



AGENDA

FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Monday, 25th October, 2010, at 2.00 pm

Ask for: **Andrew Tait**

**Medway Room, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone**

Telephone **01622 694942**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 before the start of the meeting in the meeting room

Membership

Conservative (6): Mr R E King (Chairman), Mr A H T Bowles, Mr D L Brazier,
Mr M J Harrison, Mr W L Richardson, Mrs P A V Stockell
Liberal Democrat (1): Mr M J Vye

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

- 1 Substitutes
- 2 Declarations of Members' Interest relating to items on today's agenda
- 3 Minutes of the meeting on 29 July 2010 (Pages 1 - 4)
- 4 Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) (Pages 5 - 8)
- 5 Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (Pages 9 - 16)
- 6 Dates of future meetings
- 7 Other Items which the Chairman decides are Urgent

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership
(01622) 694002
Friday, 15 October 2010

This page is intentionally left blank

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Flood Risk Management Committee held in the Swale 3, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 29 July 2010.

PRESENT: Mr R E King (Chairman), Mr D L Brazier, Miss S J Carey (Substitute for Mr W L Richardson), Mr A D Crowther (Substitute for Mr A H T Bowles) and Mr M J Harrison

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs E Milne (Team Leader Natural Environment & Coast), Mr M Tant (Flood Risk Management Officer), Mr D Cloake (Head of Emergency Planning) and Mr A Tait (Democratic Services Officer)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Ms D Silva-Parker and Mr B Luck

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**16. Minutes of the meeting on 28 May 2010**

(Item 3)

RESOLVED that subject to the amendment of "Pitt 10 Group" to "Pitt Severe Weather Group" in Minute 14 (5), the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2010 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

17. Overview of Regional Flood Defence Committees - Oral presentation by the Environment Agency

(Item 4)

(1) Ms de Silva-Parker said that the Southern Regional Flood Defence Committee (RFDC) covered the Counties of Kent, East Sussex, West Sussex, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. It consisted of elected Members drawn from the Local Authorities and appointees from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. The elected could serve two four-year terms whilst the DEFRA appointees served for 3 years. The RFDC meetings were held in Worthing.

(2) The RFDC performed three roles. These were: overseeing the Region's capital schemes and works (including their maintenance and improvements as well as their accompanying flood warning arrangements); raising local levies for flood defence and warnings; and overseeing the work of the 8 Internal Drainage Boards.

(3) Ms de Silva-Parker continued by informing the Committee that the Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) had now gone into statute, although it had not yet commenced. The time line and scope of the Act was not yet known, although the previous Government had intended that it should take effect in April 2014. Secondary legislation would need to be enacted before this happened.

(4) Ms de Silva-Parker then explained that one of the effects of the FWMA was to extend the remit of the RFDCs. These would now become Regional Flood and Coastal Committees and be given greater powers to scrutinise the work of lead local

flood authorities in relation to local flooding and whether they met the requirements of the Flood Risk Regulations which had come into being in 2009.

(5) Ms de Silva-Parker concluded her presentation by outlining its implications for the Flood Risk Management Committee. She said that it would need to agree the Flooding Plan Documents prior to publication by the Environment Agency. It would also need to agree a future work programme once the timetable for the Act had been released.

(6) In response to a question from the Chairman, Ms de Silva-Parker said that the other Counties in the Region were still at the scoping stage in the light of emerging Guidance from DEFRA and the Department for Communities and Local Government. She confirmed that Medway Council had also been contacted. She also said that all 9 Lead Authorities in Kent were interested in working in partnership and that the Act enabled them to share resources and delegate powers to one another.

(7) Ms de Silva-Parker replied to a question from Mrs Carey by saying that Flooding would continue to play a major role in the new Environment Agency strategy (which was set out in the website and had taken account of anticipated Government cuts). Savings would be made by merging the Southern and Thames Regions. The regional Office would be in Reading and there would be four Area Offices in Maidstone, Worthing, Wallingford and North London/Essex.

(8) RESOLVED that the content be noted and Ms de Silva-Parker thanked for her presentation.

18. Flood Risk and Water Resource Management - Oral presentation by Barry Luck: Southern Water

(Item 5)

(1) Mr Barry Luck said that he had worked for Southern Water for 30 years and that his role related to its strategic responsibilities including flood alleviation, flood risk management, sustainable drainage and private sewer transfer.

(2) Mr Luck said that the primary legislation for water companies had been set out in the 1991 Water Industry Act. It had been supplemented by the 2003 Water Act, the 2009 Flood Risk Regulations (which encompassed the EU Flood Directive) and the 2010 Flood and Water Management Act. These Acts were reinforced by various Regulations and regulatory processes.

(3) In terms of flood alleviation, Southern Water had (following its periodic price review) set aside some £1.8 billion for its Investment Plan in the period 2010–2015 for environmental improvement work, which included flood alleviation in the Southern Region. The identification of individual schemes was driven by cost-benefit issues. Water Companies were not allowed to consider the value of a property, so the driving factor was the willingness to pay (as identified in Southern Water's "Willingness to Pay" survey). The water regulator, "Ofwat" normally only permitted funding for a scheme where the benefits were higher than the costs.

(4) Mr Luck then said that Southern Water had developed its flood database which enabled it to compile a register of external and internal flooding incidents and to measure the frequency with which they occurred.

(5) Southern Water placed a greater emphasis on mitigation measures (such as raising airbricks or air-tight doors) rather than on the causes. Currently there were 27 schemes within the Region of which 14 were in Kent.

(6) Mr Luck then addressed the issue of private sewer transfer (for foul/ waste water). He clarified that for the purposes of this topic, a “drain” was a pipeline that served a single property whereas a “sewer” served two or more. Since the Public Health Act had been enacted in 1937, drains and sewers were only public if they were already in place or had been laid or adopted by a sewerage undertaker.

(7) The Water Act 2003 made provision for all private drains and laterals (cross pipes outside the cartilage of any property that connected to the main system) to transfer into public ownership. This provision had not yet been enabled as consideration was still being given to the most effective means of transfer. The Water Companies favoured a single overnight transfer option with a clear appeals procedure for anyone who did not wish this to happen. The most likely implementation date was October 2011 and the cost would be spread across all paying customers.

(8) Once transfer had taken place, all new developments in the region would require adoption of drains, sewers and laterals by Southern Water.

(9) In terms of flooding, Mr Luck said that Southern Water would need to help the lead Flood Authorities to develop their Flood Risk Management Strategies. These would entail flood risk assessments, plans to deal with significant flooding, hazard and risk maps and management plans.

(10) Mr Luck then turned to the topic of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) (for surface water). He informed the Committee that the 2010 Flood and Water Management Act had amended the previous “right to connect to surface water” to enable people to insist upon sustainable surface water drainage systems. It was currently intended that KCC would be the SUDS approval body for the County with the water Companies acting as statutory consultees.

(11) The Committee asked to receive a further report at its next meeting on the implications for the County Council of the proposed SUDS approval function. At the suggestion of the Flood Risk Management Officer it was agreed that this should be incorporated within a presentation on the burdens imposed on local authorities by the Flood and Water Management Act.

(12) In response to a written question from Mr Vye, Mr Luck said that Southern Water would continue to give its attention to flooding issues in local parishes even if staff moved on.

(13) RESOLVED that the content of the presentation be noted and Mr Luck thanked for his presentation.

19. Future meetings

(Item 6)

The Committee agreed provisionally that it would meet on Monday, 25 October 2010 and that Kent Fire and Rescue and Kent Police would be asked if they could host the field trip on Wednesday, 27 October (all day).

By: Max Tant, Flood Risk Management Officer

To: Floods and Water Resources Committee

Subject: Sustainable Drainage Systems

Classification: Unrestricted

1. Introduction

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS, sometimes SuDS)¹ are surface water management practices and flow controls designed to manage runoff from rainwater in a manner similar to natural processes. These techniques reduce the likelihood of flash flooding and result in greatly improved water quality.

At their crudest SUDS simply discharge water at the same rate as it would discharge from natural land, this rate is known as greenfield runoff, which requires storage for the excess water and a flow control device to limit the discharge.

Ideally, though, SUDS, would use more natural processes to store and discharge water, for instance ponds, wetlands and areas of green space. These SUDS also provide water quality benefits by filtering sediments and contaminants, amenities for the local environment and ecological habitats.

SUDS are not used for sewage or grey water (although there are sustainable means of managing these).

2. Rationale

SUDS aim to reduce the negative impacts that arise from the conventional management of surface water. Traditional drainage is designed to move rainwater as rapidly as possible from the point at which it has fallen to a discharge point, either a watercourse or soakaway.

This approach has a number of harmful effects:

- Run-off from hard paving and roofing can increase the risk of flooding downstream, as well as causing sudden rises in water levels and flow rates in watercourses.
- Many conventional drainage systems discharge into sewers that eventually flow into a combined sewer. These rarely have capacity to carry flows from the whole catchment in extreme events. Overflows from these sewers carry sewage, causing a public health issue.
- Surface water run-off can contain contaminants such as oil, organic matter and toxic metals. Although often at low levels, cumulatively they can result in poor water quality in rivers and groundwater, affecting biodiversity, amenity value and potential water abstraction. After heavy rain, the first flush is often highly polluting.
- By diverting rainfall to piped systems, water is stopped from soaking into the ground, depleting ground water and reducing flows in watercourses in dry weather.

As a result, many urban watercourses are lifeless and unattractive, and are often hidden in culverts under the ground, whilst the areas around them are prone to flash flooding without warning.

¹ The U does not stand for Urban and it can still be capitalised.

3. SUDS Techniques

3.1. Source control

Source control techniques aim to absorb or intercept rainwater runoff at or very near to its source, thus preventing runoff from passing down stream. These techniques include:

- Green or brown roofs – roofs with soil (that may be relatively thin) which absorb rain water that is evaporated later.
- Unpaved areas – not using impermeable surfaces or discharging runoff from impermeable surfaces to unpaved areas.
- Rainwater harvesting – roof water is intercepted and stored in tanks for use in domestic or commercial processes.

3.2. Filter Strips and Swales

Filter strips and swales are vegetated surface features that drain water evenly off impermeable areas. Both devices mimic natural drainage patterns by allowing rainwater to run in sheets through vegetation, slowing and filtering the flow.

Swales are these are long shallow ditches that can be designed for a combination of conveyance, infiltration, detention and treatment of runoff.

Filter strips are gently sloping areas of ground that can be used for conveyance, infiltration and treatment.

Excess water from these features will usually be conveyed to one of the following features.

3.3. Permeable surfaces

Permeable surfaces allow water to filter through them to a storage medium below or where the surface needs to be impermeable (for traffic loading reasons) it can runoff to a filter drain alongside the surface.

The water is stored in a volume of permeable material below the surface, it may infiltrate to the ground below or discharge to a local watercourse or sewer at an appropriate rate.

3.4. Infiltration

Infiltration techniques collect water and use the natural properties of the local soil to discharge the water as it would if it had fallen on undeveloped land. Infiltration can be utilised by many drainage features:

- Soakaways – these are similar to conventional soakaways but include filtration material to improve water quality
- Basins – these are landscaped areas that fill with rain and slowly discharge until they are dry.
- Ponds – these are similar to basins but always contain some water for ecological or amenity purposes, they need to be designed appropriately to prevent them from drying.
- Underground storage – this may either be via oversized pipes that are perforated or stormcells (similar to milk crates) that receive water.

The water may be collected by conventional pipes that discharge to one of these features or it may be collected by swales that themselves have infiltration potential and the excess is discharged to these.

3.5. Attenuation

Where infiltration is not possible water can be stored and discharged at an appropriate rate either into a local watercourse or to a sewer. Attenuation features take the same basic forms as infiltration techniques (except for soakaways) but rely on a surface feature to receive the discharge.

Background documents

CIRIA SUDS Manual

Author contact details

Max Tant, Flood Risk Management Officer, Natural Environment & Coast Team, EHW
max.tant@kent.gov.uk 01622 221691

Kent Flood Partnership Partners and Terms of Reference

Kent County Council
Medway Council
Environment Agency
Southern Water
Thames Water
Medway IDB
River Stour IDB
Romney Marshes IDB
Ashford Borough Council
Canterbury City Council
Dartford Borough Council
Dover District Council
Gravesham Borough Council
Maidstone Borough Council
Sevenoaks District Council
Sevenoaks District Council
Shepway District Council
Swale Borough Council
Thanet District Council
Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
Tunbridge Wells District Council
Kent Highways Services
KCC Emergency Planning

By: Max Tant, Flood Risk Management Officer

To: Floods and Water Resources Committee

Subject: Floods and Water Management Act

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary:

The Floods and Water Management Act 2010 and the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 create Lead Local Flood Authorities at Unitary or County Council level. Lead Local Flood Authorities are required to lead the strategic management of local flood risk (arising from surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses) and to approve and adopt Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Kent county is at significant risk of local flooding and these new powers place a substantial burden on KCC to manage these risks.

1. Introduction

The Flood and Water Management Act (the Act) received Royal Assent on 8 April 2010. The Act is intended to provide more comprehensive management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses. It will also help tackle longstanding issues in the water industry.

The flood risk management aspects of the Act are in response to the Pitt Review of the 2007 floods. The Act promotes cooperation and information sharing and creates clearer roles and responsibilities for flood risk management. This includes the creation of Lead Local Flood Authorities at unitary or county council level to lead on local flood risk.

The Flood Risk Regulations (the Regulations) transpose the EU Floods Directive into UK Law. They require Lead Local Flood Authorities to prepare maps of flood risk and hazard and produce mitigation strategies for areas identified at significant risk from local flood risk. There are three phases to the Regulations, the first is a screening exercise to identify areas at risk.

An outline of the new flood risk management responsibilities for KCC arising from the Act and Regulations are outlined below.

2. Overview of the Act and Regulations

2.1 Lead Local Flood Authority

The Act defines the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) as the unitary authority or county council. Kent County Council is the LLFA for Kent, Medway Council is the LLFA for Medway. LLFAs are responsible for local flood risks, defined as flood risk from surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses¹.

2.2 Development of local partnerships

¹ Ordinary watercourses include all remaining watercourses that are not main rivers, including tributaries, streams, ditches, drains, cut, dyke, sluice and non-public sewers.

The Act enables the development of local partnerships to be formed between the LLFA and Risk Management Authorities (RMAs), defined as the Environment Agency, district councils, internal drainage boards, highways authorities and water companies. The Act does not stipulate the form these arrangements should take, it is for KCC to develop a suitable partnership format.

The Act requires the relevant authorities to co-operate with each other and also empowers the LLFA (or the Environment Agency) to acquire information from others that may be needed for their flood and coastal erosion risk management functions.

2.3 Flood risk management strategy

The Environment Agency will be required to develop a national strategy for the management of coastal erosion and all sources of flood risk for England.

The Act also requires the LLFA to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management. The LLFA will be responsible for ensuring the local strategy is put in place but it will be developed in agreement with relevant local partners. The Act sets out the minimum that a local strategy must contain:

- The risk management authorities in the relevant area.
- The flood and coastal erosion risk management functions that may be exercised by those authorities in relation to the area.
- The objectives for managing local flood risk and the measures proposed to achieve those objectives.
- How and when the measures are expected to be implemented.
- The costs and benefits of those measures, and how they are to be paid for.
- The assessment of local flood risk for the purpose of the strategy.
- How and when the strategy is to be reviewed.
- How the strategy contributes to the achievement of wider environmental objectives.

The strategy must be consistent with the national flood and coastal erosion risk management strategy for England and the LLFA must consult with the RMAs that may be affected by the strategy and the public.

The local strategy will be the key means to harness all flood risk management powers and create coherent policy for the RMAs in Kent, delivering much needed strategic and coordinated planning in surface water management across the county.

2.4 Duty to investigate and to maintain a register

The LLFA will be required to investigate flooding incidents (where other flood risk management authorities do not respond) to identify which authorities have responsibility to deal with the flood and whether each of them intends to respond. They will also be required to maintain a register of structures or features which they consider to have a significant effect on flood risk in their area, at a minimum recording ownership and state of repair.

The Act also provides powers to designate structures and features that affect flooding or coastal erosion. Once designated, the owner must seek consent from the LLFA to alter, remove or replace.

2.5 Additional powers

LLFAs will take over the Environment Agency's role in deciding whether to permit works by third parties that may affect water flows on ordinary watercourses outside of Internal

Drainage Districts². LLFAs will also be required to ensure that all works by watercourses they are responsible for have the appropriate consent and that consented works are constructed according to the agreed design.

The Act also provides the LLFA with powers to do works themselves to manage flood risk from surface runoff and groundwater and to undertake maintenance. All works must be consistent with the local flood risk management strategy for the area.

2.6 Sustainable drainage systems (SUDS)

The Act places a duty on LLFA to approve, adopt and maintain Sustainable Drainage Systems³ (SUDS). The LLFA is required to establish a SUDS Approval Board to approve all developments that have drainage implications. If the drainage is sustainable, serves more than one property and is approved, the SUDS Approval Board must adopt it.

The approval process will run parallel with any planning application that may also be required for the development and development may not commence without drainage approval from the SUDS Approval Board.

2.7 Flood Risk Regulations

The Regulations require LLFAs to identify areas of significant risk from local flooding, to prepare maps of risk and hazard for these areas and to prepare a strategy for mitigating the risks in these areas. There are three key dates for delivery of each phase:

- Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) – June 2011
- Risk and hazard maps – June 2013
- Strategy – June 2015

LLFA outputs from these stages are reported to the Environment Agency, who add their reports for fluvial and coastal flooding and report to the EU. As this is tied to EU legislation, once areas are defined we are obliged to complete the subsequent stages for these identified areas.

2.8 Review and Scrutiny

LLFAs have a responsibility to review and scrutinise the exercise of flood and coastal risk management functions undertaken by all RMAs in Kent to ensure that they are undertaking their responsibilities and acting in accordance with the local strategy.

3. Implications for Kent County Council

3.1 Scale of issues

Kent county has the highest risk from surface water flooding of all LLFAs in England. The latest available estimates put the number of homes at risk at approximately 64,000 ahead of Hampshire county, with approximately 61,000. This figure excludes commercial premises, roads and other infrastructure and flooding from groundwater and ordinary watercourses.

Additionally, over the past three years there has been an average of approximately 4,500 minor and major planning applications in Kent. Once the Act is fully commenced these would all be subject to drainage approval by the SUDS Approval Board, as well as a number of permitted developments (for instance patios).

3.2 Resources required

² An area of special drainage need managed by an Internal Drainage Board.

³ Management practices and flow controls designed to drain surface water in a fashion more similar to natural runoff processes than conventional piped techniques

The task for KCC as the LLFA to undertake these new roles is substantial and as they are new functions there is limited existing expertise within the Council currently. KCC will need to acquire staff with experience in drainage engineering in order to fulfil its land drainage and SUDS responsibilities. Junior engineers and technicians will be required to help prepare maps and strategies for mitigation plans and measures. Mapping technology and resources will be required to manage these plans and the register of assets.

A key function will be the coordination of our new roles with all partners. Our responsibilities have implications for spatial planning, development control, highway maintenance and other RMA's functions. KCC now has a role to coordinate these functions to ensure that the local strategy is acceptable to all partners and is implemented coherently throughout the county.

Work is required to understand how best to provide these new responsibilities and how they will coordinate with the existing functions that they impact upon. Similarly, other RMAs have resources that could be used to meet our resource gaps. Work is required to establish appropriate protocols and the cost/benefit of the alternative means of delivering these functions, potentially in partnership with RMAs.

3.3 Member engagement

Many other RMAs are concerned about the implications for them of these new powers and their members have expressed an interest in wider engagement on these issues. A forum for members of other RMAs to keep abreast of our work in this area would be expedient.

4. Progress

The first parts of the Act commenced on 1 October 2010. These include new definitions, the requirement to develop national and local flood risk management strategies and amendments to sewer adoption processes. Currently, Defra anticipate that the remainder of the Act will commence in April 2011. The exception is the SUDS section for which there is no clear timetable for implementation (anticipated no earlier than late 2011).

In May 2010, KCC appointed a Flood Risk Management Officer to coordinate the implementation of the Act and Regulations. Below is a summary of progress that KCC have made to date in implementing the Act and Regulations:

- KCC have established a Floods and Water Resources member's committee to provide a scrutiny role in Kent;
- KCC have convened the Kent Flood Partnership, a partnership chaired jointly by KCC and Medway Council with all RMAs in Kent, and drafted terms of reference (appendix 1 contains a list of partners and draft Partnership TOR);
- KCC have commenced data collection for the PFRA;
- KCC have been liaising with all risk management authorities to explain the implications of the Act and to establish working relationships; and
- KCC have been undertaking a Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Dover.
- Commenced an assessment of KCC's capacity needs for implementing the Act and Regulations responsibilities.

Below is a summary of future progress that will need to be made:

- Provide a forum for the members of other RMAs to engage with our work(eg Districts and IDBs) – to be completed by Spring 2011;
- Review draft PFRA from EA, compare with data gathered and consult with partners on areas of significant risk – to be completed by Spring 2011;
- Continue the Kent Flood Partnership to agree appropriate ways to implement the new responsibilities – this task is ongoing;

- Undertake an assessment of resources with Kent County, including Risk Management Authorities, to understand how we can work together to provide these services the most efficiently – to be completed by Spring 2011;
- Establish a SUDS Approval Board, including agreeing guidance and protocols for the design and construction of SUDS and appropriate mechanisms to provide guidance and approval to all stakeholders – completion of this task is dependant on commencement of these parts of the Act likely to be before the end of 2012; and
- Review Defra guidance as it is published and implement it as appropriate – this task is ongoing.

5. Funding

Funding for the full implementation of the Act is still being determined by Defra. The SUDS functions will be funded separately through application, inspection and adoption fees; the Minister is currently consulting on the mechanisms for funding SUDS and the appropriate fees. The other additional burdens will be met by Defra, funding for which will be announced after the spending review.

To date we have received £100,000 to undertake the Dover SWMP and £30,000 to undertake the PFRA.

We are currently assessing what resources are required to implement the Act and are in communication with Defra and the CLG to ensure that these new burdens are fully met by central government.

6. Recommendations

The committee should consider how members from other bodies might engage with this committee.

The committee to receive subsequent report once capacity assessment is complete and the allocation of funding for flood management in Kent is confirmed by central government.

The committee to approve and recommend the PFRA to cabinet once it has been drafted.

Background documents

The Floods and Water Management Act -

http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/29/pdfs/ukpga_20100029_en.pdf

The Floods and Water Management Act explanatory notes -

http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/29/pdfs/ukpgaen_20100029_en.pdf

The Flood Risk Regulations - <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2009/3042/contents/made>

What does the Flood and Water Management Act mean for Local Authorities, Defra -

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/flooding/documents/policy/fwmb/fwma-lafactsheet.pdf>

Author contact details

Max Tant, Flood Risk Management Officer, Natural Environment & Coast Team, EHW

max.tant@kent.gov.uk 01622 221691

Kent Flood Partnership Partners and Terms of Reference

Kent County Council

Medway Council

Environment Agency

Southern Water

Thames Water

Medway IDB

River Stour IDB

Romney Marshes IDB

Ashford Borough Council

Canterbury City Council

Dartford Borough Council

Dover District Council

Gravesham Borough Council

Maidstone Borough Council

Sevenoaks District Council

Sevenoaks District Council

Shepway District Council

Swale Borough Council

Thanet District Council

Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council

Tunbridge Wells District Council

Kent Highways Services

KCC Emergency Planning

KENT FLOOD PARTNERSHIP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Objectives

1. This Partnership has been developed to provide the Kent response to the Floods and Water Management Act, the Flood Risk Regulations and ensure that flood risk management strategy development and delivery in Kent is coordinated and integrated
2. The Partnership's primary purpose, therefore, is to ensure that effective flood risk management and resilience is built into service delivery in a manner which delivers better protection from flood risk for the County's communities and key infrastructure.
3. The Partnership's key activities will involve providing a single voice on Kent's flood risk management matters at a local, regional and national level; providing the key point of contact for local authority scrutiny; and providing strategic oversight of all flood risk and drainage matters in the County.

Aims

4. Funding and skills – to identify new funding opportunities, more cost effective methods of joint working and ensure that the core skills, competencies and resources are safeguarded;
5. Lobbying – to provide a unified voice on flood risk and drainage matters on national policy and funding matters;
6. Awareness – to ensure that the general public is aware of the flood risk responsibilities and that partner organisations are familiar with their respective roles, responsibilities and duties and that work programmes are aligned accordingly;
7. Oversight – to receive reports on and provide a strategic input and direction to the development of plans, policies and programmes of works developed to manage flood risk in the County;
8. Conflict Resolution – addressing specific issues affecting delivery or collaborative working as and when they arise;
9. Reporting - to assist in the reporting of flood risk management activity and programmes to respective Partners' Oversight and Scrutiny committees (or equivalent);
10. Delivery – to establish working groups as appropriate to deliver flood risk management measures and provide advice to Local Planning Authorities, developers and other bodies as needed. As a body representing all Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) in the area, the Partnership will identify strategic priorities and risks and opportunities for funding.
11. Communication – to promote activities engaging and educating the public on flood risk issues, including the responsibilities of landowners and tenants in flood risk management.

Membership and frequency of meetings

The Partnership's members will be drawn from the RMAs (as defined in the Flood and Water Management Act) in Kent and neighbouring areas and be of appropriate seniority to represent the RMA on such matters (for Local Authorities this will be Assistant Director level or higher). Meetings should take place between every 4 – 6 months.

This page is intentionally left blank