

Report of the Chair of the Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee to the meeting of the Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee to be held on 8th December 2004.

Subject:

G

Report on the Scrutiny of Water Management

Summary statement:

The Chair of the Committee will present a draft report on the Scrutiny of Water Management with a view to its adoption as the Committee's report.

Cllr Ghazanfer Khaliq
Chair of Environment and Waste
Management Improvement Committee

Portfolio:

Environment

Report Contact: Peter Marshall
Performance Co-ordinator
Phone: (01274) 432104
E-mail: peter.marshall@bradford.gov.uk

Overview and Scrutiny Area:

Environment & Waste Management



1. **Summary**

The Chair of the Committee will present a draft report on the Scrutiny of Water Management with a view to its adoption as the Committee's report.

2. **Background**

1. In October 2003 the Executive of Bradford Council passed the following resolution:

“That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment) be asked to consider service delivery issues for the Council in relation to water management with particular reference to recent flooding incidents in Keighley and other major incidents across the District.

In addition the Executive resolved the following:

- a) That, having regard to the lead role and responsibilities of the Environment Agency in this area, a statement on the Council's present approach to water management and future options be prepared.
 - b) That an inquiry by an independent expert be undertaken to analyse information from agencies involved in water management and the public affected by flooding to support future policy development and implementation.
 - c) That a summit on strategic water management issues for the District takes place to discuss the findings of the inquiry.”
- b. The Terms of Reference of the Scrutiny were agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment) at its meeting held on the 10 December 2003 and are included in this report.

3. **Report issues**

The report makes a number of recommendations focused on the flooding problems in the District

4. **Options**

None

5. **Contribution to corporate priorities**

This report will make a direct contribution to Priority 4 – Improving Waste Management and the Environment, in particular the effective management of water.

6. Recommendations

- (i) That the draft report be adopted as the Committee's report.
- (ii) That the Executive be urged to adopt the Recommendations in the report.

7. Background documents

None

8. Not for publication documents

None

9. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Draft report of the Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee on the Scrutiny of Water Management

Appendix 1

Report of the Environment & Waste Management Improvement Committee

Scrutiny of Water Management

Draft (Final)

www.bradford.gov.uk/scrutiny



BRADFORD
one landscape many views



MEMBERS OF THE ENVIRONMENT & WASTE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

Full Members of the Committee - Councillors

Conservative	Labour	Liberal Democrat	British National
Mallinson	Khaliq (Chair)	Cole	Redfearn
Walls	V Greenwood (Dep Chair)		

Alternates – Supplementary list of members, entitled to attend a particular meeting in place of the appointed member.

Conservative	Labour	Liberal Democrat	British National
Emmott	Joyce	Mirza	Kirby
Hill	Robinson		

CO-OPTED MEMBERS:

Mr S O'Hare (Bradford Environmental Action Trust) and Mr P Tullett (Environment Agency)

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: Cllr Anne Hawkesworth

CONTACT FOR ENQUIRIES

Peter Marshall

Performance Co-ordinator

E mail peter.marshall@bradford.gov.uk

Tel (01274) 432104

Contents

Chapter 1 - Introduction	Page 4
Chapter 2 - Summary of background information	Page 6
Chapter 3 - Summary of evidence presented	Page 7
Chapter 4 - Outcomes	Page 15
Chapter 5 - Recommendations	Page 18
Appendix 1	Terms of Reference
Appendix 2	Evidence log
Appendix 3	Program of Public Hearings held on the 29 th September and the 13 th October 2004.

Acknowledgements

The Chair of the Environment & Waste Management Improvement Committee, Cllr Ghazanfer Khaliq, would like to thank all the individuals and organisations that submitted evidence to this Scrutiny, the members of the Committee for their hard work in both holding the hearings and producing the report and all of the officers involved for their invaluable assistance in arranging the hearings and the production of the report.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

2. This scrutiny has been carried out in accordance with the arrangements detailed in paragraph 2, Part 3E of the Constitution of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (July 2004).
3. In October 2003 the Executive of Bradford Council passed the following resolution:

“That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment) be asked to consider service delivery issues for the Council in relation to water management with particular reference to recent flooding incidents in Keighley and other major incidents across the District.

In addition the Executive resolved the following:

d) That, having regard to the lead role and responsibilities of the Environment Agency in this area, a statement on the Council’s present approach to water management and future options be prepared.

e) That an inquiry by an independent expert be undertaken to analyse information from agencies involved in water management and the public affected by flooding to support future policy development and implementation.

f) That a summit on strategic water management issues for the District takes place to discuss the findings of the inquiry.”
3. The Terms of Reference of the Scrutiny were agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment) at its meeting held on the 10 December 2003 and are included in Appendix 1 of this report. In particular, the objectives of the Scrutiny were agreed as follows:

Objectives of the Scrutiny

- a) To identify the Council services that contribute to the reduction of the risk of flooding and mitigation of the effects of floods, for example gully cleansing, highway maintenance etc. This will also include consideration of the provision of a co-ordinated and effective emergency response to flooding incidents.
- b) To examine:
 - i. Current organization and delivery arrangements
 - ii. The role of external agencies
 - iii. Internal and external co-ordination of services
 - iv. Current budget allocation
- c) To identify best practice examples on a regional and national basis.
- d) To identify internal and external changes required to improve the effectiveness of current processes and actions.
- e) To identify the resource issues that need to be addressed to assist service providers in reducing the risk of flooding and mitigating the effect of floods.

4. Members of the Committee received a training session on the technical aspects of water management on the 7th January 2004. Subsequent to this, a “call out” for evidence was made by written invitation to key managers in the Council and relevant external organisations. The Committee considered this information together with other relevant reports and publications and then held a “public hearing” in September 2004 to which certain managers and other witnesses were invited and from whom the Committee wanted to seek further information. The Committee agreed the report on the 8th December 2004.
5. The Committee worked closely with the independent inquiry referred to above in paragraph 2(b). Public meetings organised as part of the independent inquiry were also used to inform the Scrutiny in relation to public views on service delivery.
6. Details of all oral and written submitted evidence and other reports and publications considered are in Appendix 2.

Chapter 2 - Summary of background information

7. Bradford District has a long history of land and property being flooded. The extensive flooding that occurred in the District in October 2000 was looked at by the Best Value Review of Peacetime Incidents that reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Corporate) in February 2002. This particular flooding was part of the UK's worst weather in over 270 years. Across England and Wales about 10,000 properties were flooded with an overall estimated cost to insurers of about £1 billion.
8. Heavy rainstorms in the District (and across the country) in July and August 2003 lead to significant flooding, particularly in the Keighley area. This resulted in significant public concern about why this happened and what steps were being taken to prevent similar occurrences in the future. Subsequently, the Executive made the decisions detailed in paragraph 2 above.
9. The position statement prepared by The Department of Policy and Executive Support (now the Department of Policy and Performance) in response to the request from the Executive referred to paragraph 2(a) above is relevant background to this Scrutiny.
10. The statement provides the following information:
 - a. The background to flooding in the Bradford District
 - b. The responsibilities and roles of those Agencies involved in water management related to flooding
 - c. Changes proposed through the Governments Flood Defence Review
 - d. The Roles and Responsibilities of Bradford Council Service Units

Chapter 3 - Summary of evidence presented

11. It is important to note that the Committee arrived at its findings and conclusions from consideration of all the oral and written evidence submitted. The summaries given in this chapter are simply to give an indication of the main issues raised and do not attempt to cover all of the evidence presented.

”Future Flooding”

12. This report (April 2004) was produced by the Foresight organisation at the request of the Chief Scientific Adviser to HM Government. The request in particular was to answer the following questions:

- a. How might the risks of flooding and coastal erosion change in the UK over the next 100 years?
- b. What are the best options for Government and the private sector for responding to the future challenges?

13. This is a very extensive report with the Executive Summary running to 58 pages. Further details can be found on the Foresight web site at www.foresight.gov.uk. Some of the key conclusions relevant to this scrutiny are as follows.

Q13 What about responses to intra-urban flood risk?

Solving the problem of future intra-urban flooding by engineering alone would be prohibitively expensive. Instead, an integrated approach will be vital. However, the results are much more uncertain than the river and coastal case, due to the need for more research and better modeling tools.

Q16 What are the additional challenges for our towns and cities?

Changes in risk and the costs of flood management are particularly uncertain in the case of intra-urban flooding. We need to decide how much to invest in better modelling and prediction of flooding in urban areas to ensure that we can plan ahead more effectively.

As well as facing flooding from rivers and the sea, our towns and cities can be flooded by local intense storms that can overwhelm drains and sewers. Our analysis suggests that current methods of flood management would be stretched to maintain risks at current levels, even with substantial increases in investment. The situation would worsen considerably if the drains and sewers in the UK’s cities were to reach the limits of their capacity. If this happened floods would become much more frequent and we would need a substantial investment programme to upgrade sewers, drains and other urban drainage systems. We would need a minimum of 10 to 15 years’ warning to prevent significant flood damage and allow efficient upgrades.

It will be important to manage the layout and functioning of our cities so they can adapt to future changes in rainfall patterns. Approaches such as the creation of new green corridors and the maintenance of existing undeveloped spaces (including brownfield) would provide ‘safety valves’ for the storage and passage of floodwaters when the drainage networks become overloaded. They could also bring substantial sustainability

benefits relating to the aesthetic and amenity value of water in towns. However, such schemes might require the abandonment of parts of existing urban areas, with councils and other agencies buying up properties to create new open areas.

The risk of flooding in towns and cities, as well as possibly being our greatest challenge in the future, is also the area of greatest uncertainty. If we want to plan ahead effectively for our cities, we need to develop much better modeling capabilities to predict flooding and manage flood routes in intra-urban areas.

Q17 What factors should inform our long-term approach to flood management?

How we use land, balancing the wider economic, environmental and social needs against creating a legacy of flood risk. How we manage the balance between state and market forces in decisions on land use. Whether to implement societal responses with a longer lead time; or rely increasingly on bigger structural flood defences with potential economic, social and environmental costs. How much emphasis to place on measures that are reversible and those that are highly adaptive.

There are three key issues we need to consider: where to concentrate future urban and economic development, when to invest in flood-risk reduction and how to manage flood risk in those areas.

Q11 To what extent would reducing greenhouse emissions help to reduce risk?

We looked at the high-growth World Markets scenario in two cases – coupled with High and Low global emissions of carbon dioxide. In the absence of other responses, the risks of catchment and coastal flooding fell from around £21 billion per year to around £15 billion per year in the 2080s. These figures do not include risk reductions for intra-urban flooding, which would be additional.

We saw in Chapter 2 that a future embodying World Markets socioeconomics and High global emissions results in high growth and prosperity, but also very high risks from flooding and coastal erosion. However, combining the high growth of World Markets with Low global emissions substantially reduced the risks. When implementing measures to reduce global greenhouse-gas emissions, together with the integrated portfolio of responses detailed above, it would therefore be much easier to reduce risk levels to around (or below) present-day values.

In the case of intra-urban flooding, mitigating climate change could make the difference between the existing system of drains and sewers coping, or reaching the limit of their capacity.

Sustainability of the responses:

Ideally, we want to identify responses which are effective in reducing risk, and which are also sustainable. We therefore assessed the responses against economic, social and environmental sustainability criteria.

We found that none scored highly in effectiveness and sustainability across all four

scenarios. However, several performed well across three of the four, and are therefore reasonably robust to socioeconomic and climatic change. These include:

- ❖ Catchment-Wide Storage.
- ❖ Land-Use Planning.
- ❖ Realigning Coastal Defences.

All of these can produce environmental benefits, reduce flood risk and be made sustainable with careful implementation.

Social justice was a hurdle to sustainability in a number of responses. The key message is that, it is how the responses are implemented that is the critical factor – more than the responses themselves.

Best Value Review – Peacetime Incidents

14. The Best Value Review of Peacetime Incidents, which was reported to Overview and Scrutiny (Corporate) in February 2002, is an important piece of background evidence for the Committee as it addressed some of the issues currently being examined in this scrutiny (ie service delivery in response to incidents such as flooding) and took as a case study the response to the flooding in the District in November 2000. An updated Service Improvement Plan has been produced for the Environment & Waste Management Improvement Committee and was examined by the Committee in the public hearings.

15. The review included, in relation to service delivery, this summary of performance,.

Summary of performance

Mitigation – In this analysis, mitigation refers to medium and long-term “forward looking” risk and hazard assessment. Looking ahead over a number of years with all relevant people and organisations to plan ahead for possible future threats/emergencies, how to minimise them and implications for preparation. Currently, very little work is carried out in this area and significant change needs to take place to ensure that mitigation is properly addressed.

Preparation – This focuses on the ability to respond i.e. trained staff, call out arrangements, suitable inter-agency arrangements etc. Improvements are needed, some of which are related to those areas in which the Council does not meet the Government’s suggested standards. The particular areas include training of internal staff, links with the public, links with the locally based voluntary sector, contractual arrangements, availability of staff, adequacy of the Emergency Control Centre arrangements, the Emergencies handbook, payments to staff, incident recording and information about rest centres. Given advice from Legal Services, particular significant advances need to be focused on training and it’s accreditation, training records and incident recording. This is due to the liability that can arise on the Council if officers act negligently during an incident. The Council cannot have staff who have no relevant/up to date training acting in an emergency situation in which, potentially, lives are at risk.

Response – The Council is very good at responding. This is the view from relevant external agencies and the public consulted.

Recovery – This relates to the role of the local authority in helping, say, an area recover from a major incident such as flooding. It is clear from the consultation that with regard

to the “recovery phase” in the Stockbridge area of Keighley, many parts of the Council have been effectively and successfully involved. Particular praise has been given by some of the affected residents to the help and support from the Keighley Area Coordinator and his staff, to the Community Development Service and to Drainage.

16. The review made 6 strategic and 16 operational recommendations. Of these, the majority have a direct or indirect impact on the ability of the Council to respond to floods. An update on the service delivery plan has been produced (June 2004) by Emergency Planning for the committee.

17. With regard to this update, the following issues arise:

- a. Re impact of Asset Management Project – no new arrangements yet to ensure availability of buildings in emergencies
- b. Re medium and long planning and mitigation – detail not available
- c. Integrated Emergency Management policy – not completed
- d. New structure of Emergency Planning Unit (EPU) in order to meet Government Standards – not in place
- e. Government standards – not fully met yet.
- f. Training for staff – Not yet delivered.
- g. Medium term improvement for Emergency Control Centre – no progress.
- h. Training of Area Co-ordinators and call out procedures – not in place

Public consultation

18. At a public meeting held on the 6th May 2004 and which was organised by the Department of Policy and Executive Support in relation to the Independent Enquiry, a number of concerns were raised which are relevant to this scrutiny i.e.

- a. A household seriously flooded in October 2000 that received no help or support from the Council or any agency.
- b. Confusion about who is responsible for bridges blocked by for example trees in the rivers. Getting different messages from Council and Environment Agency. Are they working together?
- c. Information provided about who is responsible for what re flooding and who to ring is confusing and very difficult to use.
- d. Could not Council buy sand bags in bulk and sell small quantities as required to members of the public.
- e. People saying they need expert advice on flood prevention techniques and technology.
- f. Do planning check the drainage proposals from developers?

Public Hearings

19. A public hearing was held in Keighley on the 29th September and which was completed on the 13th October. Numerous issues arose from the evidence presented and from the questions and answers. The transcripts of the hearings are referred to in the evidence log (Appendix 2) and the details of the witnesses are given in Appendix 4. Particular concerns which arose include the following:

- a. Roles of Area Co-ordinator staff
- b. Emergency Plans
- c. Research
- d. Gullies

- e. Capacity of the systems
- f. Approaches not consistently joined-up.
- g. Post flood clear ups
- h. Information and support for at risk residents
- i. Insurance
- j. Planning and new developments
- k. Support to schools
- l. Emergency Planning
 - i. Getting the big picture on incidents
 - ii. Funding for costs of incidents
 - iii. Inadequate staffing levels
 - iv. Staff inadequately trained across the Council
 - v. Inadequate accommodation
 - vi. Improved de-briefing and information for members and roles of Members
 - vii. Elderly and other “at risk” residents.

Bradford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment report (April 2003)

20. The background to this report is covered in this extract from the Executive Summary.

“BACKGROUND

1.1 Flood risk is a real and also a perceived issue throughout Yorkshire, with a wake up call delivered to communities on the Rivers Aire and Wharfe during the November 2000 event. An increased programme of investment is currently underway, primarily promoted by the Environment Agency, but with local authority input in order to improve the standard of protection to existing communities. Another strategy developed by government following the devastating flood events of both Easter 1998 and November 2000, was to use the planning system to reduce the demand for further flood defences by protecting natural floodplains from development, and to steer investment away from areas of high flood risk. This guidance was published in July 2001 within a Planning Guidance Note No 25 “Development and Flood Risk”.

1.2 The first deposit of the Bradford District Unitary Development Plan was released by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (CBMDC) for initial consultation in August 2001. The documentation of policy and development allocations within the proposed plan was undertaken in accordance with current policy guidance at that time (including PPG3). This included flood risk, but not assessed against the new criteria and tests published in PPG25.

1.3 As part of the local plan process Planning Authorities are required to make objective assessments on land allocations, guided by the principles of the sequential test within PPG25, to steer development away from areas of high flood risk.

1.4 JBA Consulting were commissioned in December 2002 by CBMDC to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Bradford district. Primarily using existing data sources, and in consultation with the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Water, this Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides information on the nature of flood risk in the district, and its potential consequences with respect to the allocation of proposed development sites.”

21. This assessment now informs the planning process in the District and the development of the current UDP.
22. Concerns are expressed in the report about the Bradford City Centre situation i.e. a proportion of the city remains within the high-risk zone.

“Currently there are no specific site allocations situated within this zone, though it is understood that considerable capital investment is proposed as part of the refurbishment of the Forster Square commercial precinct. Development within this zone will be supported by the council, but floor levels must be situated above the 1% (1 in 100 year) flood level. The actual extent and severity (i.e. depth) of the flooding within Bradford city centre is currently uncertain, and therefore it is recommended that a detailed investigation is undertaken in a holistic manner to provide a consistent and equitable assessment of flood risk across the study area (as opposed to analyses undertaken on a site-by-site basis).”

Scrutinies on flooding from other local authorities

23. The London Assembly and Camden, Barking and Dagenham and Middlesbrough local authorities have recently undertaken scrutinies into flooding in their areas.

Key recommendations from these that are relevant to flooding issues in the Bradford District are as follows:

24. Camden

- Discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding.
- Review UDP policies in light of draft PPG 25 (Feb 2001)
- Work in partnership with central government, Environment Agency and the local water authority.

25. Barking & Dagenham

- Clarify which authorities are responsible for the different parts of the sewerage and draining systems.
- Explore the potential of sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) for dealing with contributions made by surface water to flooding.
- Look at the Council's emergency planning duties and powers

26. Middlesbrough

- That the Authority (Middlesbrough) reviews its current flooding policies with particular focus on the following issues: -
 - That a list of vulnerable people in particular the elderly and housebound in flood-prone areas should be compiled for evacuation purposes during flooding incidents;
 - That becks and watercourses that effect Middlesbrough are maintained along their whole course to ensure that problems do not arise downstream during extreme weather events;
 - The policy on the distribution of sandbags for both Council tenants and private residents during localised flooding events;

- The current regime for gully emptying in order that they can operate to their maximum capacity during localised flooding events;
- 'Post Flood Clean-up' to ensure residents understand what support the Authority will give in the event of flooding incidents, particularly sewer flooding of homes;
- That the Authority continues to pursue Northumbrian Water Limited for the infrastructure improvements that are required to bring the sewage system of Middlesbrough up to acceptable standards;
- That the Executive investigate the human resource capacity with regard to localised flooding events to ensure that the present policy of contact arrangements are robust and are capable of meeting the extra capacity necessary in extreme events;
- That the Authority's web site is enhanced in order to provide information to residents on flooding and advice on what action may be taken in the event of an incident in Middlesbrough.
- That a leaflet be produced which details relevant contact details of both Middlesbrough Council and other relevant agencies in the event of flooding and other emergencies for the residents of Middlesbrough

27. The London Assembly - Recommendations

Public information and the description of flood risk

- We recommend that the Environment Agency and other public bodies communicate flood risk to the public in odds or percentage terms, rather than as a return period. To clarify the nature of the risk, it would also be useful to provide further explanation that presents probabilities over readily understandable timeframes. The odds should also be revisited over time to take account of the impact of climate change. [Action: Environment Agency]
- We welcome the work done to date by the Environment Agency in warning the public of flood risk. Given the continuing low levels of public awareness, these efforts must be redoubled. Thought should be given as to how other bodies, including the Mayor and GLA, can assist the Environment Agency in conveying their message. As memories of recent floods fade, there is a danger of complacency. This process needs to be integrated into a larger programme of public involvement in flood risk management. We recommend that the Mayor discuss with the Environment Agency how to integrate the Agency's work in flood warning within a strategy of flood information-gathering from residents, public involvement in warning and emergency procedures, and flood preparedness. [Action: Mayor, Environment Agency]

Responding to flood risk

- We recommend that the Environment Agency review advice given to local authorities on flood-related planning matters to ensure such advice is clear and consistent across all areas. [Action: Environment Agency]
- We expect all new developments on low to medium and on high risk flood plains, in particular those in the Thames Gateway, to contain design features, along the lines of those recommended by ODPM, intended to mitigate the effects of flooding. [Action: Mayor, Boroughs, developers]
- We recommend that the insurance industry reconsider the 'new for old' policy in relation to property restoration and replacement. Flooded properties should be restored using flood-resistant techniques. [Action: Association of British Insurers]

Funding of flood defences

- We believe that Boroughs should proactively use their section 106 powers under PPG25 to secure funding for flood mitigation specific to particular developments. We also recommend that the use and impact of such powers be collated London-wide by the GLA so as to monitor their effectiveness in encouraging properly funded, flood-sensitive development. [Action: Boroughs, GLA]

Recovery and Insurance

- There is a need for good practice on flood recovery to be collated for use by all local authorities in the event of flooding. We recommend that the GLA supervise the collation of such recovery good practice in cooperation with London's local authorities. [Action: GLA, Boroughs]
- There is clearly a need for the Mayor to undertake discussions with the insurance industry on flood cover in London, giving special attention to cover for lower income groups. We recommend he instigate such discussions as soon as possible. [Mayor, Association of British Insurers]

Other conclusions - Public information and the description of flood risk

- Recent research by the Environment Agency shows that nearly 50 per cent of people living in flood plain areas are oblivious to the risk and only one person in ten takes any action to prepare.

Area Co-ordinator staff

28. The role of Neighbourhood Support staff, in particular the Area Co-ordinators and their staff, in flooding situations seems unclear. There is no specific agreement or protocol with Emergency Planning. Outside of office hours, there is no easy means of contacting these important “local” staff.
29. There has been over the past few years valuable and important roles and tasks (both during and post flooding incidents) taken on by these staff in an ad hoc manner. There clearly is significant potential for enhanced and better co-ordinated activities. E.g. developing public awareness, supporting community groups and taking video evidence.

Emergency flooding plans

30. There is an established Emergency Flooding Plan for the River Wharfe but not one for the River Aire, despite the extensive flooding in 2000. The River Aire is complex and would need a plan with relevant sections focused on different parts of the river. Although to some extent, urban flooding is unpredictable, data gathered over time does indicate potential “hot spots” and emergency flooding plans could be developed over time.

Research

31. Clearly the Council is involved in much needed research with various partners into various aspects of flooding. Such work appears to be vital given the lack of knowledge about certain aspects of urban flooding in particular localities. Such work can play a critical role in identifying potential effective and cost effective solutions to particular flooding problems and needs to be shared amongst all partners.

Road gullies

32. The maintenance, positioning and capacity of road gullies has been the subject of much debate. There are agreed problems with regard to gully cleaning such as parked cars preventing access. The cleaning is still on a “once a year” methodology which combined with the parked cars issue can result in some gullies becoming blocked and not cleaned for years. Street Scene is slowly building up a picture of areas that require cleaning more frequently than once a year with a view to rescheduling rounds. Other evidence suggests how vital this work is and that it should be implemented urgently with a database of potential flooding “hot spots”.

Capacity of sewers and the system as a whole

33. Part of the evidence suggests that the surface water system in the District is not adequate. Yorkshire Water (YW) said it is in “normal conditions”, that they have to work to the specification determined by OFWAT (i.e. a 1:30 year spec) and that they are not funded to build and maintain sewers with the capacity to cope with river flooding. Apparently, OFWAT are not taking into account climate change implications in their agreements with YW for example changes in rainfall patterns etc. This would appear to leave confusion about which organisations are responsible for responding to the agreed increases in urban flooding, which the present systems do not cope with at times.

34. It would appear that that the existing ways of expressing rainfall intensity (e.g. a 1 in 30 storm) is based on historical data and does not necessarily the changes in rainfall patterns with shorter but more intense periods of rainfall in the summer.
35. The Future Flooding Report and evidence from local drainage professionals clearly identified “storage areas” as a viable approach to managing urban flooding. However there is no clear agreement about who should be responsible for such areas that are not part of new developments. No capital funding would appear to be available with no apparent agreement on who is responsible for progressing such initiatives.

A holistic approach

36. The different agencies involved generally all have their own priorities and funding “drivers”. There clearly is a need for a much more holistic approach with a pressing need for all research and related investigation work to be shared in an open manner.

Post flooding clear ups

37. Concerns were raised about the quality and co-ordination of post flood clear ups that are carried out by the Council. This work needs to be much more than just emptying the gullies. A comprehensive clean up co-ordinated and delivered by Street Scene should be standard practice with Ward Members invited to be involved in assessing the effectiveness of the work.

Public awareness and preparedness

38. Clearly this needs significantly more work given that some flooded families have not been aware of what Council can do to help, which numbers to ring, where to go in an emergency etc. There is a need for easily accessible information on matters such as flooding barriers, insurance, floodplains, sandbags etc. It was also clear that having “one telephone number” (with several lines available) for all flooding emergencies would be welcomed as at the moment, there is a wide range of telephone numbers for the public to choose from when they are flooded. In addition there are some outstanding issues on these matters in the Emergency Planning Service Improvement Plan and these are referred to below.

Insurance

39. There are increasing problems for the public with regard to house and content insurance and flooding.

Planning and new developments

40. It is a very positive step that the Council in the light of PPG 25 and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has reviewed the UDP. However linkages between the Council and neighbouring local authorities in relation to developments and flooding issues does seem to need significant improvement.
41. There is an identified high risk of flooding in City Centre (Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – 2003). It would seem that the suggested further work on this matter has not been carried out.
42. It was suggested that PPG 25 does not go far enough with regard to surface water and flash flooding issues and that there are concerns on the Inspectors views on the

revised UDP i.e. allowing developments in floodplains.

Support to schools with flooding problems.

43. It seems unclear as to the level of support that is available to a school if they have flooding problems.

Resident needing extra support in flooding situations

44. An unresolved issue from the Best Value Review and highlighted in some of the evidence is the need for Emergency Planning and the emergency services to be aware of any residents who need to leave their home because of flooding but are unable to do so on their own because of a disability or general frailty. Certain parts of the Council will have information on most of these residents and this information needs to be available "24/7".

Emergency Planning (EP)

- 45.
- a. Getting the big picture - Problems with EP getting the whole picture about a flooding incident. This is reinforced by flooded residents in 2000 who say that they saw no one from the Council.
 - b. Funding - Currently departments have to cover their own costs in flooding incidents that can lead to budget problems.
 - c. Staffing - Emergency Planning was judged by the Best Value Review not to have enough staffing. This is still the position and the demands on staffing will be increased by the Civil Contingencies Bill (which became an Act in November 2004), which will make the LA a category 1 responder, similar to the blue light services.
 - d. Training of staff - This was inadequate at the time of the Best Value Review and is still inadequate. This is a dangerous situation, which could result in loss of life and claims against the Council.
 - e. Emergency Planning team accommodation - This was identified in the Best Value Review as inadequate and this is still the case.
 - f. Area Co-ordinators Staff - Better use could be made of them in Emergencies.
 - g. Flooding help line "one number" - This would be very useful for the public and must have the capacity to take several calls at the same time but must not be the direct EP contact number.
 - h. De-briefs - An identified need for members to receive feedback from the inter agency post flooding de-briefs
 - i. Emergency Planning Book - This is a paper book, updated manually. There is a case for this to be electronic and certainly relevant parts need to be available to elected members, area staff etc. This is currently not the case.

Chapter 5 - Recommendations

		Action by	
		Date	Whom
1	That a protocol be agreed to establish the important roles and involvement of Neighbourhood Support staff in relation to flooding emergencies and to agree a communications strategy which enables, when necessary, 24/7 communication between Emergency Planning and Neighbourhood Support	July 05	Director of Policy & Performance
2	That <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That a generic emergency plan for flooding incidents be produced which should include specific arrangements for known river and urban “hot spots” and that b) Relevant Ward Members are kept up to date with relevant sections of all flooding and other emergency plans 	Dec 05	Director of Policy & Performance
3	That <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Committee welcomes the vital research that the Council is currently involved in with regard to flooding matters and that b) A programme of regular activities such as conferences and structures such as databases are established to ensure that all relevant research findings are shared across all the involved partners. 	Ongoing	Executive
4	That <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Council urgently moves away from the “once a year” cleaning regime for gullies and agree a new regime utilising knowledge of the flooding “hot spots” in the District b) Individualised records of gullies and their records of cleaning, maintenance and risk situation (i.e. if in a “hot spot”) are established and c) Information on “hot spots” be reported to area committees so that local area management plans can be used to improve the situation. 	Dec 05	Director - Environmental Services
5	That, given the established importance of “storage areas” in flood alleviation, the Council seeks agreement from relevant partners on the responsibility and funding for such areas and seeks to bring about the establishment of such areas in the District where they would be effective.	Dec 05	Director of Transportation Design & Planning

6	That the Council seeks assurances from relevant partners that return data (e.g. 1 in 50 year flood) is revised regularly in the light of the accepted changes in rainfall patterns and intensity.	Dec 05	Director of Transportation Design & Planning
7	That Planning Panels be encouraged to require Section 106 agreements with developers for flood alleviation work when a proposed new development has significant new areas of impermeable land.	July 05	Director of Transportation Design & Planning
8	That, in order to ensure high quality and comprehensive post flooding clear ups, a nominated officer in the Council be responsible for all post flooding highway and other Council land clear ups and that post clear up inspections with invited local Ward Members be a part of the agreed policy.	July 05	Director - Environmental Services
9	That <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Council work with relevant Partners to insure that residents in areas known to be at risk of flooding are in regular receipt of support and information that enables them to be better prepared for any flooding. b) The Council agree with Partners that a Council telephone number (available 24/7) should be publicised as a resource that can be used by the public in flooding situations as a “gateway” to the relevant agencies. 	Dec 05	Director of Policy and Performance
10	That the Council provide information, on request, to residents in flood risk and flood effected areas on flood alleviation work that has been carried out by the Council to assist the residents in obtaining flooding insurance.	Dec 05	Director of Legal Services
11	That, given that Bradford City Centre is a high risk area with regard to flooding, an urgent detailed investigation is undertaken to provide a consistent and equitable assessment of flood risk across the study area as recommended in the Bradford Strategic Flood Risk assessment (2003).	April 05 (Initial report)	Director of Transportation Design & Planning
12	That the Council establish working agreements with neighbouring local authorities on planning as it relates to flooding matters	April 05 (Initial report)	Director of Transportation Design & Planning
13	That PPG25 should be revised to take better account of surface water and flash flooding.	April 05 (Initial report)	ODPM.
14	That, given some recent Inspectors decisions on the use of land in flood plains in the District, the Council	April 05 (Initial	ODPM

	urges the Inspectorate to take a precautionary approach to such matters given the accepted increase in flooding risks.	report)	
15	That Education Bradford supplies information to schools on the support that they can supply in flooding situations.	July 05	Director of Education
16	That the Council remind all staff that they have a responsibility to, in the event of a flooding or any other emergency, to ensure that they promptly inform Emergency Planning on an agreed telephone number.	April 05	Director of Policy and Performance
17	That the Council, given that flooding and other emergency situations can be a threat to lives, a) Ensures that Emergency Planning has the resources and authority to provide suitable training to all Council staff who may be involved in a response to an Emergency and b) Ensures that the relevant parts of the Council are adequately resourced with regard to staffing, training, equipment and accommodation to comply with the requirements of the Civil Contingencies Act.	Jan/Feb 05	Executive
18	That the Council ensures that agreement is reached with elected Members on their roles in flooding and other emergency situations, in particular: a) Call out arrangements a) Involvement in post clear up inspections b) Provision of relevant parts of Emergency Plans	July 05	Executive
19	That Emergency Planning undertake a study with Social Services and other relevant bodies on the feasibility of making available on a 24/7 basis to Emergency Planning information on those known residents of the District who would need extra targeted support and help in a flooding situation.	Dec 05	Director of Policy and Performance & Director of Social Services

Appendices

Appendix 1 Terms of Reference

Appendix 2 Evidence log

Appendix 3 Program of Public Hearing held on the 29th September and the
13th October 2004.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment)

December 2003

Agreed “Terms of Reference” for a Scrutiny of service delivery issues relating to water management and incidents of flooding

1 Context

- 1.1 The Bradford District has a long history of land and property being flooded through heavy downpours of rain and watercourses bursting their banks. These major events have often resulted in the Council and others making policy and operational changes to water management in order to reduce the risk of further floods or to reduce the damage caused.
- 1.2 In recent years there have been an increasing number of incidents where rivers or watercourses have broken their banks. The most notable was that of October 2000 when over 200 properties were flooded in the Stockbridge area of Keighley.
- 1.3 Heavy rainstorms can also cause floods that are not related to rivers or watercourses. The worst of these occurred within a four week period during July and August 2003 when localised storms over the Keighley area caused flooding to properties and land on three separate occasions.
- 1.4 According to Government research the number of incidences of flooding is liable to increase. The type and range of such incidents is liable to become more variable. The changing nature of our climate and environment challenges the Council, it's partners and local communities to develop new water management strategies and actions that:
 - a) Reduce the risk of flooding
 - b) Mitigate the effect of flooding
 - c) Provide coordinated and effective emergency responses to flooding incidents
- 1.5 **In October 2003 the Executive of Bradford Council passed the following resolution:**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment) be asked to consider service delivery issues for the Council in relation to water management with particular reference to recent flooding incidents in Keighley and other major incidents across the District.
- 1.6 In addition the Executive resolved the following:
 - g) That, having regard to the lead role and responsibilities of the Environment Agency in this area, a statement on the Council's present approach to water management and future options be prepared.
 - h) That an inquiry by an independent expert be undertaken to analyse information from agencies involved in water management and the public affected by flooding to support future policy development and implementation.
 - i) That a summit on strategic water management issues for the District takes place to discuss the findings of the inquiry.

2. Objectives of the Scrutiny

- 2.1 To identify the Council services that contribute to the reduction of the risk of flooding and mitigation of the effects of floods for example gully cleansing, highway maintenance etc. This will also include consideration of the provision of a co-ordinated and effective emergency response to flooding incidents.
- 2.2 To examine:
- Current organization and delivery arrangements
 - The role of external agencies
 - Internal and external co-ordination of services
 - Current budget allocation
- 2.3 To identify best practice examples on a regional and national basis.
- 2.4 To identify internal and external changes required to improve the effectiveness of current processes and actions.
- 2.5 To identify the resource issues that need to be addressed to assist service providers in reducing the risk of flooding and mitigating the effect of floods.

3. Key Stakeholders

- 3.1 An indicative list of the key stakeholders is provided below. This is not definitive or exclusive and can be developed as the scrutiny process progresses.

Director Planning, Design and Transportation, Bradford Council
Officers of the Drainage and Highways Departments, Bradford Council
Area Coordinators, Bradford Council
Ward Councilors
Parish and Town Councils
Environment Agency
Yorkshire Water
British Waterways
Local Communities
Local Businesses
Police
Fire Brigade

4. Means of Consultation and Evidence Gathering

- 4.1 The O&S Committee will need to consider a variety of evidence in appropriate formats, including:
- Review of relevant documents such as current policies, Best Value reviews, results of inspections etc.
 - Written submissions from interested parties.
 - Hearings held in public with interested parties making submissions and responding to questions
 - Commissioning of specific research
 - Open forums with stakeholders

- Relevant site visits.

5. Timing of the Research for Policy Development on Water Management and Flooding

5.1 The scrutiny process could start in January 2004 and be completed by March 2004.

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Environment)
Scrutiny of Water Management**

Log of evidence received and considered

Evidence number	From
1	Street Scene re gullys
2	Transcript of hearing held on the 29 September 2004
3	Transcript of hearing held on the 13 October 2004.
4	Bradford Strategic Flood Risk assessment
5	Emergency Planning revised (July 04) Service Improvement Plan

**Environment & Waste Management Improvement Committee
Water Management Scrutiny**

Public hearing in Keighley – 29 September 2004

Keighley Disabled Peoples Centre, 23 Temple Row, Keighley

Time	Activity		Notes
1:45 pm	Committee members meet at Keighley Voluntary Services, 135 Skipton Road, Keighley		
2:00 pm	“Site visit” in Keighley Town Centre where flooding occurred summer 2003.		Jeff Bennett (Assistant Area Co-ordinator) & Noreen Akhtar (Neighbourhood Development Officer) to facilitate
2:45 pm	Committee members need to be at Disabled Persons Centre so that hearing can start at 3 pm prompt.		
3:00 pm	3:00	Role of Area Co-ordinators & their staff in flooding matters	Jeff Bennett (Assistant area Co-ordinator)
	3:15	Flooding in Keighley and elsewhere (Part 1)	Tony Poole – Drainage manager Keith Smith – Head of Traffic & Highways North Ian Oddy – Works Inspector / Highways Steve Eddison – Street Scene (especially gullys)
	4:00	Flooding in Keighley and elsewhere (Part 2)	Yorkshire Water – Ben Roche (Waste water catchment manager) Environment agency – David Wilkes (Flood Defence Manager)
	4:30	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment & UDP	Andrew Marshall – Senior Planning Officer
	5:00	Emergency Planning (including “help line” issue)	Stephanie Morton – Emergency Planning Officer
5:30	Break		
6:15	Public session part of hearings		

Also in attendance

- Keith Escritt – Highways (Keighley Area Principal Engineer)
- Chris Witham – Environmental Protection (Principal Environmental Health Manager)

