

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

28 July 2015

Report of the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

**APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION (HIGHWAY, TRANSPORT AND
INFRASTRUCTURE)**

(1) **Purpose of Report** To seek Cabinet approval of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) and all supporting documentation.

(2) **Information and Analysis** Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA), Derbyshire County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), is duty bound to develop and monitor a LFRMS. The County Council also has a duty to produce a LFRMS in line with the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy. The County Council's final LFRMS encompasses all the legal requirements placed on the County Council as a LLFA.

The LFRMS is a living document that sets out the County Council's objectives in coordinating the management of local flood risk in Derbyshire and provides the framework for prioritising these objectives over the coming years. The LFRMS will continue to evolve as the Authority's understanding of flood risk across Derbyshire grows.

The LFRMS is a tool which enables the County Council to demonstrate to the people and businesses of Derbyshire the work that has been undertaken to date, and sets out its aspirations for a future service delivery plan of flood risk management for the County. The development of the final LFRMS has taken a holistic overview of the risks and priorities identified as a result of the work the Flood Risk Management Team is doing, in partnership with Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) i.e. District and Borough Councils and in the development of the LFRMS, which has been subject to a public consultation.

The LFRMS aims to deliver strong community engagement and partnership working. Promoting and supporting personal resilience is a core element within the delivery plan of this LFRMS, empowering local communities to make local choices and to enable them to understand and manage flood risk at a local level.

The FWMA requires LLFAs to have adequate scrutiny arrangements in place and includes processes for the review and scrutiny of the LFRMS by RMAs with flood risk management functions and where the LFRMS may affect the RMAs area of delivery. To assist in the development of the LFRMS, a Scrutiny and Performance Working Group was established and members of the Flood Risk Management Team have presented regular updates to the Working Group during through the production of the LFRMS.

A four week public consultation was undertaken in February/March 2015 following the earlier Cabinet Member approval of the draft LFRMS on 20 January 2015 (Minute No. 8/15 refers). The LFRMS consultation was announced with a press release, published on the County Council's website and made available to Derbyshire Association of Local Councils (DALC) and all RMAs and relevant organisations, as well as the Scrutiny and Performance Working Group.

The draft LFRMS was amended to reflect the responses received to the consultation which are set out in Appendix A. Overall, the feedback was extremely positive and all stakeholders were in favour of the objectives and actions proposed. Following the consultation, a small number of technical amendments have been made to the document which was subject to consultation. For further information relating to the responses received please refer to Appendix A.

The proposed final LFRMS has been divided into two parts:

- **Part One** – Provides general information about flooding and flood risk, who to call and how local people can help themselves to become more resilient to the impacts of flooding.
- **Part Two** – Focuses on the more technical details of understanding flood risk in Derbyshire. It provides an action plan detailing how the County Council intends to coordinate the management of the future risks and how it can fund Derbyshire's flood risk management functions and initiatives.

The two main documents are supported by six Local Objectives, Guidance Notes, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (**SEA**) and a Culvert Policy.

There are six **Local Objectives** which detail the County Council's key actions for coordinating the management of local flood risk for the people and businesses of Derbyshire. These are as follows:

1. To further develop an understanding of the flood risk to Derbyshire and the impact of climate change working collaboratively with all other RMAs and relevant groups/bodies to ensure a coordinated response to flood risk management for Derbyshire.

2. To continue to work with all relevant bodies to ensure appropriate and sustainable development in Derbyshire.
3. To aim to reduce the level of flood risk to residents of Derbyshire.
4. To continue to prioritise limited resources effectively to support communities most at risk in Derbyshire.
5. To continue to help and support the local communities of Derbyshire to manage their own risk.
6. To continue to help protect and enhance the natural and historic environment of Derbyshire.

Under each objective are a number of priority actions, which will be monitored against derived timescales. The actions identified within the six local objectives are also supported by estimated costs and potential funding sources to achieve the actions.

- There are 24 **Guidance Notes** which support the LFRMS. These Guidance Notes are designed to be short, readable and informative documents that support daily service delivery, as well as the overall LFRMS. The notes provide information and advice about how people, businesses and communities can be supported before, during and after a flood incident.
- To ensure that the LFRMS contributes to the achievement of wider environmental objectives (a legal requirement under the FWMA), the County Council has produced a **SEA**. The SEA is legally required under the SEA Directive (2001) to identify the likely significant effects of the LFRMS and help to demonstrate how the LFRMS can contribute to the achievement of wider environmental objectives.
- A **Culvert Policy** has been produced which sets out the Council's approach to applications to culvert ordinary watercourses. This Policy is principally intended for use by planning authorities, landowners and developers, and underpins the Council's role to support the Environment Agency in delivering the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD, 2000).

The proposed final Strategy, including the documents referred to above can be accessed via the County Council's website via [Derbyshire's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy](#).

(3) **Financial Considerations** The LFRMS sets out an objective to continue developing and refining the County Council's understanding of areas of Derbyshire at risk of flooding, which will help to identify the prioritisation of the County Council's resources in future years.

Based on the Flood Risk Management Team's current knowledge and understanding, funding has been secured from the national funding source for

flood risk management i.e. Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Grant in Aid (FCERM GiA) and Local Levy Grant in support of numerous schemes and projects that seek to help reduce risk to the residents and businesses of Derbyshire. Over the next six years, Derbyshire County Council will receive £444,000 FCERM GiA and £183,000 Local Levy Grant to help reduce flood risk to 172 properties/local businesses.

As part of the bidding process, the Flood Risk Management Team has been required to demonstrate a joint funding approach to secure this grant funding. The Flood Risk Management Team has therefore liaised extensively with partner organisations and other relevant bodies to secure funding from other key stakeholders; these include borough, district, town and parish councils, local and national businesses, elected Members, Capital and Revenue funding from the County Council.

Over the coming years, and as the Flood Risk Management Team continues to develop its understanding of flood risk in Derbyshire, it will seek to submit future bids for grant funding. These new bids will also need to demonstrate a joint funding approach which will require match funding. Some of these sources have already been identified e.g. earmarked reserves. However, additional sources will still need to be identified; these will include County Council Capital and Revenue funding, external stakeholders contributions, grants from other providers and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding, etc.

All future acceptance of grant funding and designation of County Council match funding will be subject to the appropriate level of Member approval.

(4) **Legal Considerations** The County Council has a statutory duty under the FWMA to publish and maintain a LFRMS.

(5) **Equality and Diversity Considerations** An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken which supports the LFRMS, although raises some concerns in relation to Public Health, in particular, issues regarding the impacts of regular/recurrent flooding incidences on mental health. The EIA also raises concerns over the effects of flooding on the elderly, infirm, pregnant and disabled, who may not be so able to adapt to/or be capable of making themselves resilient to the effects of flooding or dealing with flooding should it enter or confine them to their property.

The LFRMS takes on board these two issues and seeks to address them through the strong emphasis on preparation and developing personal resilience in advance of potential flooding, community and partnership working, and effective communication. The Flood Risk Management Team is committed to maintaining an approach which seeks to mitigate the risk to all parties, particularly where flooding cannot be completely removed.

The LFRMS seeks to raise awareness and mitigate flood risk in the areas most prone to flood risk across Derbyshire. However, changes in the Government funding model, policy changes, climate change and new development may increase flood risk, and could make it harder for residents to obtain insurance, and this could reduce the positive impacts of the LFRMS.

(6) **Environmental Considerations** The County Council has produced a SEA. The SEA aspires to identify the likely significant effects of the LFRMS and help to demonstrate how the LFRMS can contribute to the achievement of wider environmental objectives.

(7) **Health Considerations** Flooding can have profound effects on peoples' welfare, employment, mobility, wellbeing, psychosocial resilience, relationships and mental health. It can pose huge social and welfare problems that may continue over extended periods of time because of not only being flooded (the primary stressor), but also because of the continuing secondary stressors that arise as people try to recover their lives, property and relationships. The LFRMS endeavours to address these effects of flooding on people's lives.

Other Considerations

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, human resources, property and transport considerations.

(8) **Key Decision** No

(9) **Call-In** Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No.

(10) **Background Papers** Held on file within the Economy, Transport and Environment Department. Officer contact details – James Biddlestone, extension 38563.

(11) **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATIONS** That Cabinet:

11.1 Approves the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and all associated documentation.

11.2 Authorises the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment to make any technical amendments to the document with an annual report on progress and a full review every five years to be reported to the Cabinet Member.

Mike Ashworth
Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation Responses

Stakeholder Workshop Feedback

Objective	Feedback	DCC Comment
1	<p>Incorporate DCC Climate Adaption Plan and work with others to align climate strategies</p> <p>Silt trapping encouraged at the top of catchment</p> <p>Share hotspot data on DCC website for all partners</p> <p>Hold LLFA partnership meetings</p> <p>1.1.2 remove 'team to' and change priority to high and timescale to short</p> <p>1.5 mitigation and response plans for specific sites with water companies</p> <p>Develop catchment management strategies with partners where catchments cross boundaries.</p>	<p>Incorporated into objective 1.6.2</p> <p>Encouraged in Environmental Best Practice Guidance notes and main strategy</p> <p>Possible data protection issues.</p> <p>Held quarterly</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Incorporated into objective 1.5.5</p> <p>Incorporated into objective 1.1.3</p>
2	<p>Not one size fits all support for D/B and local planning guides</p> <p>Reprioritise - timescales including priority to guide on deculverting</p> <p>2.1.2 - local guidance, best practice technical guidance</p> <p>2.1.5 - acknowledge that different authorities have different objectives, processes and capabilities. Planning authorities would benefit from principled and technical advice.</p> <p>Need to bring objectives up to date to reflect statutory consultee role</p> <p>Engage with authorities that do less to try to encourage them to do more to protect residents from flooding</p> <p>2.2.5 Raise the priority - could be the solution to solving flood risk that we investigate as part of the LLFA role.</p>	<p>Agreed and incorporated into Communication Strategy and Prioritisation Guidance Notes</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>A local guidance document for SuDS will be produced as per objective 2.2.1</p> <p>Incorporated into key actions 2.1 and 2.2</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Incorporated into key action 2.1</p> <p>Objective 2 has been been altered and wording has changed</p>
3	<p>High Priority for collaboration. Set up meetings with key RMAs to discuss key risk. Meetings to be less strategic - high priority.</p> <p>Land management practice - need to deliver communication effectively. A large area that requires significant work and liaison.</p> <p>CAP and other agri-environment schemes focus on helping to reduce sedimentation</p> <p>Education Material - lower priority. More important to discuss/liaise</p> <p>3.3.2 'status' develop</p> <p>Trees not necessarily the answer Farmers cannot earn money from trees, therefore its not universally welcome</p> <p>2000 or so farms in Derbyshire - should focus on few farms that exacerbate flooding.</p> <p>Work with other groups such as Campaign for Farmed Environment, EA and NE to deliver aims and message.</p> <p>Farmers can reduce silt entering the river but not stop it altogether. Many CAP agri-environment schemes have soil retention as a priority.</p> <p>NFU happy to convene meetings with farmers where there is a real problem for rural land run off.</p>	<p>Meetings held annually and discussed at Technical Officer Flood Risk Group held quarterly</p> <p>Agreed and incorporated into Communication Strategy and Prioritisation Guidance Notes</p> <p>Incorporated into Part 2 and also the Rural Land Management Guidance Notes and also the Funding Guidance Notes</p> <p>Agreed and taken on board for future reference</p> <p>Disagree as the team already do this extensively</p> <p>Agreed - A meeting to be set up with the NFU to discuss best way forward</p> <p>Agreed - A meeting to be set up with the NFU to discuss best way forward</p> <p>Agreed - A meeting to be set up with the NFU to discuss best way forward</p> <p>Agreed - A meeting to be set up with the NFU to discuss best way forward</p> <p>Agreed - A meeting to be set up with the NFU to discuss best way forward</p>
4	<p>Sign post enquiries to guidance note</p> <p>Response - provide clarity especially if a Main River</p> <p>Send PC information about resilience to help people help themselves</p> <p>Need to cross reference to Objective 6 and prioritise cost effective opportunities to deliver FRM through environmental enhancement and multi benefit projects</p> <p>Need to educate public about gullies and the Highways - "gullies don't work!" - deliver to parish councils</p> <p>1.1.5 does not exist</p> <p>4.4.1 should timescale be short?</p> <p>4.5.1 Status should continue</p> <p>4.6.5 would LLFA take lead role if flooding was from Main River</p>	<p>Agreed - Incorporated into the strategy</p> <p>Agreed - Incorporated into the strategy</p> <p>Guidance Notes to be shared with Parish/Town Councils and via DALC</p> <p>Agreed - Objectives are cross referenced for finances and funding</p> <p>Agreed - FRM team to work closely with the Highways team. Information also incorporated in Part 2 of the strategy and the Highways Statutory Duties and Vested Powers Guidance Notes.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>No - reworded objective</p>
	<p>Communication should be a high priority. Could use existing EP systems</p> <p>Objective 5 should link with Objective 2 of the national objectives</p> <p>Variation in community thinking. Let community tell us want they want. No one size fits all.</p> <p>5.1.1 High priority. Check duplication as this section is on resilience with EP</p>	<p>Agreed - FRM team to work closely with Emergency Planning and other partners to develop Flood Response Policy</p> <p>Agreed and amended</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Action amended</p>

Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation Responses

Stakeholder Workshop Feedback

Objective	Feedback	DCC Comment
5	<p>5.2.1 Keeping flood risk at the forefront of peoples minds is a challenge - seek new media streams</p> <p>5.6.1 Deliver material carefully</p> <p>5.3 Try to communicate risk effectively</p> <p>5.5.1 Working with planning authorities to implement personal resilience measures as a condition if they are in a high flood risk area.</p>	<p>Incorporated into objective 3.3.1</p> <p>Agreed and incorporated into Communication Strategy and Prioritisation Guidance Notes</p> <p>Agreed and incorporated into Communication Strategy and Prioritisation Guidance Notes</p> <p>Agreed - incorporated into key actions 2.1 and 2.2</p>
6	<p>Risk to the historic environment. Look at FRM through working with the environment and identify different sources of funding</p> <p>Refer to catchment partnership 'to identify and respond to opportunities to deliver FRM benefits by protecting and enhancing the environment of Derbyshire.'</p> <p>Need to incorporate more fully the historic environment</p> <p>6.1.2 Should be separate actions A and B</p> <p>Add in about the different catchment partnerships that liaise with</p> <p>Worth linking objectives with ongoing objectives of the Derwent Valley World Heritage Site. Could also link in with agenda and strategy for historic environment of the East Midlands (2012)</p> <p>Note the important historic issues of:</p> <p>Historic Weirs</p> <p>Erosion of lead-mining landscapes and toxin/contaminants release</p> <p>Erosion of archaeological remains</p> <p>Impact of flooding on build heritage sites (Derwent Valley Mills)</p>	<p>Objective 6 amended</p> <p>Objective 6 amended</p> <p>Objective 6 amended</p> <p>Agreed and amended</p> <p>Agreed and incorporated into action 6.2.3</p> <p>Noted and incorporated into the objectives and the SEA</p> <p>Noted and incorporated into the objectives and the SEA</p>

Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation Responses

Questionnaire Responses

GN = Guidance Notes

Question	Response					DCC Response
	Organisation	Date Received	Section	Page	Comments	
Is there anything you disagree with in the Strategy?	Parish Council	17/03/2015	General		Members of the public ARE interested in the sources and causes of flooding. Believe a major cause of flooding is lack of appropriate ongoing maintenance, clearing drainage and maintaining clear watercourses.	Incorporated into Part 1 riparian responsibilities and also the Riparian Landownership Guidance Notes
	Regional Environment Adviser for the NFU (East Midlands Region)		GN - Riparian Landownership	3	The EA and other institutes favour a poorly maintained watercourse because of a lack of funds(?) and that it is more environmentally friendly that maintaining watercourses.	Comments taken on board and incorporated into the objectives, Rural Land Management GN and Main strategy
				4	In the final sentence the preferred terminology is "... 200 years of human intervention, principally atmospheric pollution , has resulted in a degraded landscape..."	Amended
	Countryside Services		GN-Riparian Landownership	4	'DCC does not own any watercourses except parts of those that flow though land owned by the County Council...' If canals are 'ordinary watercourses' and are the responsibility of the Navigation Authority (as set out in Parts 1 and 2 below), then DCC <u>does</u> own watercourses.	Canals are navigable waterbodies
			GN Roles and Responsibilities	5	Other County Council Teams not defined by the FWMA – list does not include Countryside Service.	The list is not endless and are encompassed on a strategic level
				7	Canal info wrong – private land owners also liable. Also, what about remaindered (canals without a Navigation Authority)?	Encompassed
				9	Why only highways?	Highways are a RMA
	EA	11/03/2015	Strategy Part 1	Section 2	Should this section be in part 2, section 12?	Members approved the current layout.
				Section 1	Maybe include a link to the National Strategy	National strategy linked in other parts of the strategy
				5,6,7,	Same as back page of part 1. Repeated again at the end of part 2.	This is on purpose
				8	Reservoir flooding is the responsibility of the owner.	Made ref to EA and EP as coordinating management
				9	this is covered on page ten and in previous sections	This is on purpose
				10	Figure 2 is repeated in GN pg 65 (Roles and Responsibilities)	This is on purpose
				16	This is repeated in GN pg 59 - (Riparian Landownership)	This is on purpose
				18	is this relevant and it is also repeated in Part 2 and guidance note, page 12	This is on purpose
Anything missing from the Strategy?	Anonymous Comments			figure 9 Page 10	This figure states groundwater flooding does not appear to feature at all in the Egginton area of South Derbyshire, yet, in December 2012, the village experienced a crisis caused by excessive groundwater and saturation which impaired the operation and function of its three sewer pumps and outfalls resulting in severe road and street flooding which required extensive sandbagging to protect residential properties.	Misunderstood the figure. This information has been logged onto the system
				5	Concerns over text confusing members of the public - do members of the public have to understand the various types of flooding before they can know who to ring? Disagree that this should be correct.	The information allows the customer to make an informed decision about who to ring
			GN - Flood Reporting and Enquiry Investigation		confusion over data protection act and flooding reporting. "If I know my neighbour is out, and I can see they are being flooded, and I contact someone, they would reject the report because it was not my house?"	The FAQ should answer the question in the GN
			Strategy part 1 and GN.		The information about causes of floods in Part 1 and Guidance is clear but only useful in prevention and analysis work, not in an actual event.	The GN for Before, During and After a Flood Event provides further guidance
	Parish Council	17/03/2015	General		Who to notify of blocked drains , rivers streams and a maximum agreed response time.	Incorporated into Part 2
	Countryside Services		GN - Asset Maintenance, Register and Designation	1	It seems only Highway assets are being included in the Assets Register (assets deemed to have a significant impact on flood risk locally)?	Team to develop closer links with the canal team
				3	Summary of Water Resources and Land Drainage Acts suggests that assets held by Countryside Service should be registered.	Team to develop closer links with the canal team
			GN- Data held, sources and Requests	15	Need to point out DCC own some canals	Contact numbers incorporated
			GN- Relevant Legislation, Strategies and Plans	1	DCC duty to investigate efficacy of risk management after flooding event, including canals? Then Countryside Risk management procedures should be checked (embarrassing for DCC to investigate itself and find lacking...)	To be built into flood response policy
				23	Add canals	Added onto back page
				8	Reservoirs and canals are significant liabilities for DCC, should be shown on schematic drawing.	Agreed but drawing is very high level

Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation Responses

Questionnaire Responses

GN = Guidance Notes

Question	Response					DCC Response
	Organisation	Date Received	Section	Page	Comments	
Anything missing from the Strategy?			Strategy Part 1	5	Are the canals classed as 'ordinary watercourses'? They should be listed here. Also, where do remnant abstractions or diversions for previous heavy industry sit?	Canals are navigable waterbodies
	Eggington Parish Council	19/03/2015	Strategy Part 2	figure 5	Clarification of the figure describing the distribution of flood risk inquiries, it should not be assumed that these are either a quantification of past incidents or reflect the severity of flooding. It is simply a record of inquiries which should not be confused with incidents.	Described in the text supporting the figure
				13	Include 'free' in the opening sentence of the Flood Warnings paragraph. The Environment Agency offers a 'free' flood warning service..... Costs and benefits of the proposed measures are not included in the action plan	Amended Costs are now identified within objectives/actions
	Anonymous Comments		Objective 6		there is an objective to support the EA in respect of implementing the WFD there appears to be no objective in respect of assisting Natural England to safeguard or protect sites protected pursuant to the Habitat Regulations. Concerns over the county's role for improving water quality if the responsibility is passed to the LLFA. This transfer of responsibility to the LLFA and the reliance of NE on the LLFA could have resource implications triggering notably higher levels of consults in this part of the district should NE continue to rely on standing advice as currently drafted. Requests more detail on the highways obligation and time scales to clear blockages. A detachable sheet defining every acronym PLUS the role of any organisational body that is referred to by its initials. There does not seem to be enough emphasis on the run off caused by people hard surfacing their gardens retrospectively. Also the clearing of small lane open ditches never seems to happen these days. The duties of the water and sewage authorities to compensate customers who suffer a flooding event would have been useful to include. A meaningful executive summary and statement of future intentions would be helpful. Those who wish to read more deeply would choose to do so, having grasped the elements at the start.	Encompassed within Objective 6 Encompassed in the process of all statutory function as described in the main strategy and Water Framework Directive GN Outside of remit of FRM team See Glossary Please refer to the Planning and Development GN Signposts towards the websites and guidance of the water companies Incorporated a contents page for easy reading.
Do you disagree with the layout and format?	Anonymous Comments				I'm a little unsure of the layout. I agree with the content (apart from the repetition) but I think the whole document could be re-organised to flow better.	Members approved the current layout.
Do you have any additional comments?	Countryside Services			19	FRM needs more info about the DCC canals in order to effectively comment.	Section reduced
			Strategy Part 2	37	Does flood team have sufficient understanding of the canals to react to a flooding query?	The team would consult Emergency Planning and Countryside
	Woodland Trust				Woodland Trust welcomes the references on page 26 and 27 of Part 2 of the Strategy to the advantage of a catchment based approach and the role which trees and woodland can play in helping to alleviate certain types of flooding. There is a considerable amount of research and literature available on this subject and we would like to see it given more emphasis in your strategy **lots of links in comment to literature**	More detail available in Environmental Best Practice GN
	Anonymous Comments		objectives 2.3.2 (Set a policy for culverting and continue to encourage deculverting) and 2.2.5 (Encourage and promote retrofit SuDS to manage flood risk where opportunities exist).		Given that the issue of flooding is cumulative it would have been useful to see some escalation mechanism for finance and resources which would need to be commensurate to the flooding events. Both of these objectives seem to be opportunistic in nature. Given the number of planning proposals currently being progressed by the development industry (encouraged by the NPPF that requires LPAs to boost significantly the supply of housing) it may be worth assigning these actions a higher status as many of the sites which will deliver growth for the remainder of the plan period (i.e. the next 15 years or so) will be determined in the short term.	The GN for Funding hopefully covers this in more detail Culvert policy currently awaiting cabinet approval
			General		A contents page Overall - the strategy covers the requirements as outlined in the Flood & Water Management Act 2010 apart from costs and benefits.	Included Costs are now identified within objectives/actions

Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation Responses

General Feedback

Number	Organisation	Date Received	Section	Page	Comments	DCC Response
1	Yorkshire Water				Good clarity is provided for the audience in terms of which authority is responsible for what element of flooding and who/how to contact. Ensure that YW are considered when creating any mitigation type 'flood guides' (e.g. any hotspots where it would be useful to share pumps etc.) for flood prone areas which are impacted by both sewers and surface water	Contact details provided on the back of Parts 1 and 2. Incorporated into objective 1 (1.5.5)
2	DCC Policy and Monitoring		Strategy Part 2- Local Objective 6	13	Local landscape character, which is also part of the natural environment, is not included in this objective. Recommended that the following is included as an additional key action: 'To support the County Council's aim and objectives to protect and enhance the landscape character of the county'. In the actions needed to achieve the overriding objective / key action number 1, the following point is recommended for inclusion as action 6.1.7: 'Continue to work on an inter-disciplinary basis with County Council teams to ensure that, where possible, projects and schemes for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) protect and enhance the landscape character of the county'.	Incorporated into objective 6
			Strategy Part 2- Section 19	26	There is a need to ensure that, where possible, the design of SuDS is appropriate to the local landscape character. In a free draining landscape, such as the 'White Peak', an open body of water may not be appropriate as part of a SuDS scheme, whilst it would be appropriate in the Trent Valley Washlands. Details of appropriate approaches to SuDS schemes in relation to landscape character could subsequently form part of a more detailed design guidance. Fully support this section land management practices listed on page 27 enhance the Riverside Meadows and Moorlands which are distinct landscape character types in Derbyshire.	To be incorporated into the Local Guidance Feedback welcomed and acknowledged
3	Matlock Town Council	06/03/2015			Consideration should be given to provide a single contact number where assistance and advice will be given to a member of the public without have to ascertain which agency/department/authority the liability falls on.	DCC agree with the comment and will try to accommodate this where possible, however due to the varying responsible agents for different flooding sources it is important that flooding is reported to the correct body. For example sewer flooding would need to be reported directly to the water company for data protection reasons. DCC are unable to report directly to the water company. It is also important to report this so that the flooding is recorded and can help towards informing future investment.
4	Horsley Parish Council				In a flood plain area planning applications should not be approved due to the obvious flood risks.	DCC statutory consultee role and the LPAs are explained within the Strategy and the Planning and Development GN
5	DCC- Archaeologist				Add my support for the inclusion of a specific objective on the historic environment. This is an important issue across the county but particularly in regard to the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site and it is vital that historic feature are protected and managed.	Incorporated into Objective 6
6	Local Resilience Forum		General Praise		Breaking up the strategy into three distinct areas with incremental increases in detail is effective. Clearly strong intent to ensure the strategy is user friendly to the public, with Part 1 acting as a very clear guide to understanding local flood risk and where responsibilities lie amongst Risk Management Authorities	Feedback welcomed and acknowledged Feedback welcomed and acknowledged
			Strategy Part 1		Consider giving more prominence (before Figure 1) as to the County Council being a lead Local Flood Authority – LLFA and what this role entails. Reminding residents and particularly riparian owners of their own responsibilities is positive and is a message that the LRF strongly supports.	Explained on Part 2 of the LFRMS Feedback welcomed and acknowledged
			Strategy Part 2		Your reference to "Derbyshire Prepared" as a source of information is welcome, it should be clear that this is a website of the Local Resilience Forum. This may then require cross referencing to Part 2 or guidance notes explaining the role of the LRF. The LRF is broadly supportive of your 6 key objectives, however, considering the strong inclination towards building flood resilience within the strategy, this should be emphasised within the objectives. Enhance local objective 5 to incorporate community resilience and preparedness – this would then allow for a link to national objective 2 – working together in managing flood risk. Figure 12 is an accurate depiction of local partnership arrangements. Guidance notes related to flood responses and emergency planning would be welcomed to ensure that the public have an accurate and realistic perception of flood response. Public Health England and the Environment Agency, Category 1 Responders within the LRF have recently prepared a useful set of Flooding Advice documents which should be signposted from the Strategy at some point. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/401980/flood_leaflet_2015_final.pdf	Built into flood response policy Built strongly into objectives 1, 3 and 4 Amended Feedback welcomed and acknowledged To be built into the Flood Response Policy Incorporated in to Part 1 Incorporated in to Part 1
7	STW	12/03/2015		6	In reference to sewer flooding and water companies how does a customer determine which water company to call? Include PDaS explanation and hyperlink What about clean water supply?	Made reference to water bill Level of detail too deep Level of detail too deep
				10	Make reference to PDaS and include information about fats and oils and different types of flooding - hydraulic and flooding from other sources.	Level of detail too deep - included links to their website and guidance
				22	reference PDaS in the glossary and a definition of hydraulic flooding from sewers.	Level of detail too deep
8	Member of the Public	21/02/2015			"Flooding will continue to get worse as long as the planners pass thousands of new buildings with associated concrete and paving"	DCC statutory consultee role and the LPAs are explained within the Strategy and the Planning and Development GN
9	EA Nottingham	26/03/2015	Strategy Part 1	8 13 14&15 17 General	Mention of the roles of wardens under the Town and Parish councils? EA off an interactive individual property flood plan http://apps.environment-agency.gov.uk/flood/151256.aspx EA have worked to educate people to not wait for a severe flood warning so please consider changing the icon on this page. Lend advice as to how residents may prove their home is at a lower risk - EA offer a flood risk report. In the 'to find out' box list flood warden scheme in addition to the flood action group. Include a list of main rivers in the county as an appendix?	Mentioned in Part 1 and Community Level Initiatives GN Guidance in Before, During and After a Flood Event GN Guidance in Before, During and After a Flood Event GN Left for guidance only and signposted for website Signposted to guidance Signposted to guidance Level of detail too high
			Strategy Part 2	General	A few typos towards the end.	Amended
10	EA Yorkshire		General		The 8m standoff zone for development to watercourses will be difficult to deal with on a practical level. Recommend an easement of 3 metres for watercourses less than 2m width, and 4.5m easement (i.e. vehicle width) for beck/streams over 2m width. If there are culverts then recommend 3 metres or greater to ensure no loading in the 45 degree zone from invert.	Considered for future work

Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation Responses

General Feedback

Number	Organisation	Date Received	Section	Page	Comments	DCC Response
					SY Interim Local Standards for SuDs that our South Yorkshire LLFAs are working on (Ashley is working on this with them as well) I think this could be a good supporting document for your LPAs, though I think they might need some reference to it in their planning documentation somewhere.	Will be incorporated into the Local Standards
11	Countryside		Strategy Part 1	page 19	<p>This is a weighty set of documents, even Part 1 which is the most straightforward of the set, can be difficult to follow, I do feel that land and home owners may struggle to find the key messages and information they need.</p> <p>The document suggests that all watercourses are either Ordinary or Designated but I understand that canals are neither of these, I have made an attempt at some explanatory text that you might consider including ... (sheet 3)</p> <p>The tone of the document suggests that only Highways assets are listed, but after talking to you I realise that this is not true. However I still have some concern that some assets owned and maintained by the Countryside Service may not be there.</p> <p>I feel strongly that FRM needs more information about canals, waterways and reservoirs owned and maintained by DCC Countryside Service to effectively comment on planning applications. Also it would be useful for you to note that Derbyshire County Council's adopted Waterways Strategy includes actions to investigate support for SUDS and storing and holding water. Similar comment also regarding providing response, in that more information about the land and water assets that the Countryside Service manages and risk modelling may be required. We would very much welcome opportunity to contribute to the development of the Response Policy.</p>	<p>Tried to make the document as clear as possible. Amendments have been made to enhance this</p> <p>Canals are navigable waterbodies and the public are signposted towards the relevant organisation for more details</p> <p>Comments acknowledged</p>
			GN: Funding	Page 6	<p>The development of an informal Water Interest Group may be an effective way of building up our understanding of each team's duties and aims, perhaps even to identify some projects with mutual benefit to the Flood Risk Management, Climate Change and Waterways Strategy objectives?</p> <p>Note that parts of north-east Derbyshire are also within the Sheffield City region LEP.</p> <p>the authority may need to pay greater attention to groundwater levels as a result of the withdrawal of mine water pumps and I talked a little about leaks and flood events on DCC canals. We acknowledge that in flood terms the probability of a major event from either of these is low, however, when it does occur the impact may be high</p>	<p>Team to develop closer links with the canal team</p> <p>Team to develop closer links with the canal team</p> <p>To be incorporated into any future bids</p> <p>Incorporated in Objective 1.3.9</p>