

Cumbria Strategic Flood Partnership Board

16th December 2019

Rheged

(following Strategy Workshop)

CSFP Board Agenda

Date: Monday 16th December 2019, 4 – 5pm

Venue: Pennine Gallery, Rheged, Redhills, Penrith CA11 0DQ

No	Agenda Item	Purpose & content	Lead	Page
1	Minutes of the Board meeting 27 th September 2019	FOR APPROVAL (r)	RD	3
2	Minutes of the Board Steering Group 18th November 2019	FOR APPROVAL (r)	RD	22
3	Reports a) RFCC update; b) Making Space for Water Group Update.	FOR INFORMATION (r); Questions only FOR INFORMATION (r); Questions only		28 31
4	AOCB			
	Close			
	Glossary			36

r = report; p = presentation; v = verbal

CSFP Board – Minutes – Item 1

Meeting: CSFP Board

Date: Friday 27th September 2019, 10am – 12pm

Venue: Pennine Gallery, Rheged, Redhills, Penrith CA11 0DQ

A **workshop on CSFP Strategy** was held after the Board meeting, 1245-1530. Notes from this workshop appended to these minutes.

Attendees:

Paul Barnes	Farming Community Representative	John Kelsall	Eden Representative
James Bickley	Forestry Commission	Keith Little	Cumbria County Council
Barry Chambers	Allerdale Borough Council	Ellyse Mather	Environment Agency
Janet Chapman	South Lakes Representative	Jane Meek	Carlisle CC
Doug Coyle	Cumbria County Council	Pete Miles	Environment Agency
Faith Cole	Derwent Representative	Stewart Mounsey	Environment Agency
Richard Denyer	Chair	Steven O'Keeffe	Carlisle City Council
Katie Duffy	United Utilities	Rachel Osborn	Highways England
David Harpley	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Carolyn Otley	Cumbria CVS
James Halliday	United Utilities	Rick Petecki	CALC
Simon Johnson	Environment Agency	Elizabeth Radford	Eden Rivers Trust
Angela Jones	Cumbria County Council	Vikki Salas	West Cumbria Rivers Trust
		Adrian Shepherd	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

Apologies:

Adam Briggs	NFU	Chris Kaighin	Natural England
Tim Duckmanton	Lake District National Park Authority	Andrew Kendall	United Utilities
Pete Evoy	South Cumbria Rivers Trust	Jane Langston	Eden District Council
John Ferguson	Highways England	Adrian Lythgo	NWRFCC
Pat Graham	Copeland BC	Chloe O'Hare	Highways England
Tony Griffiths	United Utilities	Nick Raymond	Cumbria County Council
Julian Harms	Network Rail	Jonathan Reade	Highways England
Phil Huck	Barrow BC	David Sykes	South Lakeland DC
Sarah James	Lune Rivers Trust	Jeremy Westgarth	Environment Agency

Sharma Jencitis	United Utilities	Paul Wood	Allerdale BC
Ian Joslin	Network Rail		

Officers in Attendance: -

Anthony Lane	Cumbria County Council	Helen Renyard	Cumbria County Council
Kate Luxton	Environment Agency	Paul Sewell	Cumbria County Council

Observers: -

Richard Milne	Carlisle	Rebecca Thomas	
---------------	----------	----------------	--

No	Agenda Item	Action
1	Welcome and apologies Apologies as above. AJ welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced RD as the new Chair. RD thanked AJ for the introduction. All presentations from this meeting are available in the papers posted on the Cumbria section of the Flood Hub website here .	
2	Minutes of the last meeting 4th June 2019 and actions AL went through the main actions from the last meeting. He noted an outstanding action under Minute 2: <i>"AJ asked if residents are given a request to move cars to enable gully cleaning works to be carried out."</i> A response had been provided Stephen Hall, CCC Assistant Director, Economy and Environment. Residents are informed, but depending on operations, this can be sporadic. CCC is aiming to make the gully cleaning programme available digitally over the next few years to seek a more comprehensive response to this need. AJ asked Paul Sewell to ensure this matter of communications to residents around dates and times for gully cleaning to be made a priority for the CCC Highways Service. Other actions were completed, noted or on today's agenda. Minutes were approved.	PS
3	Environment Agency Evidence Review on Community Engagement JC delivered a presentation. A summary of her dialogue accompanying the presentation is provided here: Slide 1 Who has read the document? The document was sent out to the CSFP on the 2nd September.	

	<p>If you haven't read it, I would suggest that you do so and that you read at least some of the reference documents but particularly the report called "Doing Flood Risk Science Differently" from 2004. There are parts of this 2004 report that resonate very strongly with members of the flooded community.</p> <p>We would also advise you to read the actual research review rather than the Summary or the Slideshow which we feel have been over simplified.</p> <p>I asked for this Research Review to be included on the agenda for today because of the angry reaction to it from the flooded community and because it also provides a possible way forward for community engagement within the CSFP with the co-creation model.</p> <p>With this in mind, we wondered why the launch of the document was so low key and why no real link was made between this research review and the FCERM consultation that we took part in.</p> <p>Regarding the co-creation model, from past experience, a major shift in the mindset of authorities and agencies will be required if we are to make any progress.</p> <p>See statement on page 9 of the Research Review - "Good engagement is planned from the bottom up starting with the community themselves" (NFF / Collingwood Env. Planning 2018)</p> <p>Changes at Government level in relation to mindset, funding, policies and practices are also required if the CSFP has any chance of being successful.</p> <p>There was a very low key launch of this document – Why? The EA needs to recognise and respond to the questions from communities.</p> <p>Slide 2 -</p> <p>We noticed that tricky situations are mentioned in the document and we wondered if these relate to situations such as suggestions of abandonment of homes and / or businesses when there is no funding in place to compensate people – no wonder this leads to tricky situations and no amount of conflict resolution training will help in such a situation – it is madness to think that it will.</p> <p>Every avenue will have to be seen to have been explored before agencies and authorities go down this route and the funding will need to be in place.</p> <p>Questions for the EA – see slide.</p> <p>Slide 3 Core Principles</p> <p>We have highlighted those where we feel there are particular issues.</p> <p>If we look at - "Put final decisions into action as soon as possible". This is particularly pertinent when it is four years since Storm Desmond and those people who were flooded then are still under threat and are facing the autumn and winter with fear every time it rains.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>For some people there might be planning for a scheme in place for others (as for example Workington and Backbarrow) there is nothing. Is that fair?</p> <p>In this case, we know that changes in funding formulas and bureaucracy at Government level could possibly improve things and help us all.</p> <p>Slide 4</p> <p>These are some of the statements I received following the release of the research review (and part of the reason for the request for this as an agenda item). I have included them because I think that agencies and authorities need to know how people are feeling not just about the content of the research review but about the bigger picture as they perceive it from the information they have been given.</p> <p>As you can see there is a lot of work to do but the community representatives are willing to work with authorities and agencies on the co-creation model.</p> <p>However, as we have outlined, every avenue to mitigate flooding must be explored and the funding must be in place before abandonment should ever be considered.</p> <p>RM stated that in 40+ meetings with the EA they say “It didn’t happen that way, we have the data”. Well communities also have the data and have been proven correct on many occasions.</p> <p>AJ asked for a point of clarification from JC. What is the ask of the CSFP today? Is it to take this to the national team at the EA?</p> <p>JK stated that that have been questions to EA management and to researchers. What happened following Rydale in 2004? Why haven’t these outputs been adopted?</p> <p>AJ asked are these the views of CRAGG? JK – yes. AJ advised that we need to understand the role of CRAGG and any conclusions from today would need to be a CRAGG proposal.</p> <p>PB stated that the Evidence Review was very supportive but we need to take some key points in the presentation forward.</p> <p>PM asked what is good? What is questionable? What do we want to take forward? A sub-Group needs to be convened and authors of the report can be invited to Cumbria to hear and respond to this feedback</p> <p>RD suggested having a presentation from Pickering which would be useful for a future meeting. Agencies and communities need to sit down together to discuss the imperatives, budgets etc.</p> <p>RP stated that the parishes feel that there is a distance between what the agencies say, what the community actually feel and what actually happens. The onus is on the experts/agencies to explain</p>	<p>PM & Community reps.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>why they are saying a particular thing and taking a particular course of action. They must be prepared to listen to the communities regarding what is the actual effect.</p> <p>SJ stated that the terminology used needs to be clear and not too technical.</p> <p>RP stated that these are no longer extraordinary events and all communities need to be interested even if it hasn't happened to them yet. People do not believe that the agencies have the answers.</p> <p>JK stated that there is no political statement or financial strategy to show communities that if they are under threat from flooding what they need to do – this was not part of the research.</p> <p>RD said there was merit in feeding back concerns to the document's authors, but it was also important to arrive at a better understanding of the origin and intentions of the documents, the substantive issues underlying the proposals, and optimal processes for future dialogue and consultation before publication. He would comment again after reading.</p> <p>PB advised that there are 12 core principles to building community trust and the EA need to remain independent throughout the process.</p> <p>Kate Luxton noted that mental health implications as a result of floods were of great concern, both to residents affected by flooding, and RMA officers tackling flood risk issues. Anecdotal examples were used to highlight how RMA officers frequently witness confrontational behaviour when trying to resolve flood risk issues, leading to mental health implications in officers. Kate suggested that officers and communities needed to work more thoughtfully together to reach mutually agreeable solutions without conflict to be most productive. Kate highlighted the greatest benefit the CSFP could have to ensuring mental health implications were effectively considered, when making flood risk investment decisions, would be to influence the FCERM Appraisal Guidance to use a greater damages sum. Kate believed that the associated mental health damages sum, per household, was very low, and doesn't take in to consideration the cumulative impact of flooding on residents.</p> <p>JK stated that the EA have concerns because their Project Managers have said that they are frightened to meet with communities and this should not be the case.</p> <p>AJ stated that there is an offer for Project Managers to meet with the community representatives.</p> <p>JC advised that CRAGG applied for money from The Lottery for help with mental health issues caused by flooding but the bid has been turned down. AJ advised that this should be revisited outside of this meeting. KL advised that following Storm Desmond, mental health concerns were a high priority in discussions even with central government. FC stated that Cumbria have had several floods in a</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>short period of time and have suffered more than other areas of the country. The not knowing when and if it will happen again is very worrying and therefore mental health support is needed.</p>	
4	<p>Programmes</p> <p>a) Environment Agency Programme update PM gave a presentation. He reported the headlines have been reported to the Cumbria LEP recently, the Kendal drop in sessions are back on, 2000 tons of gravel have been taken out of the river in Keswick in the last couple of weeks and there are 14 NFM projects underway across Cumbria.</p> <p>AJ clarified that the additional funding was not for new schemes but to close the funding gap for existing schemes. It would also be useful to see where and when the gravel removal programme is taking place. PM advised that he would ask about this and he will send the link through to this group.</p> <p>JK asked about Carlisle Phase 2 and Eden Bridge clearance. PM will provide an update.</p> <p>ER has provided a link to a video on the Cairn Beck NFM scheme: https://edenriverstrust.org.uk/projects/natural-flood-management/cairn-beck/</p> <p>b) WEG programme update VS gave a presentation. West Cumbria Rivers Trust has been given funding of £3.5m to improve water environments, that is, wetlands, rivers etc. Not solely to reduce the risk of flooding. AJ stated that Cumbria is leading the way in Water Environment Projects.</p> <p>RD asked if there has been consultation between the communities and the agencies especially in South Cumbria? VS advised that all WEG projects are discussed in the communities at the time of proposal. This definitely happened in West Cumbria and should have happened in South Cumbria. The Cumbria Rivers Restoration Programme is a partnership project that is being led by the EA. SJ stated that there are 2 strands of strategy in Cumbria. We are looking for the best return on investment that we can get.</p> <p>RP stated that the capacity to take advantage of opportunities is at the behest of a charity and this is a worry. Cash flow is a priority for taking on projects as they are being led by a charity – The Rivers Trust. VS advised that CCC was offered as the “bank” for all the projects but as the Rivers Trust is the lead applicant this could not happen as it is too complex. AJ advised that funding going forward will look at this issue, we need to find solutions through the Catchment Partnerships.</p> <p>ER stated that there are multiple benefits in working in Catchment Partnerships and community engagement is ongoing.</p>	<p>PM</p> <p>PM</p>

	<p>PB stated that WEG has some benefits but the biggest barrier is the paperwork as it is so difficult to get through. FC advised that Sue Hayman MP has been working with DEFRA to get help with WEG projects. KL advised that there was still some European Funding available to be applied for. AJ advised that there was still ERDF money available.</p> <p>c) LLFA update DC gave a presentation.</p> <p>SJ asked how the current update of surface water mapping available through EA mapping on the internet will impact on this programme for the LLFA. AJ also asked what data is used to compile these lists. Section 19 reports?</p> <p>DC advised that the mapping for Cumbria shows at risk properties that haven't (in most cases) flooded so far but provide an indication of priority areas to reduce the risk of flooding from surface water. Most of the schemes in the LLFA programmes are sites that have experienced significant flooding recently and evidence of the need for a scheme comes from details in the Section 19 reports.</p>	
5	<p>Cumbria Catchment Pioneer EM gave a presentation of her paper issued before the meeting.</p> <p>JC asked how much has the community been involved? EM advised that strategically, this was limited but with individual projects there has been a lot of community engagement.</p> <p>PB stated that the CCP has been running for 3 years and the DEFRA 25-Year Environment Plan has only been available for one year. The Pioneer plans have been incorporated into the 25-Year Plan and it is important not to push the Pioneer plans on the back of the 25-Year Plan.</p> <p>FC asked how system mapping will affect the rest of the catchment? EM replied that if it is a useful tool it won't be used in isolation. A systems map doesn't just look at the physical environment.</p> <p>AJ stated that early community engagement is best, linking in with the rest of the catchment work.</p> <p>EM advised that the Pioneers were pilots and are due to come to an end in March 2020.</p> <p>PM advised that he would discuss the Windermere Lake Levels Project – Pipeline option with EM.</p> <p>JK asked about the Eden Market question – farms are being converted from dairy to winter wheat and barley – are Nestle still interested as the dairy has moved on? EM advised that Nestle were still very interested.</p> <p>EM advised that the intention was to produce a final report on the Pioneers by March 2020 and DEFRA were still deciding what the final report will look like.</p>	

	<p>RP stated that more local involvement needs to happen early on to help with the tool. SJ advised that this has been discussed with the Windermere Liaison Group and the Staveley Project is a good example of co-working with the community to understand what they would like it to look like in 25 years.</p> <p>PB stated that the report needs to be post-Storm Desmond and post-Agricultural Bill to be of any worth.</p>	
6	<p>Reports</p> <p>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.uk</p> <p>SO asked the Board to note the recommendations in the Communication and Engagement sub-Group report which asked for the Board to note no work will be carried out on the CSFP website due to the end of funding. In addition to this £6000 funding for the transition of material from the CSFP website to the Flood Hub needs to be found.</p> <p>AJ asked for funding source proposals.</p> <p>In answer to questions from JK, AL was able to clarify that the Flood Hub is owned and funded by RFCC. A Project Group consisting of officers from RFCC member organisations manages the Flood Hub website. Comments made by JK on the Community section of the website had been considered by this Project Group when it had met 2 days before and the response would be sent to JK.</p>	All
7	<p>AOB</p> <p>ER advised that the Eden Catchment Partnership Plan Part 1 is already available and Part 2 will be available from today. Part 2 outlines what they want to see happen over the next 5 years.</p>	

Actions Summary

Minute no.	Action	By	Status
2	Ensure communications to residents around dates and times for gully cleaning to be made a priority for the CCC Highways Service.	PS	Outstanding
3	Convene a sub-Group of Community Representatives to collate comment on the Environment Agency Evidence Review on Community Engagement. Meet with authors of report to feedback	PM & Community reps.	Outstanding
4	Gravel removal programme to be made available to the Board.	PM	Outstanding
4	Carlisle Phase 2 and Eden Bridge clearance update for JK.	PM	Outstanding
9	Funding source proposals for transition to Flood Hub website.	All	Outstanding

Appendix

Notes from CSFP Strategy Workshop

All presentations from this workshop are available in the papers posted on the Cumbria section of the Flood Hub website [here](#).

Introduction

AJ gave a presentation to introduce the purpose of the workshop.

The case for change

AJ gave a presentation outlining the principles of why a CSFP strategy is needed.

SWOT analysis on CSFP Working Principles

SJ gave a presentation to introduce this exercise. Delegates were divided between 5 tables and each table was allocated a facilitator to collate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats on each of the 5 CSFP Working Principles. Delegates were given 6 minutes at each table to carry out their SWOT analysis and provide as much comment as they could by placing them on 'post-it' notes stuck to a flip chart at each table. Each facilitator was required to feedback a summary from their table to the whole of the workshop.

Details of the progress achieved in the Cumbria Flood Action Plan were presented to support these discussions.

SWOT analysis feedback

Table 1

Facilitator: James Bickley

CSFP Working Principle No. 1: Collaborative Working – working together to share information, coordinate funding and provide communities with a single point of contact.

Summary

No summary available.

Strengths

People already committed to working together.

S19 Reports as an excellent primary service for all.

Lots of great examples of partnership working.

Spatial targeting of ELM's. NFM Test & Trial to take forward as we have. depth of experience and very relevant local priority.

CSFP a chance to network – some great ideas but.....

We are still here, learning. We are being serious.

Lots of knowledge in flood risk management.

Partner Agility.

Weaknesses

ELMS funding needs to be brought on stream for NFM in a meaningful way that delivers results – homes out of flood risk

What layer of community? – risk of confusing messages.

Data Protection legislation.

Funding boundaries.
Co-design solutions for catchments and communities.
Less top-down.
Bring together more community vehicles for better solutions.
s.19 Reports have thresholds..... 10 homes?
Disjoin – RFCC; CSFP; CMG; SCIENCE – Universal truths –communication.
Single points contact very strong if partners use it.
In community who knows what their “single point” is?
Lack of single funding source.
Lack of ELMS Test & Trial for NFM.
Silo funding.
Internal comms about what we have done.
Need NE involved dry/wet link.

Opportunities

Could go far but held back by Government policies, practices & funding
RFCC – Task & Finish Group – SCIDS Development.
Advancements in tech.
Not decision making – need to influence more.
Single system for seeking funding & articulating multi-agency benefits.
Development community – LLFA/EA/LPA's have identified issues with .developers in construction management phase and are working to produce good guidance.
We are established so could be a trial organisation to do things differently with budgets.
Share resource between organisations – embed staff – working groups.
Need the right people in the right roles – clear understanding of what the partnership needs to achieve.
Talking to local businesses about their flood risk – not just to their business but to the employees as well.
Business to make charitable donations to alleviate flood risk – can offset against Corporation Tax – reduce employee absence.
Big organisation acting as accountable bodies for smaller delivery organisations.

Threats

Need to be open to new ideas and new ideas and new ways of working – listening.
Misinforming information to communities with single point of contact.
Different layers of communities – Flood Action Groups; farmers; councils; anglers etc.
Political – climate agenda may supersede symptoms.
Just a Talking Shop – too big to make decisions and deliver.
Competing priorities.
Not understanding how collaborative working works – who talks to who and what do they share?
Conversation breakdown.
SPOC is one-way – communities are much more static than Agency merry-go-round.
Not aligned with benefit/investment periods.
Engagement with under-represented sectors of communities?
SPOC could work but not if they become a gatekeeper stopping communities access people with real knowledge or can't access the data themselves.
Movement of people.

Table 2

Facilitator Faith Cole

CSFP Working Principle No. 2: Catchment approach – improving what we know about river catchments and taking actions that manage risk from source to sea.

Summary

Strengths – Rory Stewart was on to a good thing when he introduced a “Whole Catchment Approach” and to look at managing flood risk from source to sea. Cumbria is leading the way and we are willing to try new things and be innovative which can open the door to different funding streams.

Weaknesses - Current funding formula doesn't align with a whole catchment approach. The locus is on urban areas only. It ends up being hand to mouth funding – lack of funding to keep CaBA/CSFP together. Some river catchments straddle organisational boundaries.

We don't understand fully the link between land and sea, coastal areas are not as high on the agenda as inland areas.

Planners currently don't have to consider catchment management plans.

Opportunities – To share more technical data; better communications with all riparian owners; better understanding of the rivers function especially understanding when to speed/slow.

Threats – Funding.

Strengths

It's a natural boundary recognised by the Jet Stream.

CMG's – Catchment Partnerships.

We are leading the way in the UK.

Considers all water planning in the catchment.

Climate change scenarios – new questions.

Catchment scale interventions and activities/actions are better able to cope with climate change.

Has introduced greater partnership.

Partnerships at different levels – local working groups; catchment partnerships; CSFP.

Communication and common themes are being shared.

Weaknesses

Do we know impacts of climate change?

Organisational boundaries threatens conversations.

Do the general public know about catchments?

Groups can get to be too big and then it can be difficult to progress.

Bigger picture required at government level.

CMG's could have worked better.

It's not a material consideration in NPPF.

50 years of records is not enough.

Funding streams aren't aligned to catchment approach.

Understanding of the link between the land and the sea.

Catchment Partnership need to work on this.

River management not yet joined up – physically and managerially.

Separate river basin plans and FCRM plans.

Listen to people who know the rivers – communities.

Joined up thinking/funding required.

Data is useless in a flood.

Coastal retreat!

Opportunities

Catchment Management Groups – Catchment Plans.
 Peat!
 Disregarded conveyance in mitigation.
 Better data sharing.
 Use of local land features to hold the flow – cost effective.
 Include estuaries in catchment.
 Government to view funding on a catchment basis.
 Coastal retreat.
 Innovation/tech – funding is available; we have demonstrated that we are innovative.
 Communication with all riparian owners.
 Every river section with an understanding of its function; To slow – To speed.
 “Neutral” object for organisations/businesses to work with.
 Need to make sure every opportunity is considered eg Crummock Water.
 Education of citizens.
 Linking catchments to the health and industrial strategies.
 Sharing of hydraulic data and utilisation of AI.

Threats

Difficulty of aligning partnership funding.
 Hand to mouth funding.
 Political boundaries do not align with catchment boundaries.
 Funding for catchment based approach – Can always get delivery funding but hard to obtain funding for co-ordination and monitoring.
 Lack of funding to keep CaBA/CSFP together as catchment partners.
 Coastal risk not as high on the agenda in Cumbria.
 This is where “resilience”, “recovery” and “managed retreat” starts to get discussed – very emotive and painful in communities.

Table 3

Facilitator: Kate Luxton

CSFP Working Principle No. 3: Integrated solutions – ensuring that actions reduce flood risk but also deliver wider benefits for people and also wildlife when appropriate.

Summary

Strengths – strong partner working; good small examples; networking has fostered opportunities; we are further on than most SFP’s.

Weaknesses – ease of small scale but not large riparian owners; planning regulations/owners limit us/no planning representative on CSFP; funding constraints – timescale – incentivisations; lack of comms visibility.

Opportunities – big money comes from RMAs, how can we influence programmes are incentivised; we need env. net gain policy; UU now able to seek funding for severe events OFWAT; climate change rhetoric – look at, for example, peat management or solution with duality of benefit; Riparian owner campaign; new CSFP strategy what do we need to lobby; coastal representation.

Threats – not all stakeholders represented; do we truly understand term integration; new designation of World Heritage Status is limiting; tension between public needs vs environmental benefit; environmental constraints can limit betterment.

Strengths

Wider group of people means you can innovate better.
 Great examples at a small scale.
 Secondments like Kate.

Need to make links to Health & Wellbeing, human health – get more actions into Public Health Strategy Implementation Plan – out for consultation.
We are further on than others – Integrated Catchment.
Strong partnerships working together.
Networks are established but too much posturing for position to drive agendas forward.
Sharing data working on projects together.
CSFP a place to network.
More secondments.
More cost beneficial, better for community mental health.

Weaknesses

CMPs can sometimes be too big to effectively move forward. More resources for smaller focus groups.
Funding silos.
Lack of social media visibility.
Different investment periods and different drivers.
Funding often doesn't allow true integration; timescales; planning; lack of flexibility.
Some habitat is drowning.
Many people not heard of group.
NPFF revision.
Number of stakeholders within some catchments is excessive.
Funding timescales.
Not all stakeholders yes; Riparian Owners; infrastructure providers.
Species migration moving north climate change – mosquito/malaria.
Do Riparian Owners understand their opportunities?

Opportunities

Understanding of Peat!! Climate Change.
RFCC – S&O – SuDS Task & Finish Group.
ELM regardless of the bill.
Peat – carbon – NFM – biodiversity – archaeology.
New CSFP strategy needs to identify what we want to lobby for.
Flow management of critical assets.
Use of natural features to manage water.
Big money comes in flood schemes – maximise environmental delivery.
Environmental Net Gain Policy.
Funding incentives for multiple benefits need change.
Use planning system to stop building on flood “sinks” – planning regulations.
Talking to business re: catchment approach to protect businesses and employees.
Need to share investment opportunities.
Tree planting drone.
More joined up working lobby for changes.
Catchment management plans – wider FRM understanding to enable each riparian owner to know the strategy of their area.
New strategy will allow us to relaunch public knowledge around main players working together.
Align UU drainage area plans to a catchment level.
Severe weather inclusion – benefit realised.
Riparian owner campaign.
Getting ELMs to deliver NFM.
Advancement in tech allowing for greater integration.

Threats

Do we understand integration? No single narrative.
 Stakeholders not given representative value of having stake in the game.
 Lots of stuff to be integrated – across catchments – across different flooding sources – across different organisations – other partnerships & strategies – It's all too big.
 Government policies & practices need to change.
 No national database of Slow the Flow.
 Recognising that flood mitigation may compromise some species.
 Funding streams – government taking flooding seriously.
 People versus wildlife.
 Not many examples in green infrastructure providing flood risk benefit's impact.
 CSFP no planning representation needs to be material to planning law.
 Tension people versus environment.
 Multiple benefits.
 Not getting people on board partly.
 New designation limiting us.
 World Heritage Site status.
 Environmental constraints of estuary management.

Table 4

Facilitator: Stewart Mounsey

CSFP Working Principle No.4: Community–focussed decision-making – sharing information and data with communities, groups and organisations so they can help us to best protect our communities from flooding.

Summary

Strengths – We are in the room; people care and strong relationships
Weaknesses – We didn't always communicate in the right way; data sharing
Opportunities – Shared evidence/modelling (Citizens Science); Joining forces – one voice – greater leverage locally/nationally
Threats – The next flood; we are limited by the governance/organisations/silos

Strengths

Greater working together in recent times (but still improvements can be made).
 Catchment portals – data & what's happening.
 Flood and environment conversations happening.
 Understanding history of catchments.
 Having community reps on the Board.
 Partnership is leading the way.
 Unprecedented what next?
 People care and are engaged.
 We are all(most of us) here?
 Local knowledge.
 Aiming high – getting everyone in the room (still room to tweak and improve).
 Some networking comms reps here.
 Community focussed decision making – working with those communities that have been affected by flooding.

Weaknesses

No RFCC rep. – need independent community rep.
 Moving at pace and engagement.
 Policies/practices at government level.
 Data protection.
 Lack of trust – community left out of some meetings.
 How often do we engage with locals? – not just during projects.

Should we consider those communities not affected by flooding?
 Communication e.g. Pioneer project – other issues.
 “Partnership” – are risk genuinely shared?
 Lack of major funding to protect communities going forward.
 Lack of resources to adequately do this.
 Terminology can be different between designers/communities/RMAs.
 Don’t communicate enough in the right way.
 Competency groups – need listening to.
 Too many initiatives not coordinated – climate – flood recovery – resilience etc.
 Pioneer Project – WLLG group not consulted.

Opportunities

Local feedback on models as they are developed, iterative. Make sure locals recognise model of current situation before using future predictions.
 FLAG engagement.
 Volunteer community – WCMG; engagement; i.e. tree planting.
 Systems for data collection and access.
 Better modelling/understanding risk. Better cost benefit.
 Future Natural Capital baselining to show current state and potential for change.
 What proactive positive communication method can be utilised.
 Co-production model.
 We should be able to join forces and use the combined strengths.
 To find important local information from the community.
 Much broader conversations: - wider environment; public health/social prescriptions.
 To use the local reps to talk to the local people in their language.
 Links with schools/colleges.
 At each level have we got it right? Strategic/tactical/operational.
 Parish Councils etc.
 Build on work so far to involve community specialists to develop initiatives and drive stuff forwards – not wait for RFCC/EA/CCC to do.
 A shared understanding of risk. A Risk Register could be a valuable tool for the CSFP.
 Using shared data to prioritise multiple benefit action.

Threats

Cost benefit analysis doesn’t always equate with communities.
 Too much information – expectation of data sharing.
 Funding.
 Another major event shows failure.
 Lack of value for emotional/ mental health impacts – need to challenge the methodology that this is based on (asking people who live in a flood risk area how much they would pay to avoid flooding – but most haven’t experienced it?).
 Shared understanding of flooding mechanisms.
 Integrating different kinds of “evidence” – they don’t directly compare.
 Not yet flooded – not engaged (yet).
 Model v reality/observation.
 Opinion v competent opinion.
 Expertise – trust; listening to community.
 Limited by governance. Cross-funding.
 Inability to share key data, e.g. infrastructure resilience.
 Communication – what is in the art of the possible.
 How we use the language.
 Local engagement with limited resources.
 Strategic decisions depending on which minister/government.

Table 5

Facilitator: Elizabeth Radford

CSFP Working Principle no. 5: Evolution and learning – using learning from Storm Desmond and the best information available to work closely with communities and identify actions.

Summary

Strengths. CSFP is good. So much flooding we have had to learn.

Callon/s.19 reports/Storyboard/community reports have all helped.

Always learning.

Weaknesses. Wider community reach must include those not flooded and those on flood lists not covered – no involvement from community reps.

Surface water implications. Managing expectations – communities understanding that not everything can be funded.

Opportunities. Climate change agenda – need to understand it because it is fundamental to flooding.

Using a co-produced methodology.

Communications and technology on potential impacts.

Threats. Lack of trust – data/models/experts.

Understanding climate change – always having to adapt changing plans and policies.

Strengths.

Better than before on schemes.

Storyboard to visualise info.

Engagement good. Community involved.

Section 19 report engagement.

Realisation of expertise in community. Callon Report– “pusillanimous”

Systems thinking – sharing experience and resource to deliver better.

Learning from more people than before.

Learning all the time. Open to ideas of others/what has happened elsewhere.

Given the history of the county we have learned from experience. One community every year at least.

Learning events in local areas.

Weaknesses

Community defined as “resilience” when much community are deeply strategic.

Lag in models & future modelling based on IPCC data.

Best information available – what is that? Always changing competing views on data & info.

Lack of trust in experts.

Pitt Report work happening 12 years later. Now out of date. Is Desmond the same?

Surface water monitoring – ignorance. Raise awareness of small actions – permeable opportunities – use the planning system.

Lack of appreciation of other Risk Management Authorities challenges. So difficult to explain to communities.

Reading the wider comment (beyond CRAGG).

Received solutions of few Desmond engagement with not flooded ones.(?)

[Pioneer] toolkits developed without community involvement.

Bigger picture required?

Lack of resources to keep communities engaged.

Lack of £.

Managing expectations – all ideas cannot be funded.

Opportunities.

Use of planning system to impose conditions to reduce flood risk.

Climate change & flooding together.

We have moved/progressed since 2015. We can evolve this and build on the learning to date.

There are always more people to learn from.

Coordinated proactive communications of potential impact.

EA tells us what's wrong; we tell the politicians. They tell the EA.

Better data, models. Change in 'expert power'.

Co-production methodology.

Opportunity through national context to change.

Politicians need to step-up or move aside.

Proper use of surface water hierarchy – communities can lobby it.

Technology is evolving to help us.

Calliac. Desmond IL marks USED (Community Report). (?)

More lobby for surface water issues. Network Rail & Highways.

Threats

Climate change.

Trust in data, models, experts. "community in from the cold" "Stop the blaming".

Governance above is a restriction.

Climate change – not clear for communities. Need better education.

Another major event – we're out on our ears. Trust flooded.

Always having to adapt our learning to ever changing plans/political environment.

Prioritise the development of climate change impacts for Cumbria. Where are our future risks?

Lack of cumulative impact appreciation – in communities, e.g. new drives.

Learning B out there and available to all.

Competing priorities.

EA tied by Defra. Defra tied by Treasury.

Additional points in response to feedback

VS noted that the Partnership Programmes/Project Pipeline work that has been managed by the CMGs need to be reviewed and updated. This was an important tool for effective partnership working and should be continued.

What is the scope for the CSFP to have a budget? AJ responded by highlighting issues that would come with this: -

- Where would it come from? RMAs already direct their financial resources to projects and other interests of the CSFP;
- As CSFP activities develop, could a budget be established for administration purposes?
- There would be collective governance issues; i.e. could the CSFP become a limited company?

Our Partnership

RD presented his first impressions of the day and of the CSFP and gave a presentation intended to stimulate comment on the current health of the CSFP and scope for improvement and development.

His presentation started with a plan of the Penrith Road scheme in Keswick where he had been present for a site visit 2 days before. Prompted by the name of 'Springfield' where the new attenuation pond was under construction, he had asked himself whether it was not likely that originally there had been perhaps ten or more ponds on the slope, subsequently filled in to make way for the 20th century housing development below. Early maps and even photographs would probably contain some of the answers. Such documents are important, and in his view there can be a false dichotomy between historical and current data. Citing examples of major floods from 17th to 20th centuries, he said that occasional massive rainfall episodes had always happened in Cumbria and will continue to do so.

He then summarised some key points from a July 2019 Rockefeller Foundation report: "Combined voices can have credence - Derived from the RF 100 Resilient Cities Program".

Floods have greater consequences than any other type of natural hazard. Over 734 million people globally have been affected since 2009, with negative impacts on individual livelihoods and as a critical challenge to cities and countries in achieving their development objectives. It was found that having access to accurate and pragmatic information is crucial to proactive planning, community and stakeholder involvement, the selection of appropriate strategic interventions, and building flood resilience. It was also found that the most successful partnership engagements define and articulate their challenge and objective; ensure clear scope of work and defined expectations; prepare carefully; leverage local knowledge; and promote cross-departmental /-organisational collaboration. But even the best-laid plans required partners who were flexible and patient with timelines.

He looked forward to the recorded outputs from today's event and the challenges of developing the CSFP Strategy. He noted with particular interest the honesty of the comments made on mental health issues from so many people present and CSFP has to take this forward. He thanked everyone for the kind and supportive welcome he had received.

AJ thanked everyone for a very productive day, noting her role as Interim Chair had been interesting and challenging. She will have less involvement in CSFP in the future. The meeting acknowledged her many contributions.

CSFP Board - Minutes – Item 2

Meeting: CSFP Board Steering Group

Date: Monday 18th November 2019, 1pm to 2:30pm

Venue: Cabinet Meeting Room, Cumbria House, 117 Botchergate, Carlisle, CA1 1RD

Attendees:

Richard Denyer	Chair	Stewart Mounsey	Environment Agency
Helen Renyard	Cumbria County Council	Simon Johnson	Environment Agency
Anthony Lane	Cumbria County Council	John Kelsall	Community representative
Janet Chapman	Community representative	Steven O’Keeffe	Carlisle City Council; Chair of CSFP Comms & Engagement sub-Group
Carolyn Otley	Cumbria CVS; Lead RFCC member for Communities		

Apologies:

Doug Coyle	Cumbria County Council		
------------	------------------------	--	--

Nr	Agenda Item	Action
1	Welcome and Apologies Introductions made.	
2	Matters Arising from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August and September Board Steering Group meetings; 27 September Board meeting. Noted. SM noted the outstanding actions on: - <u>Board Steering Group, 5th August 2019</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive Approaches working as proposed in the draft National FCERM Strategy. Approval of the Strategy by parliament has been delayed because of the General Election. <u>Board, 27 September 2019</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene a sub-Group of Community Representatives to collate comment on the Environment Agency Evidence Review on Community Engagement. Meet with authors of report to feedback Gravel removal programme to be made available to the Board. Carlisle Phase 2 and Eden Bridge clearance update for JK. 	SM

[illegible]

	supported by adequate resources to collate current consultations, capture draft responses from partners and deliver a final collective response from the CSFP. The Steering Group noted Chair's suggestion that volunteers be sought to assist in this work.	
9	<p>Future of the CSFP website</p> <p>Noting that SO and CO had been invited to this meeting to give their views, RD introduced his Paper CSFP/2019/7. Appendix 2b attached.</p> <p>JC and JC fully supported the Chair's views.</p> <p>SJ and SM were generally supportive, too, but acknowledged the fruitless efforts made in obtaining funding for the CSFP website. Any long-term solution needs to be an integral part of the CSFP Strategy. CSFP is very different to the other 4 strategic partnerships in the north-west.</p> <p>SO highlighted the fact that a decision had already been taken by the Board and this Strategic Partnership needs to be part of the NWRFC approach. He said in his view Flood Hub can achieve 90% of what the CSFP website wants</p> <p>Referring to the correspondence involving Newground and RFCC advisory group members that RD had included in his paper (but in which he had not been involved), CO accepted that the Flood Hub has a perceived emphasis on resilience. It doesn't help that there are different interpretations of what resilience is. Communities need a voice, and that is integral to providing resilience.</p> <p>RD noted that a) he had proposed that CSFP act in precisely the same way as the NWNW Coastal Group, with submission of material to The Flood Hub alongside their own site; and b) his stance was dependent on success of his offer to seek resources for the CSFP site.</p> <p>Agreed recommendation to the Board: Place on hold the wholesale transfer of content from the CSFP website to the Flood Hub until Board has received and agreed proposals for CSFP website. It is important nevertheless for partners to submit information to the Flood Hub.</p>	
10	<p>s.19 reports</p> <p>Chair noted the considerable value of these reports to all areas of flood risk management in Cumbria. He asked the Group to agree that updates on their production should be a standing item for meetings of this Group and the CSFP Board. Agreed.</p> <p>Chair asked for every opportunity to be taken for cross fertilisation of s19 report content with the work of the LRF.</p>	
11	<p>AOCB</p> <p>None</p>	

Actions Summary

Minute no.	Action	By	Status
2	Actions from Board Steering Group and Board meetings	SM	Outstanding
4	Proposed CSFP Comms & Engagement Strategy be considered and included in the draft consultant commissioning document.	AL	Outstanding
	Organise dates for the Strategy Conference T&F to meet.	AL	Done
5	Circulate call for the Board to consider any urgent items for consideration at the short meeting on 16 th December.	AL	Done
7	CSFP participation in the Draft Cumbria Coastal Strategy consultation	HR	Outstanding

CSFP CHAIR REPORT #1

CHAIR's ACTIVITIES & BRIEFING AUG- NOV 2019

1 Basic preparations

Several introductory policy & procedural sessions with Doug Coyle, Anthony Lane and Kate Luxton were very valuable & much appreciated, as is their continuing support and follow up. This includes supply of documents and organisation of visits & meetings.

ICT kit was generously provided by CCC but it has been something of a time-consuming challenge to get connectivity fully operational.

2 Councils

I was warmly received during courtesy visits to Allerdale & South Lakeland DCs, with key senior officers in each case, and the new (Independent) Leader of Allerdale. They strongly endorsed CSFP principles, and welcomed opportunities for collaboration & alerting on matters of joint or shared concern; for more community engagement; and for Councillors and officers alike to participate, to be better informed & networked, and to benefit from potential continuing professional development. Some useful specific suggestions emerged, and these have been, or will be, passed on.

A visit to Carlisle City Council is imminent.

Cumbria CC has been unfailingly open, helpful & welcoming throughout, from engineers, administrators & communications officers up to the level of Unit Manager, Directorate and the relevant Cabinet Member, all of whom demonstrate strong commitment to partnership approaches and a high degree of professionalism.

3 Communities

I have been welcomed to the Derwent, Carlisle /Eden and Windermere Lake Level groups, in each case with very valuable practical introductions to challenges they have faced (& are facing), and the immense amount of data collection (including historical & real-time monitoring) and analysis they have undertaken. The voluntary contributions made by highly qualified & committed people is a resource that should never be overlooked. In my opinion there is scope for increasing it, and not just at the community level.

Despite invitations and preliminary discussions, I have not yet been able to engage more fully with folk elsewhere in South Cumbria, or with public health experts across the county; but the meetings are imminent

4 Catchment Management Groups and Rivers Trusts

A meeting with the Eden Board, along with a visit to the Cairn Beck site, will take place in early December. A visit to the West Cumbria folk is expected in February or March

5 Environment Agency

From the outset, I have been impressed by the professionalism and strongly positive commitment to partnership embraced by all the flood-related EA staff and associates in Cumbria I have encountered. They have gone out of their way to give comprehensive on-the-spot briefing on a wide range of policy & operational matters, and have invited feedback. I have visited Kendal & Keswick, and several more visits are in the proverbial pipeline. Meetings in Preston were most valuable in unpacking the arcane world of project appraisal. One has to ponder whether the circumscribing of the work of EA (& others) by so many onerous commitments (in several different dimensions) is always an optimal way of achieving the best and most cost-effective results protective of lives, livelihoods and wellbeing.

6 United Utilities

Several meetings are imminent, and others are in prospect.

7 Cumbria Resilience Forum

I will report orally on my imminent meeting with the Assistant Chief Constable, the new Chair

8 RFCC

I was an observer at the recent RFCC meeting in Warrington, and also had an introductory meeting with RFCC Chair. After the meeting, in response to a general invitation to comment, I made a proposal related to extension of the appraisal formulae by inclusion of heritage-related criteria. This was endorsed by CCC and RFCC, and has now gone forward to DEFRA. My thinking was influenced by the idea that this would differentially benefit Cumbria as compared with the better-heeled counties that are currently at a distinct advantage because of population density and house prices.

9 External activities

Meetings with Sue Hayman MP (Shadow Secretary of State for EFRA) alone and in company with the Derwent community folk have fallen by the wayside due to the general election.

Among several relevant All Party Groups I was invited to join, there was only time to attend one, that for Planning & Housing. In the Palace of Westminster, I was seated between the Chair of Local Government Association and Chair of Town & Country Planning Association, and interacted also with six parliamentarians (some from the Lords) and the CEO of RTPI. I spoke up for Cumbria and for flooding in the discussion which was on the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission (see paper CSFP/19/1c appended to this report).

When the new Parliament convenes, I expect to be invited to rejoin this, and those for insurance and a number of others.

The attached personal invitation (CSFP/2019/1a) from the Westminster Sustainability Business Forum speaks for itself, but note it is a restricted document, not for sharing. Comments and ideas for me to feed in would be much appreciated; deadline 2100 on 19 Nov.

I have also been invited to attend the Future of Floods Conference and associated briefing sessions, outlined in CSFP/2019/1b attached. (Note that this is also a personal & confidential invitation deriving from my engineering, environmental technology, publishing and Third Sector networks!)

In September I attended an international conference in Blackpool, under the title Sea Change, run by World Monuments Fund and International Council on Monuments and Sites. With presentations by or about some 30 countries (including India, China, USA & Australasia), this looked at the relationship between climate, rainfall, sea levels and heritage assets, ports and coastal /estuarine communities, including many policy & strategic dimensions.

In October, I attended a conference in Carlisle on the inter-relationship between archaeology and the environment in a North of England and Ireland context. A presentation on aerial mapping proved to have potential for exploring past behaviour and routing of rivers and other watercourses, and I am pursuing that.

10 Future invitations and contacts

I look forward to continuing to make visits, and welcome invitations. For communities, I have to stress that, due to the strategic nature of my role, I am unable to pursue individual cases, but that I am always glad to have a strictly limited number of well-evidenced examples to illustrate points of principle or commonality that can be made.

Contact is best made initially by email to richard.denyer@cumbriastrategicfloodpartnership.org

Richard Denyer

CSFP Board Meeting - Item 3a

Subject: North-West Regional Flood & Coastal Committee Report

Authors: Doug Coyle; Anthony Lane

Sponsor: Cllr. Keith Little

Meeting Date: 16th December 2019

1.0 Purpose

This report provides the CSFP with an update on the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee meetings including the Finance sub-Group and related activities

NWRFCC Meetings	NWRFCC Finance sub-Group Meetings
Friday 18 th October 2019	Thursday 3 rd October 2019
Next meeting: Friday 24th January 2020	Next meeting: Friday 10th January 2020

2.0 Background

Details of the purpose and remit of the NWRFCC and the Finance sub-Group can be seen in the 'About the NWRFCC' section of the Flood Hub. This website is a one-stop shop for flood information and resources to support householders, businesses and communities across the North West in becoming more flood resilient.

<https://thefloodhub.co.uk/about-us/#section-1>

Further details, including approved minutes from NWRFCC meetings can be found on the Gov.uk website here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/north-west-regional-flood-and-coastal-committee>

Full details of all items in this report, including RFCC papers and presentations can be obtained from CSFP@cumbria.gov.uk

3.0 Finance sub-Group meeting, 3rd October 2019.

3.1 Investment Programme report

- Against our target of 3,055 homes, derived from the February 2019 consented programme, we are forecasting to better protect 5,569 homes. This will take us to a total of 39,073 homes better protected since 2015. This forecast is 2,514 more than the 3,055 target due largely to accelerated delivery of Phase One of the Carlisle scheme.

- On 10 September Defra announced an additional £62m for flood risk management schemes nationally of which £22.8m is going to help fund four schemes in Cumbria and Lancashire.
- It is clear that we will not meet the 6-year efficiencies target and are being assisted by other RFCCs who are exceeding their targets.
- The current published programme allocation for North West RFCC in 2020/21 is £73.1 million (agreed at the EA Board in February 2019). Following the refresh, the North West has been allocated a reduced allocation of £65.1 million.
- We noted the expected announcement on future capital settlement in the Autumn Budget 2019. Adrian Lythgo reported that this be for a further one year or six years.

3.2 RFCC Action Plan 2019/20

Sally Whiting, EA Senior FCRM Advisor provided an update on progress delivering the RFCC Action Plan for 2019/20 with a new format 'highlight' report.

4.0 Key Updates from 18th October 2019 NWRFCC meeting

4.1 Flood incidents

The North-West had suffered a number of significant flood events in July and August: -

- Toddbrook Reservoir in Derbyshire involved the evacuation of 1500 people from their homes. The Secretary of State has ordered an inquiry
- Members from Greater Manchester, Lancashire, Cumbria, Cheshire and mid-Mersey reported on flood incidents in their areas.
- UU provided figures for flood incidents they had to deal with.
- Chair noted the reduction in overall impact of the reported flood incident figures because they do not include damage and disruption to infrastructure.

4.2 Local Levy for 2020/21

Members agreed an increase of 2% on the Local Levy.

4.3 RFCC Consultation on Partnership Funding Rule Amendments

Members were asked to provide support and views on a number of potential Partnership Funding rule amendments being considered by Defra and the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency and Defra will take these views into account when deciding the approach to a new investment programme.

4.4 Update on the RFCC Action Plan

Presented by Sally Whiting, EA Senior FCRM Advisor, as presented to the Finance sub-Group. Updates were provided on: -

- Project delivery confidence assurance exercise;



- RFCC Technical Advisory Group;
- Planning and SuDS Adoption Task & Finish Group;
- Local Levy Strategy and process review;
- RFCC member recruitment.

5.0 Recommendations

The CSFP Board is asked to note the contents of this report.

CSFP Board Meeting - Item 3b

Subject: Making Space for Water Groups (MSfWG)

Authors: Helen Renyard

Sponsor: Lead Local Flood Authority

Meeting Date: 16th December 2019

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide the CSFP with an update from the 6no district wide Making Space for Water Groups.

2. Flood Reports Update

The following information provides details of the flood event that have resulted in Section 19 reports within the last year and indications of the properties that have been affected and the actions proposed. (there have been no reports to reach this threshold this reporting period – December 2019)

Community	Date of flooding	No. of properties internally flooded	Summary of potential actions

3. Making Space for Water Group meetings

Date of next meeting –

District	Date
Allerdale	13 th January 2020
Barrow	23 rd January 2020
Carlisle	7 th January 2020
Copeland	13 th January 2020
Eden	7 th January 2020
South Lakeland	23 rd January 2020

The following is an example of some of hotspots discussed at the previous meeting –

District	Update
Allerdale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tallentire – Works have started and are currently on schedule • Dovenby – culvert surveyed from exterior and appears to be in reasonable condition. Further discussions with landowners regarding additional leaky dams. Problems with bridge blocking in village which is to be investigated further. • Gote Road, Cockermouth – A potential scheme was discussed as well as how it could be implemented and where funding might be



	<p>made available. Further investigations and discussions to be made following the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Branthwaite – Investigations have taken place into this flooding, however, the landowner has been informed that this is a private matter for him to take forward. • Flimby – 1st phase of leaky dams and Cat Ghyll bund installed. Further telemetry to be installed. Ongoing discussions with consultant to develop further works within the village. • Newlands / Braithwaite – EA working with highways England to identify funding • Berkermeth/Kirkbeck – UU raised concerns about a manhole adjacent the watercourse – issues with damage – Rivers Trust and UU to investigate possible protection works • Planning • Low Seaton – LLFA considering response to Planning Authority • Solway Holiday Village, Silloth -
Barrow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandylands / Rugby Club – BBC to carry out survey of culvert – MSFW group still awaiting results • Rating Lane/ Abbey Approach – Following extensive CCTV surveys by LLFA a S25 notice served on landowners to resolve riparian issue • Black Butts Lane – UU completed modelling exercise. MSFW looking at ways to promote works including removal of surface water from the combined system. • West Avenue – UU and highways have carried out work in this area and there have been no further reports of flooding • Ewan Close, Barrow – UU completed modelling – UU and LLFA to look for solutions to resolve the problem. • Hallgarth, Rampside – UU considering options including surface water removal but site difficult due to many environmental barriers • Dalton – Following various works recently there have been no further reports of flooding. NFM being considered for Goose Green • Planning • Flass Lane – previous planning permission has lapsed • Parker Pond/Greystone Lane – surface water disposal being investigated and looking to identify exceedance routes • Askam – Site close to UU pumping station being investigated for development but there may be issues with discharging surface water as there is no direct connection to the nearby watercourse • Lindal – UU checking development against their network model.
Carlisle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumwhinton – LLFA have carried out CCTV survey following flooding in August. Blockages have been identified and UU and landowner has been notified of these. • Thurstonfield – Ongoing surface water flooding to highway. Need for highways to monitor and clean gullies regularly. Surface water identified to come from adjoining fields. LLFA working with landowner to consider ways of reducing runoff. • Green Lane, Carlisle – LLFA have been carrying out CCTV survey of the drainage following flooding event in August 2019. Large volumes of debris have been removed from the system and LLFA are looking at the outfall to see if improvements can be made



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baldwinholme – recent flooding issues on the highway – potentially blocked culvert under the highway – further investigations to be carried out by highways. • Low Mill Dalston – Highways have completed cleaning of gullies adjacent to the site and landowners have cleared obstructions in watercourses since the recent flooding to their access road. • Old Road Longtown – UU, LLFA and highways looking at was to reduce issues on the public sewer. Flooding of properties not reported but residents unable to use toilet facilities etc. • Milton and Hallbankgate - flooding occurred on 1st October – currently being investigated. • Dalston Road / Pirelli – flooding of highway in this location on 10 August and 1 October that resulted in road closures. Highways currently investigating. • Castlerigg Drive, Carlisle – Reports of water in the back gardens has been received. Highways and UU identifying possible casues.
Copeland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moor Row, Stonegarth – UU and highways have discussed possible options. Highways are to carry out further survey works to confirm options viable. • Frizington – Monitoring of culvert still ongoing • Cleator Moor, Little Croft / Norbeck Park – Discussions with landowners planned in near future regarding their riparian responsibilities. • Whitehaven, Victoria Road – CCTV survey still awaiting scheduling. • Millom & Haverigg – Tender for Initial Assessment due to be issued in next 2 weeks. • Moresby Parks, School Brow – Investigations have been ongoing and a clear picture of what is happening is starting to become known. LLFA to contact farmer to overcome issues in the area. • Moresby Parks - works identified are still to carried out but it is hoped that these can be completed before the next MSFW meeting • Sandwith - Jnc Lighthouse Road – investigations continuing to try to identify if there is a blockage on the system. • Seascale Santon Way –confirmed the swale/ditch in the farmers field is expected to be finished on time. • Whitehaven – Egremont Road – LLFA have identified collapse of culvert in a garden – currently working with landowner to resolve. Information to be forwarded to UU so they can check for cross connections. • Lamplugh Crossgates – highways to look at replacing highway system. CBC also making contribution to the scheme. Work expected to start in November 2019. • Keekle Mews, Keekle – UU have been investigating issue but to date have been unable to determine the cause – ongoing • Seascale – Fairways – Further funding needs to be identified before the works can be carried out. • Gosforth – UU / CBC and CCC continuing to review proposals. • <u>Planning</u> • Harras Moor Development – surface water issues may be connected with this site and careful design of the surface water system will be needed.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitehaven, Cemetery area – surface water identified to run across field that is proposed for development – further investigations to be made. • Cleator Moor, Birks Road – on going construction appears to have altered original flow routes and is now causing problems – site visit to be arranged. • Summergrove – North of West Lakes – may be opportunities for improvements of roadside ditch if the developer opts to use this for discharge of surface water. • Whitehaven, Old Bus Station – surface water discharge considered appropriate as flow levels are low. • Whitehaven, Harras Road – concerns were raised over the proposed surface water system – further information to be requested from developer
Eden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armthwaite – LLFA and Highways investigating flooding incident • Planning • Carleton, Penrith - Developer has resubmitted application to increase number of properties on site. UU to investigate impact on site • Raiselands – ongoing issues with adoption specification but nearly resolved • Appleby – 190 property development proposed for Station Road • Langwathby – still awaiting drainage details for site • Hackthorpe – still awaiting drainage details for site
South Lakeland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Square, Burton – visit to look for NFM potential still outstanding. Work due to start on culvert upgrade through The Square in October 2019 • Loftus Hill, Sedbergh – works due to start 25th October 2019 • South Ulverston – Economic appraisal completed now working on potential options • Troutbeck Bridge – works continuing to install flood protection wall. NFM is also being delivered above Staveley. • North Road Holme – LLFA currently looking to appoint consultant to consider shortlist and outline design for preferred option • Finsthwaite – site visit planned with aim to consider scheme for delivery 20/21 • Steels Row Burneside – UU scheme on site and progressing as expected • Carling Steps, Burneside – A S25 enforcement notice has been issued to a landowner to remove an obstruction in the watercourse. • Low Garth, Kendal – UU flying start project – LLFA, UU and SLDC working together to deliver project • Staveley – UU looking at sewers, however, there are difficulties as sewer crosses the river twice. Operational improvements have been made already. • Borrans Bridge / Staveley – NFM currently being delivered • Windermere Road , Grange – MSFW working towards scheme starting soon • Colthouse – Quote received for bunds but appears to be quite high – further consideration to be made. • Sandylands – Ongoing consideration of options potentially including NFM • Planning



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carras Green – Planning application ongoing – aim to secure funding for scheme through S106 • Lumley Road / Milthorpe Road – Unclear if highway works have been carried out in relation the planning application – to be checked • Sainsburys – discussions ongoing with developer on installation of permeable paving • Croftlands, Ulverston – 2 applications currently being reviewed in this area
--	--

4. Flood Incidents reported since last meeting

Flood Date	Details of flooding
10 th September 2019	Whitehaven Road, Cleator Moor – 1 no property internally flooded
11 th September 2019	Sandwith – 1 no property internally flooded
24 th September 2019	Alston – 1 no property internally flooded
27 th September 2019	Gatebeck, Kendal – 1 no property internally flooded Burton-in-Kendal – 1 no residential garage flooded
29 th September 2019	Main Street, Grange-over-Sands – 1 no commercial property flooded
1 st October 2019	Milton – 1 no property internally flooded Scaleby – 1 no property internally flooded Warwick Bridge – 1 no commercial property externally flooded
24 th October 2019	Coronation Drive, Whitehaven – 1 no property externally flooded
1 st November 2019	Mainsgate Road, Millom – 1 no property externally flooded

5. Recommendations

That the CSFP Board notes the MSFWG Update.

Glossary

AcT	ACTION with Communities in Cumbria is the community development organisation and Rural Community Council for Cumbria.
AD	Associate Director
AIMS	Asset Information Management System. System owned by the Environment Agency for managing their flood risk assets.
AMP7	Asset Management Period 7. Water companies tender contracts to service providers to help keep infrastructure properly maintained every 5 years. The next period starts in 2020 (the seventh since water industry privatisation) following Ofwat price review in 2019 (PR19).
AOB	Any other business
BRAG	See RAG
C@R	Communities at Risk (of flooding)
CCC	Cumbria County Council
CCF	Cumbria Community Foundation exists to address disadvantage by making life-changing grants and promoting philanthropy. It responds to emerging need, having managed four disaster appeals, most recently raising £10.3m in response to the floods in 2015.
CaBA	Catchment Based Approach. Central approach led by DEFRA for water environment management
CCA	Civil Contingencies Act 2004. The legislation that establishes a coherent framework for emergency planning and response ranging from local to national level.
CCTV	Closed circuit television
CFAP	Cumbria Flood Action Plan was the first step to developing an action plan covering the Eden, Derwent and Kent and Leven catchments. It provides an overview of on-going work, new actions, information and evidence gathered since the flooding of December 2015. The Environment Agency, working with the Cumbria Floods Partnership and communities across Cumbria, has collated the action plan.
CH2M	Consultant name
CLA	Countryside Landowners and Business Association. A membership organisation for owners of land, property and businesses in rural England and Wales.
CMG	Catchment Management Group
CPAs	Coastal Protection Authorities. Local authorities identified as responsible for coastal management in the Coastal Protection Act 1949.

CRAGG	Cumbria Rivers Authority Governance Group. Co-ordination of County Community Action to minimise the effects of flooding. Provides a community communication structure to affiliate all Flood Action, Parish and Community Groups so their views can be represented at a County level
CSFP	Cumbria Strategic Floods Partnership
CSR	Comprehensive Spending Review is a governmental process in the United Kingdom carried out by HM Treasury to set firm expenditure limits and, through public service agreements, define the key improvements that the public can expect from these resources. Flooding risk management investment is set within each spending review. The first 6-year investment programme was defined by a CSR in 2015 and covered 2015-21. A similar arrangement defined by a CSR is expected to cover the 6 years between 2021-27.
CVS	Cumbria CVS (Cumbria Council for Voluntary Service) offers help, advice, training and support to third sector groups throughout Cumbria. It is a registered charity and membership organisation helping community/voluntary/not-for-profit groups and organisations to develop and improve.
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government. The department of central government responsible for a wide range of local government and community activities.
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. The department of central government responsible for flood management policy in England.
DWMP	Drainage & Wastewater Management Plan. Plans currently being developed by water companies for the long term planning of drainage and wastewater services. Plans will be published in 2022.
EA	Environment Agency
EFRA	The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration and policy of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and its associated public bodies. The EFRA Committee is one of the 19 Select Committees related to Government Departments, established by the House of Commons under Standing Order No. 152.
ELMS	Environmental Land Management Scheme. The cornerstone of future land management policy post-Brexit; underpinned by natural capital principles and delivering through the Defra 25-year Environment Plan goals.
EU	European Union
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund is a fund managed by the European Union. Its purpose is to

	transfer money from richer regions (not countries), and invest it in the infrastructure and services of underdeveloped regions.
ERT	Eden Rivers Trust
ESI	Company name. Geographical Information Systems
FAS	Flood alleviation scheme
FBC	Final Business Case. A later stage of scheme development.
FCRM	Flood & Coastal (Erosion) Risk Management
FCERM	Ditto
FLAGs	Flood Action Group
FAG	Ditto
FRMS	Flood risk management scheme.
GiA	Grant in Aid. Main source of funding from Defra for FCERM projects.
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulations. European legislation (including in the UK) that aims to keep peoples data safer than ever before and gives people more control and say on how their personal information is used.
GMMC	Greater Manchester Metropolitan Councils
GM	Greater Manchester
HE	Highways England is the government company charged with operating, maintaining and improving England's motorways and major A roads. Formerly the Highways Agency, it became a government company in April 2015.
IDAS	Integrated Drainage Area Study. Integrated approaches to urban stormwater drainage management for advancing more sustainable and holistic management of urban water environments.
IDB	See WLMB.
Infrastructure T&F	Infrastructure Task & Finish set-up after the CSFP Board in March 2018 to carry out an assessment of the flood resilience of infrastructure and establish an agreed baseline assessment of the current exposure to flood risk.
IRP	Infrastructure Recovery Programme. Owned by Cumbria County Council, this programme covers repairs and replacement of highways and bridges infrastructure damaged in the 2015 floods.
LAs	Local authorities
LDNPA	Lake District National Park Authority
LEPs	Local Enterprise Partnerships. Voluntary partnerships between local authorities and businesses set up in 2011 by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills to help determine local economic priorities and lead economic growth and job creation within the local area

LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority. The Floods and Water Management Act 2010 gave County Councils or Unitary Authorities a new leadership role in local flood risk management. They have become the lead local flood authority, with responsibility for development, maintaining and applying a local flood risk strategy. Local flood risk is defined as a risk of flood arising from surface run-off groundwater or an ordinary watercourse, which includes a lake or pond which flows into an ordinary watercourse.
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LRF	(Cumbria) Local Resilience Forum. Brings together all organisations with responsibilities under the CCA. Responsible for producing and maintaining the MAFP.
MAFP	Multi-Agency Flood Plan. Sets out responsibilities and plans for response in flood events for emergency services, first responders and the military services.
MHCLG	Ministry of housing, Communities & Local Government.
MSfWG	Making Space for Water Group. There are 6 area based MSfWGs across Cumbria. Membership is made up of officers from key RMAs such as UU, EA, Cumbria County Council as well as Rivers Trusts. They meet quarterly and their key responsibility is to investigate flood incidents and seek solutions to reducing flood risk
MSFW	Same as above
NE	Natural England. The government's adviser for the natural environment in England, helping to protect England's nature and landscapes for people to enjoy and for the services they provide. Natural England is an executive non-departmental public body, sponsored by DEFRA
NFRMS	National Flood Risk Management Strategy published by the Environment Agency.
NFM	Natural Flood Management. Natural flood management as the alteration, restoration or use of landscape features, is being promoted as a novel way of reducing flood risk.
NFU	National Farmers Union
NGO	Non-government organisation. An organization that is neither a part of a government nor a conventional for-profit business. Usually set up by ordinary citizens, NGOs may be funded by governments, foundations, businesses, or private persons.
NGSA	New EA procurement strategy due to be launched in 2019 to replace WEM agreements.

NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework was published on 27 March 2012 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
NR	Network Rail
NRR	National Resilience Review published by the government in 2016.
NWR	Ditto
NW	North-West
NWR FCC	North-West Regional Flood & Coastal Committee
OBC	Ordinary Business Case. A stage of scheme development.
Ofwat	The Water Services Regulation Authority, or Ofwat, is the body responsible for economic regulation of the privatised water and sewerage industry in England and Wales.
OM	Outcome measure – those outcomes expected from flood risk management investment. Identified in the EA Partnership Funding Calculator used to identify the cost benefits of a project. Covers number of homes protected and environmental outcomes.
PAFs	Project Application and Funding Service. A DEFRA on-line service available to RMAs to seek funding allocations for flood risk management schemes.
PDU	Programme Delivery Unit. Environment Agency procurement framework.
PF	Partnership funding. Scheme funding shared between a number of partner sources.
PLP	Property level protection (against flooding)
PR19	Ofwat 2019 Price Review. Every five years, OFWAT set limits on the prices which water companies in England and Wales can charge to their customers; this process is known as a Price Review.
PRG	Project Review Group. A review group constituted to make independent review of project progress or a funding application. Membership is usually made up of individuals or organisational representatives with close interests and responsibilities in the project.
PSO	Partnership and Strategic Overview. Teams within the Environment Agency with responsibilities for promoting partnerships with LLFAs and RMAs
PWG	Project Working Group – normally operating with Catchment Management Groups
RAG	Red, Amber, Green. Colour coding used to identify the progress status of projects: - Red – significant concern, needs to be escalated; Amber – some concern, but most issues resolvable; Green – satisfactory

	BRAG - includes Black – critical, requires immediate attention.
RBMP	River Basin Management Plan. River basin management plans set out how organisations, stakeholders and communities will work together to improve the water environment.
REDFA	River Eden & District Fisheries Association
RFCC	Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (normally referring to NWRFCF)
RMA	Risk Management Authority. An authority with responsibilities in flood risk management as defined in the Flood & Water Management Act 2010.
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SAC	Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) are protected areas in the UK designated under regulations, the UK Government and Devolved Administrations are required to establish a network of important high-quality conservation sites that will make a significant contribution to conserving the habitats and species identified in Annexes I and II, respectively, of European Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, known as the Habitats Directive.
SCRT	South Cumbria Rivers Trust
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment. The systematic appraisal of the possible effects of decisions taken at a high level (such as those in strategies, policies and plans) on the built, natural and historic environments.
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan. Plans to manage the threat of coastal change and developed by Coastal Groups with members mainly from local councils and the Environment Agency. They identify the most sustainable approach to managing the flood and coastal erosion risks to the coastline over the next 100 years.
SPA	Special Protection Areas (SPAs) are protected areas for birds in the UK classified under regulations in accordance with European Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds, known as the Birds Directive. SPAs protect rare and vulnerable birds (as listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive), and regularly occurring migratory species.
SR19	Government public spending review planned for 2019.
SSSI	A Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in Great Britain is a conservation designation denoting a protected area in the United Kingdom. SSSIs are the basic building block of site-based nature conservation legislation and most other legal nature/geological conservation designations in the United Kingdom are based upon them, including

	national nature reserves, Ramsar sites, Special Protection Areas, and Special Areas of Conservation.
STF	Slow the Flow. Usually adopting NFM approaches these flood risk management techniques seek to reduce the rate of flows in watercourses.
SuDS	Sustainable drainage system. A system designed to reduce the potential impact of new and existing developments with respect to surface water drainage discharges.
SW	Surface water
ToR	Terms of reference define the purpose and structures of a project, committee, meeting, negotiation, or any similar collection of people who have agreed to work together to accomplish a shared goal.
Totex	Total expenditure. Used mainly in the water industry to reflect the change in investment from capital expenditure (capex – new and improved infrastructure) to total expenditure where investment is made over a wider range of activities.
T&F	Task & Finish. A group set-up to accomplish a specific task within a defined time.
UU	United Utilities
WEM	Water and Environment Management. An Environment Agency procurement framework
WEG	Water Environment Grant. This scheme provides funding to improve the water environment in rural England, which includes: rivers and their estuaries; lakes; canals; wetlands; groundwaters; coastal waters; The scheme closed at 5pm on 11 May 2018.
WCRT	West Cumbria Rivers Trust
WLMB	Water Level Management Board. Also referred to as Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs), these Boards operate in the low lying fen and valley areas, maintaining pumping stations and drainage channels to ensure that people are safe and the risk of flooding is greatly reduced. They are independent bodies accountable to the local community for the flood protection service they provide.