trips to the beach and beach activities.  
  #binitforbeaches is a social media campaign running from 26 July for one week and focus on cleaning beaches.  
  • Cllr Aitken (Fylde Council) mentioned a list in the Sunday Times of the best beaches which featured no North West beaches. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.4 Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Wyre Council’s Local Plan has been delayed due to issues with highways. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be completed in the next few weeks and it is recommended that all development sites avoid Pilling and St Michaels due to flood risk in those areas.  
  • Fylde Council will going out to consultation on their Publication in three weeks’ time. They plan to submit their Plan in December 2016. They also plan to update their SFRA. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.5 UU updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • UU reported that the Fats, Oils and Greases Trial which was recently started in Blackpool is going well. The Trial, which only includes domestic properties is looking to create a change in habits in disposal of fats, oils and grease.  
  • A planning application has been submitted for a new storm tank at Fishers Field in Blackpool. If approved work is expected to commence by the end of the year.  
  • The Anchorsholme tank has now been completed and is now operational. The replacement of the Anchorsholme pumping station is currently out to tender and construction is expected to commence in October.  
  • A report re the Broadway pumping station, Cleveleys has been sent to Wyre Council. Some surface water has been diverted to Fleetwood to prevent contamination.  
  • UU are working with the Rivers Trusts on getting farming interventions in the catchment to improve the bathing water quality. There are 20 farms signed up along the Ribble and 10 signed up along the Wyre to deliver interventions over the next 1-2 years. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.6 Coastal Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Work is being undertaken on the creation of coastal path around the whole of England. Work is underway on the section to Cleveleys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.7 Rossall Coast Protection Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rossall sea defence scheme is approximately two-thirds complete and remains ahead of programme and under budget. It is due for completion in summer 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The Anchorsholme Scheme is set to be completed in August 2016. Further works will need to be undertaken in 2017 to finish off after works by UU.
- The Fairhaven and Church Scar schemes have been approved by the EA; construction is planned for 2017.
- Funding for the Sand Dunes Project ends March 2017; the project team are currently drafting a bid for a continuation of funding for a further 5 years.

Next meeting Wednesday 21 September at Fylde Town Hall

### Flooding December 2015 update

6.1 This item was not covered specifically, but addressed through other items, including the What’s going on in the Region and FLAG updates.

### What’s going on in the Region.

#### United Utilities

**Update on Major Capital Schemes in the area:**

**7.1.1 Anchorsholme Park**
- The large storm storage tank (circa 12,400 cum) is now online (21st April 2016) along with the bringing into operation of further storage at Moor Park – circa 6,000cum
- New 3.7km outfall has been manufactured in Norway and will be installed an awarded contract (in Summer 2017)
- New pumping station to be constructed by April 2018, currently negotiating the tender. Award by End of November 2016,
- UU working in conjunction with Blackpool to ensure that the existing PS roof structure is able to support the final surfacing of the promenade on completion of the Anchorsholme Sea Defences

**7.1.2 Wyre/Ribble Rivers Tidal Trust Partnership**
- Work to identify and mitigate against other sources of pollution to the bathing waters (non UU assets). Installation of farming interventions to commence this month. We will be having regular progress meetings to drive completion of work on site over the next two years. March 2017 is the UU date for provision of the appropriate funding. However, the work (partially funded by other grants/match funding) will extend beyond this date.

**7.1.3 Broadway PS/Rossall Outfall**
- Report completed and shared with Wyre BC. The majority of known misconnections have been corrected. Information regarding the remaining 5 no. incomplete misconnections and 59 no. properties that we were unable to access has been passed to Wyre EHO. We will continue to liaise with Carl Green & Wyre EHO to progress further investigations into the incomplete/missing information.
- In the meantime, Broadway PS valve arrangement has been reverted back to its original design, so that more flow is directed towards the Fleetwood Dock outfall. This has the twin advantage of reducing the flow spilt via the Rossall Beach outfall (Cleveleys bathing waters) and increasing the potential for dilution of the forwarded flow discharging at Fleetwood Dock.
### 7.1.4 Blackpool South SW separation Scheme
- The Harrowside Outfall has been renewed and extended (completed last October 2015)
- New screens and storage at Lennox Gate PS. Contract with MMB to commence this work ahead of the completion date (April 2018)
- SW separation (SUDS storage, new PS and Rising Main) Contract with MMB to commence this work ahead of the completion date (April 2018)

### 7.1.5 Fleetwood WwTW
- Focus is on our ability to manage screens load around the first flush to help speed up the ability to get flows into the works after long dry spells. Targeting defining work and tender, award by February 2017 for year’s implementation.
- In recent weeks we have had to carry out emergency maintenance to remove a blockage at the inlet to the treatment works at Fleetwood, caused by a large collection non-flushable items, such as wet wipes, being flushed down the tunnel system and blocking our large inlet pumps. This resulted in some additional wastewater and storm water spilling into the sea during the very heavy rainfall on 20th August. Our Engineers and contractors worked around the clock so to resolve the problem we liaised closely with the Environment Agency throughout the incident. There was no increased impact on public health because the Environment Agency had already issued advice not to swim at local beaches due to the storm conditions and high tide.

### 7.1.6 Rossall Sea Defence
- Continuing to work with Balfours to protect our outfall pipelines during the Sea Defence project at Rossall

### 7.1.7 Modelling Works
- DB reported that UU have undertaken modelling of the sewer network in Churchtown and St Michaels following from the December floods. The modelling confirmed that the system is working as designed and not causing or contributing to the flooding suffered in these areas.

### 7.1.8 Survey works
- DB reported that investigation works had been undertaken in Hambleton, Pilling and Poulton Industrial Estate. These works had included CCTV surveys and desilting works to known areas of concern – no major issues had been reported.

### 7.1.9 PF asked what had become of the application to move the rising main around Sharples Quarry in St. Michaels. KW replied that UU had provided a cost to undertake the works but had not received a response for the applicant. The scheme is no longer going ahead.

### 7.2 Environment Agency

#### 7.2.1 Works following the Winter flooding
Embankments on Ainspool Watercourse, a tributary of the Wyre, which runs to the west of Churchtown and protects against flooding when this tributary becomes ‘tide-locked’ by high levels in the Wyre. Following the winter flooding visual inspections of the Ainspool embankment highlighted a slight settling of the crest level at one location and a wash out directly upstream of Ainspool bridge. These defects are being resolved as part of the asset recovery programme, delivered by our internal workforce.
These works will be completed by the end of September.

Locally, the Asset Performance team has carried out a technical Review of the Ainspool Embankment following many years of anecdotal reports of seepage. Following this review a geotechnical survey has been commissioned and will be carried out shortly to understand if further capital reconditioning works are required to this embankment. The engineer leading on this work has been liaising very closely with the affected residents on this piece of work. However, as far as we are aware, the August flooding at Churchtown was not caused by overtopping of the Ainspool Embankment.

Raised embankment on the right bank between Kirkland Bridge and the sewage treatment works. Asset inspections following the Winter storms did not identify any issues with this defence. In the recent event flooding at Churchtown from the Wyre was caused primarily by overtopping of a natural channel side upstream of Kirkland Bridge and overtopping of the channel side at the Sewage works site.

### 7.2.2 EA actions following the August event.

Looking to coppice back the trees in the vicinity of Kirkland Bridge as part of this year’s maintenance programme.

The Upper and Middle Wyre Capital Scheme Review, which is looking at our system of flood defence assets covering all the communities in the Upper and Middle Wyre, (including Churchtown and St. Michaels) was accelerated in the capital programme following the flooding over winter and brought forward to this financial year. It is assessing the standard of protection offered by the assets (raised embankments and the 2 flood storage basins) and understanding options for future capital investment to protect these communities into the future. This review is due for completion next year.

We are carrying out a review of the mechanical and electrical elements of Garstang and Catterall basins to ensure future operation, reviewing the reliability and resilience of the hydraulic components and are currently pricing refurbishment and replacement of the hydraulic cylinders at Garstang.

### 7.2.3 Community Group Work

The EA are keen to offer continued support to Wyre Community Groups across Wyre. This will be achieved via the following:-

- Regular updates on EA works via the Wyre Flood Forums
- Publication of the EA Annual Maintenance Programme on the Gov.uk website
- Clear communication channels set up between the EA and Flood Action Groups to ensure efficient use of EA resources / timely responses to the group
- Presentation on the operation of Garstang and Catterall Flood Basins planned for the September Wyre Flood Forum (15th September).
- A tour of the Garstang / Catterall flood basins, planned for the 19th October 2016
- Invite to see the Area Incident Room in Preston. This will be an opportunity to see the equipment and room used by the EA during a flood event. There will be opportunities for Q & A’s at all the above events.
### 7.2.4 Routine Maintenance

PH gave an update of maintenance works being undertaken by the EA;
- Works have been undertaken to repair damage to the banks of the Wyre and Brock after the December 2015 storms. The breach on the Brock at St. Michaels has been repaired and bank levels are now back to normal. Works on removing trees and repairing other leaks and slumps have been undertaken.
- Following the flooding of 22 August all assets in the areas affected were inspected on the following day. Over thirty locations were identified as in need of remedial works and parts of the Ainspool watercourse require topping up of the banks.
- A new grid has been fitted to the culvert on Royles Brook (Heys Street).
- New tidal flaps have been installed at Hambleton.
- General weed cutting of all main river watercourses has been undertaken.
- Repairs are in progress on the culvert on Broadfleet watercourse.

Works are planned for
- The trimming of trees overhanging the Wyre at Kirkland Bridge (to reduce any obstruction when the river is in flood).
- A review is in place of the Middle and Upper Wyre to identify any location that may be suitable for additional storage during a flooding event.
- A bid has placed for money to carry out conveyance works at Churchtown to look at improving flows.

### 7.3 Wyre Council

#### 7.3.1 Rossall Sea Defences

Rossall sea defence works continue to progress well; works have concentrated on the installation of precast concrete units on the upper revetment, wave wall and rear flood wall.

Works to date include:
- 245,000 tonnes of rock armour imported.
- 1740m of sheet steel piling installed (97% complete).
- 1200m of rock revetment and 12 rock groynes installed (using 147,000 tonnes or rock armour and 76,800 tonnes of smaller underlayer rock (65% complete).
- 6 sets of beach steps installed and foundations for additional 4 sets placed (40% complete).
- 15 groyne crossover ramps installed (83% complete).
- 66% of precast concrete revetment units installed.
- 25% of precast concrete wave wall and rear flood wall installed.

Over the next couple of months rear walls at the northern end of the scheme will be installed.

#### 7.3.2 Planning

Responses to questions raised to Wyre Borough Council Planning Department by St Michaels Flood Action Group.
1. Can you give us an overview to explain the roles and responsibilities of the planning department with regards to managing flood?

Flood risk is a material consideration as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). When determining applications, Local Planning Authorities should ensure any development is safe from flood risk and that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. The Planning Department consults the Environment Agency (EA) and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended) (DMPO). The planning department also consults the Council’s in-house drainage team on all new development proposals.

2. What information and data does the LPA use when making decisions regarding flood risk (both application site and downstream in catchment) related to planning?

Applications within designated flood zones 2 and 3 and major scale proposals must be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment. Applications must be accompanied by details of a drainage strategy or detailed drainage proposals. Applicants are also required to show that they have gone through a sequential assessment in relation to the means of disposal of surface water. Information/details submitted are considered by the Council’s in-house drainage team and by the EA and LLFA as appropriate.

3. Can you provide us with some examples of the sorts of limits or conditions that the LPA is able to apply to a planning application approval in order to ensure that flood risk downstream of the development isn’t increased, and where possible is reduced below current levels.

Typically conditions will be attached to planning permissions to require development to proceed in line with the submitted flood risk assessment; to require the agreement of a surface water drainage scheme that will ensure that surface water runoff from the site is no greater than that from the site prior to development (i.e. the greenfield run off rate); to require the agreement of a lifetime management and maintenance plan for the approved drainage scheme; and to ensure that no development is brought into use/occupied until the agreed drainage scheme has been implemented in full.

4. Does the LPA routinely accept the advice of the LLFA and the wording they propose for conditions in any permission granted? Who decides the volume of attenuation required and the rate of discharge and on what basis?

The officers of the planning department do not have specialist drainage knowledge or qualifications. As such, we are advised by the EA and LLFA in their capacity as statutory consultees and by the Council’s in-house drainage team. In the absence of specialist expertise within the department, this advice must be taken into account and given significant weight.
5. How does the LPA routinely police observance of maintenance, repair and renewal conditions imposed in connection with SUDS and particularly attenuation facilities? How does the LPA ensure that funds are available from developers and their successors in title to cover necessary repairs and renewals throughout the life of the development?

Typically a condition will be attached to any permission granted to require the agreement of a lifetime management and maintenance plan for the approved surface water drainage scheme. The information submitted to discharge this condition is then assessed by the LLFA in their capacity as statutory consultee. Such plans should include provision for necessary repairs and renewals throughout the lifetime of the development, although it is not a matter for the local authority to determine how or by whom this is funded. The onus on ensuring the development is carried out in accordance with approved plans and details rests with the developer. The Council cannot, given the resources available, oversee or monitor developments to ensure that they are carried out in accordance with the permission, but enforcement powers are available to the council should there be evidence that there has been a breach of planning control.

6. Where an application is made successfully for less than 10 residential units and then followed on contiguous land by a further application for less than 10 units is the second treated as a major application involving the LLFA?

No, there is no provision within the relevant legislation for the LPA to treat a follow up application in this manner. However, the requirement for new developments not to increase flood risk elsewhere applies to smaller schemes. The planning department consults and is guided by the Council's in-house drainage team on these smaller proposals.

7. What consultations take place between Wyre, Preston, Fylde and Lancaster Councils concerning the effect of granting planning permissions, on flood risk to areas of Wyre vulnerable to flooding such as St. Michaels and Churchtown? What weight do you give to flooding risk in deciding whether or not to grant permission?

Specific consultation with neighbouring authorities does not take place on individual applications with regard to flood risk. However, Lancashire County Council is the LLFA responsible for Wyre and they, as LLFA, are also for the boroughs of Preston, Fylde and Lancaster. On this basis, a consistent approach should be taken across the sub-region. The NPPF gives significant weight to flood risk in the determination of planning applications by virtue of the requirement for development to be brought forward in accordance with the sequential and exceptions tests where appropriate and for all development to be informed by a site specific flood risk assessment. Only where the tests are passed and the FRA judged to be acceptable by the statutory consultees will planning permission be granted.
7.4 **Lancashire County Council**

**7.4.1 Sunnyside Terrace, Cart Gate, Preesall**
- Detailed design is nearly complete, currently awaiting to undertake trial trenches to accurately locate services to ensure that the design is constructible.
- Investigation programmed in towards the end of September, with onsite construction commencing in February (dependant on weather).

A meeting with the local community and flood group will be arranged for November / December to discuss proposals once finalised.

**7.4.2**
In addition, we have placed our intention to bid for the following sums of money on the FCERM 1 Refresh Programme for year 2016-18 to undertake:

1. **Wyre District Level 2 SWMP's - Garstang, Scorton, Forton, Upper Rawcliffe - £100,000**
   - An investigation which will compile existing known information regarding flooding with the areas and mechanisms of how and why the flooding occurs. Look at possible flow path risks and appraise options for flood alleviation works.

2. **Churchtown Level 3 SWMP - £85,000**
   - LCC as LLFA recommendation a Level 3 Surface Water Management Plan for the area which will aim to undertake a detailed study and produce options to reduce the risk of flooding within the catchment.

**7.4.3 Section 19 Report**
EL reported that the LCC Section 19 Report investigating the flooding of December 2015 is to be submitted to the LCC Committee on the following day. She noted that the report was very extensive and covered some 229 individual sites that were affected. The report is due to be published in October.

The report is to published in two stages; stage one is an overarching report and will deal with the weather conditions and the role of the risk management authorities before, during and after the event; stage 2 will deal with a programme of actions for each of the affected areas.

**7.4.4 JB asked that he be invited to the meeting with residents to discuss the Sunnyside Terrace works.**

**7.4.5 GW reported that LCC Highways Section were still dealing with the aftermath of the December and August flooding events. The additional works have put a great strain on the maintenance of the highway and highway drainage systems – LCC are working to get these additional works completed as quickly as possible.**
7.5 **Natural England**

No report received.

### 8. Making Space for Water Group

8.1 PL reported that the MSfW meeting had only taken place the day before and minutes were not yet available. He noted that it has been proposed to simplify the minutes of the meeting to provide details of areas of concern as “hot spots” but to remove named properties to prevent them being blighted.

8.2 A copy of the new ‘hot spot’ list is attached with these minutes.

8.3 PL asked whether there were any other areas that needed to be considered by the MSfW Group. The following areas were added:
- Smallwood Hey, Pilling
- Carr Head Lane, Poulton

8.4 RB raised a flooding issue by the bus stop on the corner of Gubberford Lane and the A6, Cabus. GW replied that he was aware of the issue which was due to the footway being lower than the A6 highway at this point. He added that the footpath would need to be raised and resurfaced; there are no plans for this work to be undertaken in the short term.

### 9. Emergency Planning

9.1 **Generic arrangements.**

The Generic Emergency Response Plan puts arrangements in place allowing the Council to respond to Major Incidents.

The Council’s Rest Centre Plan puts arrangements in place allowing Council to provide humanitarian assistance with the support of LCC by opening Council owned facilities during times of evacuation, this plan is reviewed every 6 months.

We have standby arrangements in place with 3 officers on call 24/7/365 allowing us to respond at all times.

We hold a separate document with all the Council’s and our multi agency partners contact details; this is reviewed 3 monthly, or whenever there’s a change to either Officer, or contact number.

We have other plans in place with our partners at LCC allowing us to respond to Severe Weather, Coastal and Maritime Incidents, Coastal Pollution.

9.2 **Generic Emergency Response Plan**

The 12 monthly review of the Plan leading to Version 3.00 has been completed, the plan has undertaken a comprehensive review following the December flooding, and large tip fire in Fleetwood, it went live on the 31/08/16; copies are available on the link below.


There is an ongoing training programme within the Council following on from the most recent restructures with those officers who have a role to play during plan activation. We also intend to update the Council’s website in the coming months.
### Wyre Flood Plan

The 12 monthly review of Wyre Flood Plan leading to Version 3.00 will be completed for October 2016, this will take on board lessons learnt from the most recent flooding events, and will superseded all previous versions.

The Wyre Flood Plan has been sent to all Flood Group contacts as part of the consultation.

Flood Groups in place as shown below, and I am currently working with Churchtown Flood Group, and hoping to start soon with St Michael's Flood Group.

It really important that we try to develop Local Flood Groups with Site Specific Flood Risk Summary Sheets for their patch, this will allow them to work more closely with us to continue to build resilience at a local level and develop, and update local arrangements, hot spots, vulnerable premises, customers, communities, and businesses, etc.

There are nominated Flood Wardens in in each of the areas and their role is to undertake and provide assistance where possible to the Community and the Council before, during and after any incident as outlined in each of their Flood Risk Summary Sheets.

Could I please ask Flood Wardens to keep their document current and up to date by advising me of any changes at their earliest opportunity?

It makes sense for this to be provided at our 3 monthly meeting as part of their local and individual updates, in a hard copy to Paul (Long) prior to the meeting from:

- Cleveleys;
- Thornton;
- Hambleton;
- Pressall;
- Churchtown;
- St Michaels (Group to be established);
- Stalmine and Staynall;

The Wyre Flood plan will be available on the Councils website at the link below; it will not contain any personal contact numbers.


We will provide a hard copy of the plan to the Local Flood Groups if requested, and also copies of their Site Specific Flood Risk Summery Sheets so they can continue to develop and review local arrangements, again if requested.

I am more than happy to work with other Parish Councils and local community to form Local Flood Groups, and develop the current generic Site Specific Flood Risk Summary Sheets and local arrangements, it’s important to note the work to collate the local information need to be completed by the Local Flood Group, Flood Wardens, I’m there to help and facilitate with this process.

And again I’m also available to attend any of the groups when requested to do so.

It's easy to get buy-in from those who want to help immediately after localised flooding, but very difficult when the suns shinning.

So I'm happy to help with any group if they would like to make contact with me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.4</th>
<th><strong>Community Resilience Update</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyre BC, Lancashire County Council, United Utilities and the Environment Agency are keen to offer continued support to existing and emerging community groups in a consistent and co-ordinated way. To this end we would like to know whether the groups would like to meet prior to (or after) the Wyre Flood Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In order to allow us to schedule this please submit an expression of interest a minimum of 2 weeks before the Flood Forum via Paul Long and we will schedule slots with the relevant groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.5</th>
<th><strong>Resilience Grants</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB read out the response from Wyre Council to questions raised by Churchtown FLAG about financial assistance following the recent flooding. (Questions 3, 4 and 5 related specifically to payment of resilience grants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.  | Is WBC able to extend the period for non-payment of council tax beyond 12 months from the date of the December 2015 flood for properties that were flooded again in August?  
Residents who have still not returned home since Dec 2015 can have council tax exemption extended through to 4 December 2016 (ie maximum of 12 months). There is no new funding to award any discounts for residents who have been forced to leave again because of the August floods. |
| 4.  | Can families that have stayed in residence but lived through inconvenience owing to flood damage, be recognised and relieved of some level of council tax? For example, families having to keep babies and toddlers upstairs because of damp and dirt during works.  
Wyre followed the national guidance outlined by the DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) in December. That scheme did not make any provision for part-occupied relief. Residents forced from their homes can be exempted up to the date that they return home, up to a maximum of 12 months. Parallel discounts/exemptions are available for any temporary accommodation taken on as a result of leaving main home. |
| 5.  | Can WBC clarify if money eg £500 one off payment and/or £5000 resilience grants, will be available to residents whose properties were flooded again in August? (it is understood that Peter Mason has said that there is no money at the moment, but that he is applying to a higher authority for clarification. Who has he approached since 22 August and what was the income?)  
No new money is available – this has been confirmed by DCLG. Any resident who was flooded during December 2015 (and who hasn’t already) is entitled to apply under the current scheme. The scheme has a closing date of December 2016 (exact date to be confirmed) – Full details of the scheme are available on the council’s website. |

http://www.wyre.gov.uk/floodinggrantscheme
Local Flood Groups

St. Michaels

St Michal’s FLAG now has a presence on Facebook - [https://www.facebook.com/St-Michaels-FLAG-509891412531260/].

1. Three meetings have been held since the date of the last Flood Forum. The number of people attending is increasing

2. Liaison arrangements with EA and Wyre BC have been established. We would wish for similar arrangements with UU, particularly in view of the continuing problems with sewer capacity causing surging and inability to use domestic plumbing including WCs at times of high water.

3. EA has been helpful in giving information on progress of bank works in St Michaels. FLAG has continued to report instances of suspect banks and surging sewers. Arrangements are being made for members of FLAG to visit the locations of bank works and review progress.

4. FLAG has tabled questions concerning the role of Planning Authorities in the Wyre Catchment Area for answers at the forthcoming Forum.

5. An Emergency Plan template has been received but regrettably little progress has been made with this so far. A grant for facilities for purchase/storage of equipment will be pursued in early October. The Village Hall car park has been used during Dec/Jan and again since Aug 22 for storage of EA equipment and has sustained considerable damage as a result of use by heavy vehicles which it was not designed to take.

6. The dominating event was the flooding of 22 Aug 2016, when the Wyre reached 4.71m at St Michael’s. At the northern end of the village two properties were flooded and the main A586 road to Blackpool was closed for some 22 hours. Villagers were on tenterhooks – particularly those whose homes had only just been repaired or were still in course of repair. St Michael’s problems however were this time smaller compared with neighbouring Churchtown.

The term “unprecedented” was used to describe the December floods. FLAG believes that with Aug 22 in mind this term can no longer be used with justification. Whilst, of course, it is sensible that appropriate steps are taken to protect life and property by residents, these activities are only of limited value in view of the apparent substantially increased flood risk.

There is a number of potential causes for increased flooding and the effect of the interactions between these is not clear. The view of FLAG is that urgent action by EA, UU and the local authorities in the Wyre Catchment area including the LLFA is needed to determine an effective strategy to overcome the present unsatisfactory situation. This view is shared by MP Ben Wallace.
### Churctown Flood Defence Group

Since our formation in January 2016, we have prepared a substantial document (Churchtown Flood Risk Management Plan Part 1) detailing the flooding incidents in Churchtown from 1980 and the responses from the various agencies. It was sent to our MP Ben Wallace, for distribution to senior personnel within United Utilities (UU), the Environment Agency (EA), Wyre Borough Council (WBC), and Lancashire County Council (LCC) as the Lead Flood Authority (Rachel Crompton, LCC Flood Risk Manager).

In order to prepare the report we distributed a questionnaire to the villagers asking for information about the December 2015 flood, and also, if villagers were present in the village at the time, the 1980 flood. We also held a whole village meeting to ask for support and obtain contact addresses of the residents, both for informing them of flooding affairs and to contact them in the event of a flood. The Flood group went around the village trying to include everyone. Some villagers were too afraid of their houses being identified and would not give us their details. They don't realise that unfortunately the EA know the level the water reached in the village and can identify most flooded properties.

The CFDG meets regularly on a monthly basis. The notes that follow indicate some of the items discussed. Additional activities by group members are also included.

#### 27th January 2016
Members of the newly formed CDFG Group met with the Wyre BC ‘Roadshow’ at the Grapes and made themselves known to the participants.

#### 22nd February 2016
Members of the group attended a meeting regarding flooding at Wyre BC

#### March 10th 2016
Members of the group attended a Flood Forum Meeting at Wyre BC
The group sent written evidence to the House of Commons Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Select Committee inquiry into future flood prevention.

#### April 1st 2016
The Group's Secretary arranged for Ben Wallace to attend a whole village meeting regarding the flooding and the aftermath.

#### May 8th 2016
Four members of the group attended a conference ‘The Science of Flooding’ in Hebden Bridge, in an effort to understand more about how flooding occurs and prevention.

#### May 15th 2016
The group met and amongst other things started an ongoing discussion about the preparation of Part 2 of the Churctown Flood Risk Management Plan which will focus on Resilience, both at property and community level. There was also discussion about contacts already made with academic institutions such as Imperial College, London, and the University of Lancaster. There is a reasonable chance that one or both of the organisations will be able to assist in the investigation of the village flooding problem and help find solutions.
May 16th 2016
Members of the group met for a walkover of the "assets" - all of the accessible embankments of the Wyre and the Ainspool and associated structures - and compiled a report (with photographs) of defects and work needing to be done which was sent to the Environment Agency. The group have made the EA aware of an apparently unauthorised embankment behind the Sewage Treatment Works in Churchtown.

26th May 2016
Members of the group attended the WBC Flood Forum meeting to represent Churchtown.

June 8th 2016
Representatives of the EA, LCC (Flood Risk Manager) and WBC (Chief Engineer) attended the regular monthly CFDG meeting to answer questions and listen to concerns. The group applied (successfully) to the Lancashire Foundation for funding to organise a catchment specific conference for Wyre, aimed at flood groups (to be held in January 2017).

The CDFG affiliated to The National Flood forum.

During the month, application was made to be affiliated with the National Flood Forum, which was accepted.

7th July 2016
Four members of the group attended the North West Flood Conference in Kendal.

During the month an objection was made by the group against granting permission for the Nateby Marina Development. It was felt that the Flood Risk assessment for this development was unsafe.

12th July 2016
The group met with John Blundell, Emergency Planning Officer for Wyre BC to discuss Churchtown’s Emergency Flood Response Policy and to help formulate their plan in the event of another major flood. This is ongoing and involves matters such as the appointment of volunteer flood wardens and collection of information about vulnerable residents. The group is in the process of assisting WBC with the production of an updated version of the Wyre Flood Plan. Also discussed at this time was the need for more river gauge telemetrics to provide more accurate local warnings to avoid false alarms (also discussed with the EA), linking to the National Severe Weather Warning Service, and the need for a Planning representative on the Wyre Flood Forum.

22nd July 2016
Six members of the group went to Pickering to view their flood defences. We met with Mike Potter Chairman of Pickering Civic Society and Philip Roe of the Forestry Commission. Pickering seems to have solved its flooding problem by a whole catchment approach entailing the installation of dozens of simple, cheap leaky timber dams high up in the catchment area (largely owned by the Forestry Commission), and the building of a large storm water basin lower down the catchment.
## Action

### August 8th 2016

Members of the group met with Robert Tidswell Waste Water Asset Manager of the UU to discuss the situation regarding the waste water drains in Churchtown in the hope of finding a solution.

During the month members of the group met with some of the St Michaels Flood group to exchange information. Some members also met to discuss making a film of the events of December and August in order to help convince the authorities that action must be taken to prevent further flooding.

In the days after the flood on 22nd August, group members accompanied EA representatives as they walked the area, and pointed out where and how flooding occurred.

### September 2nd 2016

Group members organised a meeting for villagers with the local MP.

### September 8th 2016

Churchtown Flood Plan submitted to WBC, including details of Flood Wardens for 6 zones, complete with checklist of voluntary duties.

RW reported that Churchtown FDG wanted to remove all personal details of vulnerable persons from the publicly available version of the Wyre Flood Plan to protect residents’ privacy.

The Group now has six flood wardens.

The Group is concerned that the time taken to close roads during a flooding event is a long process during which residents’ home are affected by vehicle wash entering their properties. GW responded that the other people with the authority to close any road, particularly a main arterial road such as the A586 or A6, were the Police and LCC. He added that he did not wish for residents to take it upon themselves to close down roads. RH asked whether road closures could be discussed between residents and the Police. CG suggested that residents could put out Road Flooded signs to advise drivers. JB noted that Wyre Council would be holding an internal debrief and the flooding would be discussed at the Lancashire Resilience Forum (LRF); he would include road closures as part of these meetings.

It was pointed out that calls to LCC out of hours could only be made by calling the Police and asking them to forward details. GW confirmed that the number to ring is 01772 614444.

### Proposed Agenda Items

#### 10. Proposed Agenda Items

**10.1** SH asked whether there had been input from major land owners upstream of Garstang in the production of the Section 19 report. PH repeated that the EA were looking to sources of potential additional storage upstream but this would not be covered specifically in the report. PL to add this to the MSiW Group agenda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.</th>
<th><strong>Any Other Business</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>PO noted that there used to be a great deal of plans showing local land drainage when local drainage boards were responsible for their maintenance. He asked if anyone knew where this information was now. PH replied that these were probably mislaid when drainage boards were disbanded. She would check to see whether any of these records were passed over to the EA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 12. | **Operation of Garstang and Catterall Flood Basins**  
- **Presentation by Paul Bond (Environment Agency)** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB gave a presentation of the Garstang and Catterall Flood Basins (see Appendices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO asked whether the land within the flood basin area was farmed; PB confirmed that the land is farmed but added that six hours’ notice is normally given (less in an emergency).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG asked whether the flood water caused any contamination of the land; PB replied that it does, particularly if left flooded for a considerable time, as this can compact ground and kill off grass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RH asked whether the barriers are ever lowered to prevent flooding upstream (and thus threatening communities downstream). PB replied that this was not the case as there would be no advantage in doing so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13.</th>
<th><strong>Date of Next Meeting</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next meeting of the Forum will be held at <strong>1pm</strong> on <strong>Thursday 8 December 2016</strong> at Wyre Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | Details of the Flood Forum, including past minutes and copies of presentations can be viewed on the Council website at [www.wyre.gov.uk/info/100006/environment/883/flood_forum](http://www.wyre.gov.uk/info/100006/environment/883/flood_forum)  

**Appendices.**  
- Operation of Garstang and Catterall Flood Basins - presentation
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins
Overview

- What is a flood basin?
- How do the Garstang & Catterall basins work?
- How are they maintained?
- Questions & Answers
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins

What are flood basins?

- Land that provides storage volume which can be controlled and be most effective to reduce peak levels
- Managed by flood barriers / sluices
- Protect around 400 properties from flooding.
- Together, the Garstang & Catterall flood basins can hold a capacity equivalent to 1200 Olympic-sized swimming pools

Follow us on Twitter: @EnvAgencyNW #floodaware
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins

How does the Garstang Flood Basin work?
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins

How does the Catterall Flood Basin work?
Effect of High Tides

Effect of high tides limit

Flood barrier

Flood barrier
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins

How are the basins maintained?

- Maintenance works are carried out by Environment Agency
- Maintaining defences, channels and flood basins
- Management of vegetation adjacent to the channels
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins

What if something goes wrong?

- unlikely that flood gates do not operate as expected
- sites regularly visited
- back up hydraulic rigs stored at both sites in cases of operational failure
Garstang & Catterall Flood Basins

Summary

• Garstang & Catterall flood basins operated and maintained by Environment Agency

• Land that provides storage volume which can be controlled and be most effective to reduce peak levels

• Both flood basins protect around 400 properties

Follow us on Twitter @EnvAgencyNW #floodaware
Any questions?