**CSFP Board – Minutes – Item 2**

**Meeting:** CSFP Board

**Date:** Tuesday 4th June 2019, 1:30pm – 4:30pm

**Venue:** Conference Rooms A&B, Cumbria House, 117 Botchergate, Carlisle, CA1 1RD

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paul Barnes | Farming Community Representative | Keith Little | Cumbria County Council |
| Janet Chapman | South Lakes Representative | Pete Miles | Environment Agency |
| Faith Cole | Derwent Representative | Stewart Mounsey | Environment Agency |
| Doug Coyle | Cumbria County Council | Steven O’Keeffe | Carlisle City Council |
| Pete Evoy | South Cumbria Rivers Trust | Jackie O’Reilly | Copeland BC |
| Julian Harms | Network Rail | Rick Petecki | CALC |
| Simon Johnson | Environment Agency | Elizabeth Radford | Eden Rivers Trust |
| Angela Jones | Cumbria County Council | Jonathan Reade | Highways England |
| John Kelsall | Eden Representative | Vikki Salas | West Cumbria Rivers Trust |
| Jane Langston | Eden District Council | Adrian Shepherd | Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority |

**Apologies:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| James Bickley | Forestry Commission | Sarah Littlefield | Lune Rivers Trust |
| Pat Graham  | Copeland BC | Adrian Lythgo | NWRFCC |
| Tony Griffiths | United Utilities | Ellyse Mather | Environment Agency |
| David Harpley | Cumbria Wildlife Trust | Jane Meek  | Carlisle CC |
| Phil Huck | Barrow BC | Chloe O’Hare | Highways England |
| Sharma Jencitis | United Utilities | Rachel Osborn | Highways England |
| Ian Joslin  | Network Rail | Nick Raymond | Cumbria County Council |
| Chris Kaighin | Natural England | David Sykes | South Lakeland DC |
| Andrew Kendall | United Utilities | Paul Wood | Allerdale BC |

**Officers in Attendance: -**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Andy Brown  | Environment Agency | Anthony Lane  | Cumbria County Council |
| Katie Duffy | United Utilities |  |  |

**Observers: -**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Richard Milne | Carlisle | Mike Fox  | Low Crosby |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Agenda Item** | **Action** |
| **1** | **Welcome and apologies**Apologies as above.All presentations from this meeting are available in the papers posted on the News section of the CSFP website [here.](http://www.cumbriastrategicfloodpartnership.org/index.html) |  |
| **2** | **Minutes of the last meeting 5th March 2019 and actions**AmendmentPage 8. Minute 5b.Pete Miles (PM) delivered this presentation.AmendmentPage 9. Minute 6, para. 6 should read:*John Curtin, Executive Director of Flood & Coastal Risk Management at the EA said at an Association of Drainage Authorities Conference in London recently that he was a hydrologist by background.*AL will make these corrections.Matters arising: -Minute 4. Surface Water Flooding. Feedback from discussion group, Table 2, . Improving communication around blocked gullies. AJ noted the problems with cleaning gullies when access is frequently restricted due to parked cars. She asked if residents are informed the day before these works are carried out. Minute 5b. Environment Agency Programme update. Page 8. NFM. Communities question the ability of these new techniques to contribute to flood risk management in larger catchments.Outstanding actions from the minutes. AL reported there were no outstanding actions. All items were completed, on-going, deferred or will be dealt with as part of today’s agenda.Minutes were approved. | **AL****AB** |
| **3** | **Discussion Topic 1****CSFP Strategy and Action Plan.**AJ delivered a presentation asking members to note the key themes from CSFP Board meeting discussion groups over the last year. These details had been shared with the Board prior to the meeting. SM then delivered a verbal update on the Cumbria Flood Action Plan. The current version of the Plan and an associated briefing had been loaded on to the CSFP website.Stuart reported that many of the people in the room contributed to the 100 actions in the Plan; 81 were now complete.The CSFP Action Plan will no longer be updated and monitored directly by the Environment Agency in this format. The Action Plan has been migrated to the Cumbria and Lancashire Flood Risk Management Plan. Here it will be updated, monitored and published annually.Stuart asked for views on the future of the Plan content. What do members want to see in the Plan and how the residual items in the Plan should be tackled. He suggested that these matters should be considered in the CSFP Strategy conference in September.A closure report will be published for the Cumbria Flood Action Plan.Discussion Groups then considered what needs to be taken forward into new CSFP Strategy/Plan. Key outputs: -Table 1: Facilitator: Pete Miles.Timescale:* 25 years to deliver catchment scale outcomes;
* But we need shorter and accountable planning cycles (5-6 years);
* Other ‘plans’ are the vehicles to deliver the objectives of the CSFP Strategy; needs are: -
	+ Action focussed – outcomes;
	+ Accountability;
	+ Transparency;
	+ Collective responsibility – ‘Coalition of the Willing’
	+ Commitment and participation.

Purpose of the Plan:* Drawing it all together;
* Synergies of working together;
* Better use of resource and investment;
* Influence investment/location/timing of programmes;
* Supporting and advising existing initiatives to deliver CSFP priorities;
* Identifying gaps and blockers and agreeing collective action to address.

What does success look like in a 5-year timescale?* Truly working in partnership;
* Making investment work harder;
* Going beyond that was going to happen without a CSFP – Added Value;
* New investment to drive better and faster outcomes.

Table 2: Facilitator: John Kelsall.Catchment Management Plans: -* Geographically referenced;
* Planning implications;
* Knowledge synthesis.

Climate change – quantify;Modelling – make more sensitive;Shared view of risk with a consensus on funding;Responsibility – clarification;Economic and commercial influences.Table 3: Facilitator: Doug CoyleCSFP needs to be more strategic. There needs to be a step change in focus towards more collaboration rather than partnership working;Planning. CSFP Strategy needs to influence: -* the Local Plan process and identify land use for flood management;
* National Park Management Plans;
* Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;

Lobby government for changes to the NPPF to lean towards catchment working;Funding – review the basis of the funding formula.Table 4: Facilitator: Vikki Salas* This needs to be a high level strategy, with clear links to other plans and strategies;
* DWMP from UU – delivery is expected by 2022. These will cover river basin areas and everything from the CSFP Strategy will need to feed into it;
* Needs to cross-cutting.
	+ How do partners commit to working together?
	+ Identify principals that all plans should follow.
* Who will lead the Strategy? Who will coordinate where all the different types of funding go?
* A National Strategy for Development Planning is expected. But what more can we do locally in the meantime?
* Surface water flooding has to be a clear priority in the strategy.
* Strategy needs to drive the direction and purpose of the CSFP.
* Strategy needs to be clear on how it will deal with ‘blockers’ and issues. This hasn’t been great so far. How can this be achieved? Authority is needed for members to speak on behalf of others with one voice.
* Appointment of Chair to provide a strong lead and direction.

AJ thanked the groups for their feedback which will provide a useful resource in planning the Strategy Conference in September. |  |
| **4** | **Discussion Topic 2****National Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy**Andy Brown of the EA National team responsible for the development of the draft Strategy, delivered a presentation.AJ asked for comments. She stated that CCC would be making a response to the consultation and encouraged member organisations to do likewise. She asked members if they supported a response from CSFP?KL asked for a joint CSFP/LEP response.FC stated that from “…a community side it made my heart sink”. A 95-page strategy from the EA with not much about helping the area and its people that suffer from mental health issues from the experience of flooding. There is too much emphasis in the Strategy on the benefits of PLP and protecting the environment. Traditional flood defences are not discussed enough. NFM features strongly too but there’s no evidence to show it works in large catchments.FC felt the draft Strategy had no drive to making sustainable communities, only interested in helping more prosperous areas.Much more ambition is needed to help the residents of Cumbria through real flood protection measures.AB denied the claimed focus on prosperous communities. He highlighted that this Strategy asks for an anticipated £1bn of funding per year. Current funding is £2.6bn over 6 years. In answer to a question from PB, AB confirmed that each consultation response is given equal weight despite the number of individuals involved in making a joint representation. PB stated that communities want to see ‘spades in the ground’, not another strategy.In answer to a question from JK, AB confirmed no further consultation on the draft Strategy is planned. There may be another public consultation before it is laid before parliament.MF noted that Cumbria is seen as a test bed for new approaches in FRM. What has Cumbria learnt in the last 10 years in terms of dealing with resilience? A joint response from the CSFP is important.AB noted that the Strategy will not work if everyone views it as an EA strategy only, but the EA is legally bound to produce it. One organisation will not do everything, as this is not on the agenda. It needs to be a collaborative endeavour. There is no appetite for one organisation to deal with FRM.SJ noted that the draft Strategy points the EA towards doing things differently. CSFP has an opportunity to influence this through its own Strategy.AJ encouraged partners to share their draft responses to enable a joint CSFP/LEP response to be made. | **DC/AL** |
| **5** | **Discussion Topic 3****Funding**AJ explained that issues around funding were prominent in all of the discussion groups held at CSFP Board meetings to date. In order to explore this further, 4 key partners had been asked to deliver presentations covering: -* Funding sources;
* Current programme;
* Forward planning;
* Long-term/25-year offer.

Presentations were made by: -* CCC as LLFA;
* EA;
* UU;
* Rivers Trusts.

AJ asked for comment and questions but encouraged discussion groups to consider the open question:*As a CSFP how we do we better coordinate funding and sharing of resources to deliver our CSFP objectives/shared outcomes*JR noted the extensive amount of paperwork that partners need to complete to compile funding bids. There must be opportunity to share this effort whilst maintaining the different approaches required of different funding bid processes.KL asked of the River Trusts if there was more opportunity for them to consider working more collaboratively. ER responded by confirming they do work together but as separate organisations they do work separately too. Rivers Trusts work with a ‘spade in the ground’ ethos.SM noted the distinct lack of reference to sourcing funding from businesses and the LEP. CSFP needs to promote more prominence of these opportunities.SJ asked how can we make funding work harder?JK noted that funding is required to develop schemes in the first place. It is a ‘chicken and egg’ situation. AJ amplified this by noting the purpose of the Cumbria Coastal Strategy to provide an evidence base for coastal projects. FC asked why West Cumbria Rivers Trust turned down WEG funding – why was not it brought to the partnership for discussion? VS stated that related projects are still going ahead with other funding. Trustees were worried about the WEG funding terms and conditions in the context of using volunteers. This place an onerous risk on the Trust.JH noted that as Network rail is the owner of a linear asset, surface water management is a key issue. It is a challenge to work in a cost effective approach which is demanded specifically in terms of corporate governance. Working collaboratively with other organisations and individuals works well for Network Rail – it can achieve lots by doing so where it cannot do so on its own.AJ confirmed funding will be discussed more at the conference in September. She thanked the presenters and members for their feedback. This material will be a useful resource to for the conference. |  |
| **6**  | **Programmes****6a CMG update**Paper distributed before the meeting.**6b Environment Agency Programme update**Paper tabled at the meeting. JC noted that community members have noticed that the plans for the Kendal scheme were going back to the planning committee on the 6th June to be reconsidered under revised policy guidelines issued since the last planning meeting (see the news section on the homepage of the SLDC website). Members of the South Lakes Flood Action Partnership are obviously very concerned. Janet asked for an update. Why are the plans going back to the committee and should flooded communities in Kendal be concerned?SM explained that the scheme proposals were called-in by the Secretary of State but objections were not upheld. Since then there has been a change in the Council through local elections and the adoption of a local Masterplan. The scheme will be considered by the new planning committee for ratification in the context of these new arrangements. SM will attend. JK asked that future planning applications should take a more holistic approach than that adopted for Kendal. This should improve the passage through the planning process. |  |
| **7** | **Cumbria Coastal Strategy**DC delivered a presentation.VS noted that the pipeline of coastal projects needs to be included in Partnership Programmes.JH stated that most of the Network Rail coastal work is managed by its structures team and it is included in the 5-year spending programme; although cuts have been made. There appears to be plenty of scope for shared working and this potential needs to be explored and coordinated.SM stated that businesses will benefit from much of the coastal work proposed; we need to engage with them more.AJ suggested that coastal communities need to be involved in these proposals and their voice should be heard through CALC. | **DC** |
| **8** | **Independent Chair update**AJ made a short presentation and reported that 4 applications had been received for the role. |  |
| **9** | **Reports**Members were encouraged to read the reports distributed prior to the meeting reflecting the wider work of the partnership since the last Board meeting. Questions can be made via CSFP@cumbria.gov.ukSO asked the Board to note the recommendation in the Communication and Engagement sub-Group report. This seeks approval to decommission the CSFP website by March 2020. Agreed. |  |
| **10** | **AOB** None. |  |

**Actions Summary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minute no.** | **Action** | **By** | **Status** |
| **2** | Corrections to minutes. | **AL** | **Completed** |
| **2** | AJ asked if residents are given a request to move cars to enable gully cleaning works to be carried out. | **AB** | **Outstanding** |
| **4** | Partners to share their draft responses to the National FCERM Strategy consultation to enable a joint CSFP/LEP response to be made. | **DC/AL** | **Completed** |
| **7** | Pipeline of coastal projects needs to be included in Partnership Programmes. | **DC** | **Outstanding** |
|  | From 5th March meetingA full presentation on the NFM programme. | **AL** | **Deferred to September 2019 Board meeting** |