KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

KENT FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent Flood Risk Management Committee held in the Council Chamber - Sessions House on Monday, 11 March 2019.

PRESENT: Mr A R Hills (Chairman), Mr A H T Bowles, Mrs L Hurst, Mr P W A Lake, Ida Linfield (Substitute for Mr I S Chittenden), Mr H Rayner, Mr R J Thomas (Substitute for Mr K Pugh), Mrs R Doyle (Canterbury CC), Mr D Mortimer (Maidstone BC), Mr J Scholey (Sevenoaks DC), Mr G Lewin (Swale BC), Mrs C Mackonochie (Tunbridge Wells BC), Mrs G Brown (KALC) and Mr C Mackonochie (KALC)

ALSO PRESENT: Ms S Hamilton, Mrs P A V Stockell and Mrs L Wright (Thanet DC)

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Tant (Flood and Water Manager), Mr T Harwood (Resilience and Emergency Planning Manager) and Mr A Tait (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Minutes of the meeting on 12 November 2018
(Item 3)

RESOLVED that subject to the deletion of "container" in Minute 17 (18), the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2018 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

2. Climate Change Impacts Forecast (UKPC 18) - Presentation by Mark Rogers, Met Office Advisor Civil Contingencies
(Item 4)

(1) Mr Mark Rogers from the Met Office gave a presentation. The accompanying slides are contained within the electronic agenda papers on the KCC website.

(2) Mr Rogers said that the UK Climate projections (UKPC) had been launched at the end of 2018 using the most recent scientific evidence to provide a comprehensive analysis of how the climate in the UK could change by the end of the 21st Century. This document updated its predecessor which had been published in 2009. The work had been led by DEFRA with the Environment Agency and the Met Office as delivery partners. The purpose of this work was to help inform decision-making so that adaptations could be made, and resilience built over the next 50 to 100 years.

(3) Mr Rogers then said that projections were based on the latest developments in climate science, including state-of-the-art global climate models, innovative regional climate models and up to date observational data. They were based on four different "Representative Concentration Pathway" (RCP) levels of greenhouse gas

concentrations. These ranged from RCP 2.6 (which was compatible with the aim of limiting global warming since pre-industrial levels to below 2˚C) to RCP 8.5, which represented the "reasonable worst-case scenario."

(4) Mr Rogers said that overall in the UK, the headline findings were that there would be hotter, drier summers leading to more thunderstorms and torrential downpours. There would be a greater frequency of milder, wetter winters leading to more river flooding. There would also be further rises in sea level around the entire UK coastline, particularly in the South. It was projected that by 2100 there would be a rise of between 29 cm and 115 cm depending on whether there was a low or high emission scenario.

(5) Mr Rogers picked the two periods 2020-39 and 2060-79 for deeper analysis in South East England. The average winter temperatures were most likely to rise by up to 1^{O}C in the 2020-39 period. Depending on RCP levels, there would be an increase of between 1 and 3^{O} between 2060 and 79. Winter precipitation would increase by up to 10% between 2020 and 2039.

(6) Summer temperatures were expected to rise by 1 to 2^{o} between 2020 and 2039 and between 1 to 2^{o} or 3 to 4^{o} between 2060 and 2079 depending on RCP emission scenarios. Precipitation levels would fall by up to 10% between 2020 and 39 and between 10 and 40% from 2016 70 79, again depending on RCP emission scenarios.

(7) Mr Rogers replied to a question from Mrs Doyle by saying that the projections did not take natural phenomena such as volcanoes into account because it could not be predicted if and when they were likely to occur.

(8) In response to a question from Mr Lewin, Mr Rogers said that the modelling for UKPC18 was far better than for UKPC9. In his view, any mis-assessment of the projections within the study were more likely to be on the side of caution than otherwise. The next projections were likely to take place in ten years' time. Meanwhile, the new projections would continue to be monitored.

(9) Mr Scholey asked whether the projections would lead to the Environment Agency altering its flood risk maps. Mr Heeley (Environment Agency) replied that they were awaiting guidance on how to apply the latest figures and would begin updating at that stage.

(10) Mr Tant said that the flood map that was used for planning took no account of climate change. The Environment Agency was preparing guidance which was due to be released later in the year. This would take account of UKPC18. There were, however, situations where there was a statutory need to take climate change into account. UKPC9 would continue to be in use for this purpose for the moment.

(11) Mr Heeley said that Flood Zones 1,2 and 3 within the flood maps were based on present day climatic conditions. The hydrologic and coastal models that had been developed over the previous few years contained scenarios which factored in climate change.

(12) The Chairman said that the current climate models often worked to a 1 in 100 or 200 year risk. It was likely that once the Environment Agency had absorbed the

new projections, they would need to make practical adjustments by, for instance, reviewing whether a 1 in 100-year design continued to be fit for purpose.

(13) Mr Heeley said that the Environment Agency would need to ensure that any projects it brought forward were climate change resilient and that the new data was factored into its project planning when assessing cost benefits.

(14) Mr Mortimer said that some 28 local authorities in the UK were in the process of issuing a climate change emergency policy. As Leader of Maidstone BC he had asked Environmental Officers to look into questions such as emissions and the carbon footprint in the Borough. He asked whether there was any advice that could assist.

(15) Mr Rogers said that everyone should try to do what they could, either as individuals or as a local authority or national government. At the same time, it needed to be understood that emissions had a global impact. This meant that Britain would be as affected as the rest of the World if other countries did not reduce their emissions in the same way as the UK. Locally, the main benefit of emissions reduction was to people's health.

(16) Mr Harwood said that a number of local authority climate change strategies had looked at both mitigation and adaptation. The importance of adaptation was underlined by UKPC18. Spatial and other planning work could be undertaken in terms of making space for water (surface, fluvial and coastal) or by providing tree cover to enable better percolation of water into the ground. It was also increasingly important to safeguard and conserve groundwater resources.

(17) The Chairman said that it would be very useful for the Committee to receive a further update in the near future on how the climate change projections set out in UKPC18 would affect the south east region, including Kent.

(18) RESOLVED that Mr Mark Rogers be thanked for his presentation and that the significance of the climate change projections contained within UKPC18 be noted.

3. Environment Agency - Flood Risk Vision for the future of Kent - Presentation by Frank Heeley, Team Leader, Partnership and Strategic Overview - SE London and North Kent
(Item 5)

(1) Mr Frank Heeley, Environment Agency Partnership and Strategic Overview Team Leader - SE London and North Kent gave a presentation. The accompanying slides are contained within the electronic agenda papers on the KCC website.

(2) Mr Heeley began his presentation by saying that the Environment Agency aimed to work collectively to respond to the challenges faced over the next decades through its ability to manage catchment strategies, taking account of multiple factors and benefits. It also had to consider in detail how these activities could be resourced through partnership funding of projects and schemes.

(3) Mr Heeley then said that the 25-year Environment Plan was an ambitious document put together by DEFRA covering waste, clean water, and the mitigation of climate change effects. One of its targets was the protection of 300,000 homes from flooding by the end of the current funding cycle in March 2021. This target was just over half way to being fulfilled, and a large number of the projects were set to conclude in the last three months of the cycle. This work was supported by the EA's corporate strategy "*Creating a better place*."

(4) The challenges faced included EU exit. The EA was currently manning its Incident Room as part of DEFRA's response. It was ensuring the mitigation of any environmental impacts (such as waste) arising from the use of Manston Airport as an Operation Stack queuing point. This work could potentially take place at the expense of the Environment Plan's priorities. Other challenges were the securement of partnership funding and the need to ensure that the projects were managed to time and cost.

(5) Mr Heeley moved on to give an overview of flood risk in Kent. He said that there were some 60,000 residential and commercial properties at risk of flooding from the rivers and the sea. He clarified that those areas in Kent designated Flood Zone 2 had a flood risk likelihood of 0.1% and that the likelihood for Flood Zone 3 was 1%. These figures would be subject to re-evaluation when the recent amended climate change projections were fully taken into account. An additional factor was that development continued to be permitted in Flood Zone 2 areas.

(6) Mr Heeley went on to provide the Committee with statistical information. He said that the national allocation to the 2019/21 capital programme was £845.7m of which £113.8m was allocated to Kent and South London. He pointed out that this region traditionally received a greater proportion of the national allocation than other regions and that it also had a good track record of delivering its projects. The EA was forecasting that flood risk to a further 21k properties would be reduced over the next two years (7.5k in 2018/19).

(7) Mr Heeley showed the Committee a list of the capital schemes in Kent for the period 2019/21. He drew attention to the two major schemes which were the Hythe Ranges Scheme to protect against a 1 in 200 year scenario and the Lydd Ranges Scheme where the significant part of the capital scheme was the responsibility of the East Kent team. The entry that appeared under this heading on the Kent table related to the shingle replenishment part of this scheme.

(8) Mr Heeley said that in recent years, funding had been allocated on a national basis to those projects that delivered the greatest benefits in terms of outcome measures. The South East received a higher proportion of national funding than other areas because of the high number of beneficiaries and its ability to deliver. Two projects were, however, likely to slip into a future funding period. One of these was in East Peckham which had a significant funding shortfall.

(9) Mr Heeley then said that the partnership model had changed from an "all or nothing" approach to a scheme where no project was unrealisable if sufficient partnership funding was made available. The Environment Agency worked to a strict spreadsheet to identify the funding it could provide, depending on the benefits that could be achieved. This allowed a far more flexible collaborative approach, although

it meant that those schemes with fewer benefits required significant funding from the beneficiaries.

(10) Mr Heeley said that the Environment Agency had been widely praised for the way it worked with Local Authorities and private enterprise in order to bring about a communal approach to flood defences. The East Kent Engineering Partnership, for example, had provided excellent schemes whilst developing value engineering to enable delivery at lower cost.

(11) The Local Authority Capital Programme consisted of four projects (Chatham Waterfront, Hythe to Folkestone Beach Management Replenishment and Recycling, and Hythe to Folkestone Beach Recharge) at a combined cost of nearly £6m.

(12) Mr Heeley moved on to consider future schemes. Some of them such as the Great Stour Flood Alleviation were underfunded for the next two years according to the national allocation. The EA was working with KCC and Canterbury CC to ensure that further work could be carried out in the next six-year programme. The Nailbourne Schemes were purely levy-funded. More information would soon be available to enable an options appraisal.

(13) Mr Heeley said that planned work during the next 6-year capital programme (beginning in 2021) including the Medway Estuary and Swale Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCRM) Strategy had now received approval. Work was also being undertaken in close co-operation with contractors to identify and develop next generation projects. Local Enterprise Partnerships would also be involved in this process.

(14) Mr Heeley then explained that Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) set the strategy for coastal management over the next 100 years. There were four management approaches which had been widely consulted upon within the communities and partnerships. These were “hold the line”, “no active intervention”, “manage realignment” and “advance the line.” The latter option had never been adopted largely because such an approach would run the risk of encroaching upon the natural inter-tidal habitat. A “refresh” was currently underway, designed to make the SMPs more accessible to the public.

(15) Mr Heeley then turned briefly to the question of climate change, which had been widely discussed during the previous item. He said that although total rainfall levels were expected to fall during future summers, the resultant storms would be very intensive and lead to a greater risk of flooding. This could in turn lead to increased costs and funding gaps for the capital programme due to the need to defend to a higher scale.

(16) Mr Heeley concluded his presentation by saying that the Environment Agency had protected a significant number of people during its current programme. In addition, it responded to some 1,000 planning consultations each year. He believed that good strategic planning was the most valuable way of preventing people becoming the victims of flood risk. Catchments needed to be developed in a way that allowed for slower run-off and encourage groundwater percolation to replenish the aquifers. The EA would be investing many of its resources in strategic planning for catchment areas over the next few years. This would involve engagement across communities, infrastructure levies, new modelling and flood mapping. Finally, the EA

had an important role as a Category 1 responder and would continue to encourage people to sign up for flood warnings, particularly in the Medway catchment area and around the Stour, where they also needed to encourage people to become flood wardens and increase flood risk awareness.

(17) Following a question from Mrs Brown, Mr Lake said that he was the Local Member for the Leigh Barrier. He had recently attended a presentation on how raising the barrier was going to work. He was very pleased with the work that was going to be undertaken for Leigh and Hildenborough but had concerns over how this was going to affect areas further up river. He hoped that the same presentation would be delivered in Penshurst so that people could consider the impact of adjusting the height to the new barrier in terms of raised floodwater.

(18) Mr Lake then said that he regretted that there had been no attempt to clear the Eden and Medway rivers of fallen trees and other natural debris. He was also concerned that the EA had stated that there was going to be no attempt to maintain the weirs above the barrier. Once they crumbled away, an awful lot of water would hit the barrier rather than being held back.

(19) Mr Heeley replied to Mr Lake by saying that the EA's Asset Teams made risk assessments of whether there was an immediate danger to properties as a result of not carrying out river maintenance work. This enabled the prioritisation of high risk areas. He offered to seek a response on the specific area in question. The same principle applied to weir maintenance. Although any project was potentially fundable, grant money would only be forthcoming if there was a level of benefit with sufficient partnership funding to merit it.

(20) Mr Lake said that Chafford Weir at Fordcombe had at one time powered a paper mill. The same power could be used again to provide electricity for housing in the locality. He believed that the best approach would be to hold back the water whilst utilsing the power that was coming downstream.

(21) The Chairman suggested that this topic could be considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

(22) Ida Linfield asked what provision there was for clearing waste from motorways in the event of live animal transportation becoming stranded during the Brexit period. She also asked whether flood risk provision in Canterbury only covered the Nailbourne or whether other areas were involved. Mr Heeley replied that animal welfare was the responsibility of DEFRA. The EA was looking to identify sites for the disposal of animals that died on the motorways during the Brexit period. Contingency Plans were in place and the EA was working closely with Strategic Command in Kent to help inform the permitting regulations. There were 16 people working each day to ensure that the environmental implications were managed.

(23) In response to Ida Linfield's second question, Mr Heeley said that the EA was developing a project to protect the Great Stour. This would probably be part of the next pipeline of schemes.

(24) Mr Heeley replied to a question from Mrs Doyle by saying that the future great Stour Alleviation Scheme to protect 300 properties at risk in Canterbury and the middle Stour would concentrate on making improvements to the Great Stour in order

to prevent water reaching the properties. Where this was not possible, they would move into property protection. He added that options for the Nailbourne would be ready in the Spring and could be reported to the next meeting of the Committee.

(25) Mr Heeley replied to a question from Mrs Mackonochie by saying that the EA was only funded to protect housing that had been built before 2012. It was expected that those built afterwards would have taken climate change and flood risk into account.

(26) Mrs Hurst asked what provision was being put on place to go beyond the Stour and whether it could have any impact on the Wantsum. Mr Heeley said that he was not in a position to give a detailed answer to the question. The principle adopted by the EA when developing projects was that it must not put new people at risk. He was therefore confident that there would be no detrimental effect on the Wantsum.

(27) The Chairman said that he would aim to have the points raised during this item addressed at the next meeting of the Committee.

(28) RESOLVED that Mr Heeley be thanked for his presentation and that matters raised during the discussion be further considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

4. Middle Medway Flood Resilience Project Update - Presentation by Peter Waring, Project Manager and E A Senior Flood Advisor, Kent and South London
(Item 6)

(1) Mr Peter Waring (EA Senior Flood Advisor, Kent and SE London) gave a presentation. The accompanying slides are contained within the electronic agenda papers on the KCC website.

(2) Mr Waring introduced himself as the Middle Medway Flood Resilience Scheme Project Manager. He showed the Committee a diagram of the Medway Catchment and identified the Middle Medway as within the Low Weald, focused on the confluence of the Medway, the Beult and the Teise and incorporating the Lesser Teise. It contained the parishes of Yalding, Hunton, Collier Street, Marden, Nettlestead, East Farleigh, West Farleigh Wateringbury, Teston and Barming as well as a number of smaller communities.

(3) Mr Waring then said that the Middle Medway area had always been at risk of flooding and that significant flooding events occurred every couple of decades. Records indicated that flooding had been taking place since at least 1643. He added that the impact of flooding on society had increased continually over the years. Furthermore, flooding incidents were now happening more frequently and with greater intensity due to changing weather patterns.

(4) Mr Waring briefly set out some of the existing flood risk management measures within the Medway catchment. There was a series of embankments at Edenbridge to protect the town as well as the flood storage area at Leigh, where the capacity was going to be increased for the benefit of Tonbridge and Hildenborough.

The capacity increase at Leigh would, however, have a minimal beneficial impact on the Middle Medway area.

(5) Mr Waring went on to say that the EA had considered a number of options to reduce flood risk in the Middle Medway area. Unfortunately, none of these could be implemented without increasing the risk to other communities or without incurring far greater cost than the benefit to the community that they would protect. The EA had, for example looked at storage on the rivers Beult and Teise; at walls and embankments around communities; and at measures to improve conveyance through the flood plain. None of these had been cost effective or had any technical merit. This meant that the only remaining option was property flood resilience.

(6) Mr Waring moved on to discuss property flood resilience in detail. He said that there were two aspects to this. These were resistance and resilience. Resistance was the installation of measures that prevented the ingress of flood water into the property. This could include door barriers, flood doors, and non-return valves on waste pipes. These were “passive” structures that would prevent internal flooding even if there was nobody inside because they did not have to be re-installed or switched on. Resilience did not prevent the ingress of flood water. It was the use of material to enable the rapid recovery of the property if internal flooding took place. It involved the use of materials such as lime plaster (which did not contain gypsum or other soluble materials), and closed cell plastic insulation (which was impervious to dampness). These materials would enable the property to become dry and habitable very quickly. These materials were expensive to retro-fit. The aftermath of a flood would be an ideal time for retro-fitting to take place. Unfortunately, this very rarely happened because Insurance payments generally simply paid for the restoration of the property to its former state.

(7) Mr Waring showed the Committee a detailed map of the Middle Medway Project Area and pointed out that the majority of the projects were in a diamond-shaped area between the Lesser Teise, the Beult and Yalding. The Project Area as a whole extended from Laddingford in the west to Queen Street in the south west to the plain area of Marden to the south and across to Stile Bridge to the east. The most downstream area was in East Farleigh to the north.

(8) Mr Waring said that a series of engagement events with residents had taken place in 2016/17. This had been followed by scoping and full property surveys of 454 properties during Spring and Summer 2017. This had established that 46 properties were not suitable for Property Flood Resilience (PFR).

(9) The work had begun with Phase 1A, which was a pilot scheme of 28 properties, where resistance measures were installed by the end of 2017. This phase was tested by a Flood Exercise in Spring 2018. Phase 1B had just begun and would see the installation of resistance measures in some 256 properties by the end of 2019. Detailed surveys of these properties had already been carried out. A Flood Exercise would also be carried out by the end of the year. Phase 2, led by KCC and Maidstone BC, would be for those properties that were only suitable for resilience due to their fabric and mode of construction.

(10) Mr Waring then discussed the challenges. Some residents had decided not to participate, which could become an issue if they lived in a terraced or semi-detached property. Even if all the other properties in a terrace had flood resistance measures

installed, flooding to the property which did not agree to PFRs would affect them all. It was therefore important to persuade all terrace owners to be part of the scheme if at all possible.

(11) Mr Waring continued that it was sometimes very difficult to contact residents. They might be at work or only live in the property occasionally. Some were let out to tenants who did not pass on the information to their landlords. If a property changed hands, it was very possible that the new owners were not made aware of the project by the time they arrived.

(12) Another challenge was posed by listed buildings. Sixty two of the 256 houses in Phase 1B were actually listed and could only proceed after separate applications to the Local Authority. It would be essential to ensure that the work undertaken did not damage the properties' heritage value or undermine the historical significance of the building.

(13) Mr Waring showed four pictures to demonstrate the measures that were now in place after phase 1A, consisting of both passive measures and those requiring the owners to take action upon receipt of a Flood Alert.

(14) Mr Waring concluded his presentation by quickly reminding the Committee of the three levels of the Flood Warning System. A Flood Alert was given when there was flooding of low-lying land and roads, but no property flooding was expected. People were encouraged to be vigilant and to pay attention to weather forecasts. A Flood Warning was issued when flooding of properties was expected. Immediate action was required, including the deployment of flood barriers, moving furniture upstairs and moving out of the property to safety. A Severe Flood Warning was issued following consultation with emergency partners when the flooding began to present a high risk to life, requiring evacuation if feasible and not already undertaken.

(15) Mrs Brown said that the Environment Agency had done a very good job of keeping the community up-to-date on its activities. She asked whether there was any further information on Phase 2 of the project. Mr Waring replied that KCC and Maidstone BC had asked the EA to engage some consultants to undertake some initial assessments for the 46 properties involved. This work had been completed within the past fortnight. He had then produced a brief interpretive report, which was currently being peer-reviewed. His next step would be to discuss the conclusions with the two Local Authorities.

(16) Mrs Wright asked whether the new developing Local and Neighbourhood Plans should specify that new housing should be built with the capability of withstanding flooding. Mr Waring replied that the EA would probably object when it was consulted about any development that was the subject of flood risk. It considered that the best form of flood defence was to avoid building properties in the flood plain. There could be exceptions to this general principle, such as domestic extensions or agricultural buildings that were being converted. It was possible that no objection would be raised if it was possible to convert a building so that there was no risk of flood water entering by, for example, raising the finished floor level. Essentially, the EA would object whenever there was a risk of inundation to a property.

(17) The Chairman said that 400 new three-storey houses were being built in his Romney Marsh constituency, which was for the most part Flood Zone 3. He asked whether there was any conflict between this type of development and flood regulations. Mr Waring replied that providing there was no accommodation on the ground floor, the property would be classified as flood resilient.

(18) Mr Waring replied to a question from Mrs Brown by saying that there were a lot of listed properties in Yalding. It was feasible to raise floors and sacrifice the ground floor for storage and garages in buildings if they were not listed. Another suggestion had recently been made during a presentation in Yalding that it might be possible to introduce a raised walkway system. He did not consider that this could be implemented without significantly changing the character of the village.

(19) Mr Waring then said that the walkway system would work at properties such as the former Rose and Crown public house in East Peckham. The EA had withdrawn its objection to the development because it was designed to raise up the property so that all the accommodation was at ground floor level leading to a walkway above flood level, which would take the inhabitants to an area that was at a much lower risk of flooding. This system would allow the residents to go about their normal business during a flood event.

(20) Mr Waring replied to a question from Mrs Mackonochie by saying that when the EA had looked at options for the Yalding/Collier Street area, they had taken into account the impact of water storage in these villages on nearby communities. As there would have been a detrimental impact to them, this particular option had automatically become unviable.

(21) RESOLVED that Mr Waring be thanked for his presentation and that its content be noted.

5. Environment Agency and Met Office Alerts and Warnings and KCC severe weather response activity since the last meeting

(Item 7)

(1) Mr Harwood introduced the report. He informed the Committee that since publication of the papers there had been an additional fluvial flood alert on the River Eden issued by the Environment Agency (paragraph 2.5) and an additional Met Office severe weather warning for wind (paragraph 2.6). It was also noted that the last closures of the Thames Barrier (Appendix 3) had taken place in 2019 rather than in 2018 as set out in the table.

(2) Mr Harwood referred to paragraph 2.1 of the report which showed that the above average rainfall in November and December had been followed by two months where it had been below average, leading to all river catchments in Kent being in the “below normal” to “notably low” ranges.

(3) Mr Harwood then drew attention to paragraph 3.2 of the report which set out the risk of coastal flooding in combination with high winds in the periods between 20 and 25 March, 18 and 23 April, and 17 and 21 May.

(4) Mr Harwood said that the county had not seen the flood impacts that had been prevalent in previous years. The ground was dry for the time of year when rivers and reservoirs were usually replenished. During the high levels of rainfall in November and December, water had been diverted to the reservoirs, which were consequently at a good level. Groundwater and river levels were, however, now very low.

(5) Mr Harwood then said that although the main concern was lack of rainfall, the current trend of flash flooding concentrated in very localised parts of the county would continue to be a risk during the summer. There was a need to remain vigilant and to plan appropriately.

(6) The Chairman said that the recent unseasonal warm weather had resulted in local flora sucking up more water than would normally have been the case because of the extended growing season. He had discussed this with Affinity Water and Southern Water who had both expressed concern over the potential effects that could result. At the same time the spring tides could cause problems due to the oscillations in the jet stream. He was confident in the ability of KCC staff to respond effectively to emergencies in any of these circumstances.

(7) In response to a question from Mr Thomas, Mr Harwood said that community resilience was a significant area of work for the Emergency Planning Team. He would welcome the opportunity to help Local Members scope the specific issues within their electoral divisions so that they could report back to their communities.

(8) Mrs Brown said that the most important things that local representatives from districts or parishes at risk of flooding could do were to urge their constituents to sign up to receive flood warnings and to ensure that they knew who their local flood warden was.

(9) RESOLVED that the report and content of the ensuing discussion be noted.