

Wyre Flood Forum

Minutes of meeting held Thursday 05 August 2024

PRESENT:

Civic Centre:

Chair

Carl Green (CG) Assistant Director of Engineering, Wyre Council

Lancashire Councillors

Cllr Steve Clarke (SC) Fleetwood West & Cleveleys West

Wyre Councillors

Cllr Roger Berry (RB) Neighbourhood Services and Community Safety Portfolio Holder
Cllr Collette Rushforth (CR) Preesall

Parish and Town Councillors

Roger Brooks (RBr) Garstang Town Council
Deborah Smith (DS) Stalmine-with-Staynall Parish Council
Phil Orme (PO) Preesall Town Council / Stalmine-with-Staynall Parish Council

Council Officers / Agency Representatives

Paul Long (PL) Senior Engineer, Wyre Council
Ryan Hirstwood Apprentice Engineer, Wyre Council
Lewis Dobson Apprentice Engineer, Wyre Council
Len Harris (LH) Senior Planning Officer, Wyre Council
George Briscoe (GB) Planning Policy, Wyre Council
Mark O'Donnell (MO) Highways Operational Manager, Lancashire County Council
Rachel Crompton (RC) Principal Flood Risk Officer, Lancashire County Council
Martyn Dugdale (MD) Assistant Flood Risk Engineer, Lancashire County Council
Lorah Cheyne (LC) Flood Risk Coordinator, Lancashire County Council
Pippa Hodgkins (PH) Flood Risk Officer, Environment Agency
Fiona Duke (FD) Flood Risk Manager, Environment Agency
Gemma Mason (GM) Risk Analyst, United Utilities
Phil Wylie (PW) Drainage Performance Engineer, United Utilities

FLAG Representatives

John Thompson (JT) Hambleton Parish Council and FLAG
David Walmsley (DW) Cleveleys FLAG
Ashley Anderton (AA) Preesall FLAG
Linda Rowland (LR) Preesall FLAG
Roger Weatherall (RW) Churchtown FLAG
John Bracken (JB) Churchtown FLAG
Richard Green (RG) Thornton FLAG
Jim Sloane (JS) Garstang FLAG

Others

Peter Holt Carleton Resident

Via Microsoft Teams:

FLAG Representatives

David Astall (DA)

Great Eccleston FLAG

Apologies:

Cllr Alf Clempson

John Shedwick

Paul Bond

Mike Woodcock

Graeme Kellott

Martin Woodcock

LCC Councillor, Poulton-le-Fylde

LCC Councillor, Thornton & Hambleton

Environment Agency

Thornton FLAG

Environment Agency

Poulton Resident

The Forum was held as a combination of live event and remotely via Microsoft Teams.

1. Introduction by the Chair, Carl Green (Wyre Council):

CG welcomed everyone to the meeting, and everyone introduced themselves; see attendance list above.

2. Apologies:

Apologies were noted as above.

3. Local Planning and Managing Flood Risk:

- Presentation by Len Harris (Wyre Senior Planning Officer)

CG introduced LH, Senior Planning Officer for Wyre Council, who gave a presentation on changes to planning following the recent change in government. He explained that that he would be giving an introduction to the relationship between the planning system and the issue of flood risk management, and that GB would give a presentation at the next Forum on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA),

A copy of the presentation is provided at [Appendix B](#)

LH explained that the planning system is based upon the Local Plan and planning applications are largely based on this Plan. The latest [Local Plan](#) was produced in 2023 and was based on the 2019 Plan – it is currently expected to be in place until 2031. LH added that the Council is obliged by government policy to review the document every five years considering changes in circumstances, such as flood risk, climate change, housing and employment. Details on the Local Plan can be seen at [Development Plan – Wyre Council](#)

LH said that the new government has changed the emphasis on housing development and new housing targets have been proposed. He explained that currently Wyre planners use a “standard method” to calculate the number of houses that the council is expected to approve for construction; however, that that formula has now been revised which means that the number of houses that Wyre is expected to approve has changed from 280 per year to 637 per year. He noted that this remains a proposal at the minute and the Council, like many others throughout the country, is making representations to the government. The changes mean that approximately 6,000 additional houses are expected to be built over the lifetime of the Plan.

LH reported that the government are also introducing changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). At this time there are no changes planned to how flood risk is accessed, however, the government have said that “aspects of current planning policy for flood risk could be clearer or more proportionate...” which hints that changes to the NPPF that deal with flood risk may be coming.

LH said that Wyre Council has policies in the Local Plan that control development, including flood risk. The previous government had proposed a national set of policies, but it remains unclear whether this will include flood risk and climate change.

As mentioned, the NPPF is a material consideration when writing the Local Plan and in making planning decisions and any changes may have significant implications for the Local Plan.

In addition to the NPPF there is a document called the [Flood Risk and Coastal Change National Planning Practice Guidance](#) which sets out the basic policy on flood risk. LH noted that the Council has previously challenged housing needs on the grounds that there is significant risk of flooding within the borough, but this had not been accepted by the government inspector.

In addition to the Local Plan, the Council is working on another document, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This document is split into two parts; part 1 looks at the general issues of flood risk and water management within the borough, and part 2 looks at specific sites that are proposed for development.

LH noted that government policy is not to refuse development in areas of flood risk but to manage it as best possible. The NPPF states that any development should be away from areas at the highest risk of flooding – this includes groundwater flooding, surface water flooding or flooding from reservoirs, rivers or the sea. It adds, where development is necessary in such area, then any development must be safe over its expected lifetime and shouldn't increase flood risk elsewhere. The NPPF defines flood risk vulnerability for the type of development and sets out two key tests that should be applied.

- The [Sequential Test](#), which basically asks whether there are alternate sites where the flood risk is lower that can be used instead.
- The exception test, do the benefits of the development outweigh the flood risk matters and can the site be made safe from flooding over its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Within the planning system, planners cannot ask a developer to mitigate existing problems outside of the site, only issues that are caused by the development. Additionally, surface water being discharged from the site should be restricted to greenfield run-off rates so that, theoretically, water coming off the site should be identical to pre-development rates. Surface water should be dealt with following the surface water management hierarchy.

In conclusion, LH noted that Wyre understands that flood risk is a major issue for new development, but it is unlikely to be an excuse for reducing development targets. It is more likely to determine where that development will be focussed and may put more pressure on those areas at lower flood risk.

GB added that as part of the process in developing the Local Plan, over 450 sites were identified as being able to accommodate development. This has been whittled down by removing sites that lie within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 to just 56 sites that could be developed. He noted that should development not be possible, for example the landowner may not wish to release the land for development, then sites within areas of greater risk will have to be considered.

LH noted that climate change and its impacts are also important, and Wyre is reviewing the evidence that is needed to deal with it.

Questions to LH:

- AA said that he had seen a document listing the proposed development sites within the borough; he asked whether the proposed changes to housing numbers now means that this document is now out of date and that it is likely that all the sites listed as options are likely to be included. LH replied that the sites in the document are not all allocation; these sites are only assessed as suitable and not necessarily available, for example landowners may not wish to put their land forward for development.

- SC said that his concern about any future development was about roads, schools, hospitals and doctors. He said that building more and more houses leads to more traffic and pressure on existing services. He added that the loss of land inevitably leads to a reduction in the area that naturally drains away rainfall and an increase in flood risk. He asked whether developers still have an automatic right to connect to a public sewer – this was confirmed by representatives from United Utilities.

LH replied that the number one concern that residents have about development is local infrastructure and how it is affected. He said that the council produces a document called the [Wyre infrastructure delivery plan](#) which is produced in tandem with the local plan. This is produced in discussion with local service providers.

- RBr raised concerns about the comments on page 5 of the document “Local Planning - Managing Flood Risks” which states that “where possible development should achieve green field run off rates” – he said that this was allowing developers to ignore runoff from green fields. He gave an example of local development at Nateby Crossing Lane in Garstang where the green infrastructure has all but been annihilated, with almost all trees and hedgerows being removed. He asked whether the Ainspool watercourse was safe.

RBr said that Westminster politicians appeared to be trying to outbid each other in the number of houses that they were going to build without the slightest idea as to why they are building them – he asked whether the government is being honest as it can that the housing requirement is totally realistic.

LH replied that there is nothing in government policy that states that a development must discharge at greenfield run-off rates only and there is some wriggle room

where this is not achievable. With regard to the number of houses required, he said that this is government policy and that it was the Council's responsibility to meet this requirement or to show why it cannot.

AA noted that the policy is to ensure that development is safe "for its lifetime" – he asked what is meant by lifetime. Guidance is that residential development is assumed to have a lifetime of at least 100 years, non-resident development is assumed as at least 75 years.

PL added that he would try and arrange a site visit with the Developer on Nateby Crossing so that the FLAG could see any works around the connection to the Ainspool for themselves. He will contact RBr once a visit has been agreed.

Action - PL

- JT noted that there is a significant lack of green spaces, and that flood attenuation areas are ideal spaces to be used for green spaces. LH replied that there is a requirement in planning for green infrastructure to be included in all developments. He added that it is now common for sustainable drainage areas to also be used as green space.

- PO noted that the national birth rate is now lower than the death rate and queried the long-term requirement for more house building. He said that the local plan is intended to satisfy local demand, but many of the recent developments in Wyre have been advertised outside of the borough and were attracting persons not currently resident. He added that many of these new arrivals did not work in the borough but commuted to jobs elsewhere and this all contributed to making the borough a poorer area.

CR noted that introducing large numbers of housing Over Wyre would introduce more unemployed or retired residents and have a detrimental effect on the area.

LH noted that demographics were changing all the time and population and household size did not necessarily go together – over time the average household size have been declining.

- FD noted that LCC are leading on a [Local Nature Recovery Strategy](#) looking at the creation of green infrastructure for improving people's well-being.
- CG asked what the risk is if the Local Plan is not developed and approved. LH replied that the government could impose the number of houses on the borough and that it would be much easier for developers to get planning permission.

4. Minutes of previous meeting:

The minutes of the meeting of 13 June were approved without amendments.

There were no matters arising.

5. Reports from Flood Management Authorities:

Environment Agency:

A pre-meeting update to the Forum is included as [Appendix A](#)

PH gave a summary of works undertaken by the EA since the last Forum. These included.

- Watercourse maintenance carried out by the EA's own maintenance teams has been progressing well.
- There has been a delay in works undertaken by external maintenance contractors. This means that that works will only be undertaken on high priority watercourses. Works have begun and are progressing well.
- Work has begun on the repair of the embankment at Six Arches in Scorton and is expected to be collected by the end of October.
- Work to improve the crane pads by Garstang flood gates is underway and expected to be collected this winter, allowing the gates to be removed in June 2025.
- The replacement footbridge by the Catterall flood basin is expected to be installed in mid-October after which the old bridge will be dismantled.
- The [Hambleton Tidal Flood Risk Management Scheme](#) is scheduled to be considered by Wyre Planning Committee on 2 October.
- The [Fleetwood and Copse Brook Flood Risk Management Scheme](#) is currently on hold for up to 12 months.

FD reported that, due to a dispute between ABP and local fishermen on Jubilee Quay, the EA have struggled to gain access to the site to undertake ground investigation works. Without the works the EA are unable to start designing the scheme. Additionally, there is an on-going land sale between ABP and Fox Group which may take up to six months to complete. Until the sale is complete the EA cannot make a legal agreement with the landowner. The scheme has been put on hold for twelve months or until the sale is completed. Furthermore, the planned dredge of the quay will not be undertaken by ABP while the change in land ownership is ongoing.

Questions to Environment Agency:

- RB asked whether the funding sources for the Fleetwood scheme were secure or was it possible that they could be withdrawn as a result of the lengthy delay. FD confirmed that she and CG had tried to resolve the issue between ABP and the fishermen but confirmed that the delay was not expected to change or increase the flood risk to residents. With regard to funding, she confirmed that the grant aid would still be available when required at a later date. She noted that it was likely that the cost of the scheme would increase due to the delay.

SC noted that the work on Copse Brook outfall was critical as it took significant volumes of surface water, including large parts of Cleveleys.

RW said that Churchtown FLAG has two major concerns about the repair works to the barrage gate at Garstang. Firstly, a concern that the use of a crane to lift

the broken gate, and the requirement for installing crane pads, was very expensive and time consuming. He suggested that installing two gantries between the embankment and the central pier to pick up the gate and hold it in place while the repair to the wall is undertaken. Secondly, he considered that the gates were opened/closed by a single ram on one corner and that the gates were twisting when operating putting more force on the inner hinge; he believed that this is why the hinge has failed. He suggested that the EA look to redesign the gate to prevent reoccurrence, and to consider replacing the other gate hinge at the same time to prevent a similar failure on the west gate.

Lancashire County Council:

Highways:

MO gave a summary of the works being undertaken by LCC

- Routine cleaning of highway gullies – 9518 have been cleared.
- Reactive cleaning of gullies has continued – there are now two gulley machines operating to clear the backlog of reported blocked gullies
- Churchtown, junction of A6 and A586 – looking at surface water drains at the junction. Repairs undertaken to pipes on east side of A6
- Tarn Road, Thornton – root cutting and relining of pipes
- Sunnyside Terrace – the watercourse to the side of Sandy Lane has been dug out following discussion with the FLAG
- Factory Brow, Bleasdale –
- Winder Lane - drainage investigation works
- Stocks Lane, Carlton – drainage investigation works jointly with Blackpool Council
- Breck Road, Poulton – drainage investigation works

MO said that he has been using pipe sleeving techniques to repair damaged pipes without the expense of digging up the highway to reach the pipe. This has proved to be highly successful, and he offered to give a brief presentation of the technique at a later Forum meeting.

Flood Management Team:

RC said that all items have already been covered on the Agenda.

Questions to Lancashire County Council:

- PO reported that the Aco drain on the junction of Sandy Lane and Sunnyside Terrace does not appear to be draining properly and is flooding the road. He asked that the drain be checked and cleared if necessary.
- RBR asked for further details on the works on Stocks Lane. MO confirmed that the works were to clear and repair the local highway drains which drain through the crematorium land.

United Utilities:

PW reported that work was very much 'business as usual'; he noted the following works

- The design work for the storage tank proposed for the last in line sewage pumping station in St. Michaels is expected to be completed soon and will be tendered by early 2025.
- UU are undertaking works to remove surface water from the combined sewer in Little Eccleston. This is to provide additional foul water capacity in the current pipe to accommodate the anticipated house building in Great Eccleston. Surface water is being directed into the local watercourse networks and hence into the River Wyre. He noted that a lot of cross connections had been discovered and these were being removed to prevent foul discharge to the watercourses.
- Investigations are underway in Hambleton to look at solutions to the whole system being full. Additionally, UU are looking at the option to increase the flows from Kiln Lane pumping station to Skippool pumping station and to increase storage upstream to reduce flooding along Carr Lane.

Questions to United Utilities:

- JT queried why major projects were planned for larger areas, such as Manchester, when there were works needed locally. He said that Wyre residents were paying the same money for major schemes as those residents in other areas, but it appeared that schemes were favoured in areas with larger communities. PW replied that schemes are planned on a cost/benefit basis and works are undertaken where they have the greatest impact for the least cost.
- DA asked whether the works being undertaken on the A586, near to the Show Ground, were those to remove the surface water from the combined sewer. PW confirmed that this was the case.
- DA asked whether UU were undertaking works close to the pumping station opposite the entrance to Raikes Road. PW was unaware of these works, although it was possible that this was work being done by UU contractors.
- JT noted that there were three large tankers working on the pumping station on Kiln Lane, Hambleton. It was understood that the works involves the replacement of a flow meter. JT asked whether it was known how long the meter had been faulty and whether this fault had resulted in additional discharges from the station to Wardleys Creek overflow. PW replied that the meter has been broken for some considerable time; to enable UU to consider increasing the flow from Kiln Lane to Skippool it is important that an accurate reading of current flows is made and this work is to replace the meter to gain that information.
- JT noted that UU did not appear to be overflowing from the Kiln Lane station to Wardley's Creek because they would exceed their permitted foul discharge volumes for the area. PW said that UU do not have EA consent to discharge at Wardley's Creek unless there was a major failure of the pumping station.

PW noted that surface water inundation of the foul drainage system is the major issue Over Wyre and UU is looking to identify and remove it. He noted that identifying where the water is coming in is very difficult.

Wyre Council:

PL reported that this summer had been relatively quiet as far as flooding was concerned, and this has allowed the council to look at a number of long-standing issues.

- Works has been undertaken to dig out the watercourse alongside Sandy Lane, Preesall to look at redirecting some of the water flows from the field behind Sunnyside Terrace to reduce the risk of flooding from the main river watercourse.
- Wyre have been working with Wyre Rivers Trust on the plan to construct a wetland storage area behind Sunnyside Terrace to retain flood water and further protect properties. PL confirmed that the landowner has given consent for WRT to install water level monitoring devices from this September and approval in principle for the wetland to be installed next year summer.
- Works to CCTV inspect the private culvert on Calder Ave., Thornton were still outstanding – access to the culvert has not been possible due to high water levels and alternate means of gaining access are being looked at.
- Works are ongoing on Royles Brook pumping station, where one of the newly refurbished pumps has been damaged by debris in the watercourse and a second has an electrical fault that needs to be corrected. Works to repair these faults is expected soon. The FLAG has been made aware of the issue.
- All other issues have been covered in the Making Safe for Water minutes that have been provided to all members.

CG reported that the sea defence works at Cleveleys and Fleetwood are going well and are on track to be complete by 2026

CG updated the Forum on the "[Our Future Coast](#)" scheme – he said that the plan is to use dredged materials for nature based solutions; this will allow the dredging of the port to keep it open while using the dredged material to create habitat.

Questions to Wyre Council:

- RG asked whether there was an update on the EA's siltation report for Thornton and whether there are any works planned as a consequence. PL confirmed that the EA had not yet shared the report, but it is understood that there are large areas that have not been included in it, including the area on Hillylaid Pool between New Lane and the Bay Horse. It is also understood that there are no current plans to undertake any desilting works. PH confirmed that this is the case.
- RG confirmed that he had sent an email to PL reporting tree offcuts being dumped in the watercourse off New Lane. He asked that this be reported to the EA for removal.

Natural England:

No report was received from Natural England

Wyre Rivers Trust:

No report was received from WRT.

CG noted that TM was currently engaged in writing a business case for funding of projects and was unable to attend today.

6. Making Space for Water Technical Group:

PL confirmed that there had been little or no significant flooding events and that the Group had been concentrating on looking into resolving current issues. He added that all issues were covered by the minutes from the MSfW meeting or had been discussed earlier in the Forum. He invited members to raise any queries.

Questions to MSfW Group:

- PO noted that in the minutes of the meeting (page 5) it was reported that the Broad Fleet outfall gate in Pilling is twisted and letting the tide back. It was also reported that the EA are looking to repair it. PO asked if there was an idea as to when this work is likely to be done, as he is aware that the Broad Fleet has an influence on Out Rawcliffe and Preesall. PH said that she was not aware of this but would look into it and advise.

Action – PH / GK

- PO said that, over the last few years, there had been several events where an individual or company has been identified as being responsible for a flooding issue. He asked that LCC Legal Team be more active in taking action against these persons – RC replied that she took advice from LCC Legal Services, and it isn't possible to take active enforcement on every defect. PO said that he wasn't looking to take action on every defect, just one or two key cases, to act as an example.

7. Local Flood Action Groups:**Reports and questions from each of the FLAGs****a) Cleveleys FLAG**

DW said that he had very little to report this meeting; rain totals for the three months June to August were very modest and below average for summer. He noted that there had been two major storms in August which had coincided with an exceptionally high tide that had required closure of the storm gates at Cleveleys. Fortunately, despite near storm wind conditions and very high tides, no flooding occurred.

b) Thornton FLAG

There was no representative from the FLAG at the meeting – PL noted that the FLAG had sent in requests for information / works to the MSfW meeting and these are being addressed and reported within that meeting.

c) Knott End FLAG

There was no representative from the FLAG present.

d) Preesall FLAG

AA gave a summary of issues in Preesall. He said that the FLAG was pleased to see that the ditch adjacent to Sandy Lane had been dug out and awarded further works to check/clear the outfall.

AA noted that contractors had been noted working on installing water level monitoring equipment on the fields behind Sunnyside Terrace in preparation for the planned flood alleviation scheme.

e) Hambleton / Stalmine FLAG

JT reported no new flooding issues. He noted that there had been a fly tipping incident where gardening waste was being tipped into a watercourse; this was reported both to Wyre Council's Environmental Health Team and the wife of the offender! The debris was removed by FLAG members.

The FLAG is continuing to monitor flooding issues in the village.

PO reported that he had received complaints that the pond on the Linley Grange site in Stalmine has not been constructed as planning permission. He asked that this be checked.

PO asked whether there had been any further movement on resolving the issues on Meadow Ave, Preesall. PL said that a survey of the drainage on Pilling Lane had confirmed that surface and highway drainage did not, as previously suspected, run down into Meadow Ave. As such, the urgency to look at the surface water drains there was lower. However, PL noted that he still needed to speak with the developer as work is required to ensure the flows in the watercourse.

PO asked whether enforcement action has been taken against the person who has built over part of the watercourse behind Pinewood Ave, Preesall. PL confirmed that LCC have sent a letter to the homeowner instructing him to remove the obstruction.

PO asked if there has been any movement on replacing the culverted section off watercourse behind Rosemount Ave in Preesall. PL noted that CR has spoken to the current landowner and that the issue would also need to be addressed as part of the proposed development adjacent.

PO asked whether the storm boards on The Esplanade, Knott End could be redesigned to give improved access / egress. He said that he would discuss this outside of the Forum.

f) Out Rawcliffe FLAG

There was no representative from the FLAG present.

g) Great Eccleston FLAG

DA said that there was nothing to report this meeting.

He noted that someone has done up the drains on Water Lane, leading to the water treatment plant. He asked if anyone was aware of this – no-one was.

h) St Michaels FLAG

There was no representative from the FLAG present.

i) Churchtown FLAG

RW reported that there had been no flooding in Churchtown during the past quarter. He said LCC had continued to investigate highway and surface water drainage in the village, particularly at the junction of the A6 and A586, although he had yet to receive a detailed report of the findings. MO replied that he would speak to the contractor to have a report sent over.

RW reported that the FLAG is still awaiting consent to install a penstock to reduce flood risk to Ainspool Lane. In readiness of a penstock being installed he said that the FLAG have installed a level gauge on the bridge by the Ainspool watercourse and have a further gauge to install in the wood. This would provide the FLAG with defined levels at which to open or close the penstock that would not flood properties on Ainspool Lane.

RW reported that the FLAG has changed the dates of its quarterly meetings to better coincide with the Flood Forum meetings and allow them send in reports ahead of the Forum.

j) Garstang FLAG

JS said that the two main issues concerning the FLAG were the Nateby Crossing development and the Garstang flood gate repair. PL reiterated that he would contact the developer at Nateby Crossing to arrange a site meeting with the FLAG in the near future.

8. Communications Update:

No report.

CG said that there is a significant volume of useful flooding information available at [The Flood Hub](#)

LC reported that there is a current joint authorities project [Unpave the Way](#) looking at alternatives to paving flood gardens to create parking spaces – details on alternatives, such as using permeable driveways water collection or SuDS, are included on the website.

9. Emergency Planning Update:

CG reported that Wyre Council has a new Assistant Emergency Planner and she will be helping with updating Wyre's emergency plans including our Multi-Agency Flood Plans (Level 2).

10. Request for reports to the next Forum meeting:

CG noted that GB would be giving a further planning update at the next Forum.

PL noted that he has sent out early invitations to the Flood Forums next year to ensure that all members were aware of dates. He added that, to try and reduce the length of the meeting, he was asking for questions in advance of the meeting, where possible, so that responses could be prepared in advance.

11. Any Other Business:

The Environment Agency have updated guidance on the rights and responsibilities of owning a watercourse. The booklet can be downloaded at [Your watercourse: rights and roles | Engage Environment Agency \(engagementhq.com\)](https://www.engagementhq.com/your-watercourse-rights-and-roles)

12. Next meeting:

Next meeting is 12 December 2024, 1.00pm start at Wyre Civic Centre and via Microsoft Teams (Link below)

Microsoft Teams

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 316 232 608 428

Passcode: DPEKzs

Appendix A

Pre-meeting report from Environment Agency (September 2024)

Reporting a problem

The most effective means of reporting a potential flooding or blockage problem on a Main River is to report it to the Environment Agency's National Call Centre on 0800 80 70 60. The National Call Centre will collect the relevant information and ensure it is passed to the correct team for assessment.

A copy of the Main River Map can be viewed here [Main River Map](#)

Here are the present updates since June 2024 from the Environment Agency:

Flood Basin training dates

Garstang Flood Basin Training dates from June 2024 to August 2024:

14 June 2024
12 July 2024
02 August 2024

Catterall Flood Basin Training dates from June 2024 to August 2024:

14 June 2024
12 July 2024
06 August 2024

Maintenance Work

Our internal maintenance programme is progressing well and our externally contracted workforce has begun to work on the highest priority watercourses. The delays in beginning this work mean that our maintenance programme will only focus on high risk watercourses this year.

We have begun work to repair the collapsing wall near Six Arches bridge in Scorton. We are planning for this work to be completed by October.

Garstang update

Work is ready to begin on the crane pad improvements once an electricity service diversion has been undertaken by Electricity North West. We plan to complete the crane pad work this winter, ready to remove the gate from June next year. We understand that this remains a cause of concern to the local community and to ensure that a standard of flood risk protection is provided to people and property downstream of the basin, additional stop logs were installed upstream of the floodgate on the east side in October 2022. These allow us to be able to store around 900,000m³ of flood water in the basin, for comparison, a typical flood event will see us storing around 325,000m³ of flood water. The west gate remains operational and will be used alongside the stop logs to operate the flood storage basin

Catterall Footbridge

Work on constructing a new foot bridge to our control structure at Catterall flood storage basin is progressing well. The new 36m long bridge is planned to be installed from mid-October, with the old timber bridge being dismantled in December.

The new bridge is crucial to ensuring that we have safe access for our operatives to operate our flood storage basin at Catterall in the future and continue to protect the local communities.

Project / Review updates

Hambleton Tidal Flood Risk Management Scheme (FRMS)

The proposed scheme will reduce the flood risk to over 600 properties. Linear flood defence walls are proposed from Kiln Lane, north of Wardleys Pool, to the end of the existing embankment near Peg's Pool which will be strengthened and raised. The Hambleton FRMS will provide a consistent standard of protection against a flood event with a 0.5% chance of occurring in any one year. The scheme has included the effects of climate change, with consideration given to the impacts of sealevel rise and increased magnitude and severity of flood events.

The planning application for the scheme is undergoing determination by Wyre Council, ahead of an anticipated planning committee in early Autumn.

The documents can be viewed online here or through Wyre Council's planning portal by searching for application "23/00960/LMAJ". A printed copy of the Environmental Statement is available for public viewing at the Shovels Inn, Hambleton. Ahead of planning determination, we are continuing to work with external stakeholders, including Natural England, the Marine Management Organisation, United Utilities and Lancashire County Council Highways, to finalise elements of the scheme that fall within their remit.

Further information relating to the scheme is available via the scheme's FloodHub page (<https://thefloodhub.co.uk/hambleton/>). If you would like to discuss the scheme further, please contact our Lancashire Partnerships and Strategic Overview team at CMBLNC-PSO@environment-agency.gov.uk.

Fleetwood and Copse Brook Flood Risk Management Scheme

The proposed scheme at Fleetwood will include the construction of approximately 800 metres of tidal flood defence wall and the reconstruction of the Copse Brook outfall to provide protection to Fleetwood. It will protect over 2,200 properties from flooding from the Wyre Estuary Frontage. Total scheme cost is estimated to be £13M and over £7M will be funded through Government Flood Defence Grant in Aid. We have received an indicative allocation of £1.77M of Local Levy funding from the Northwest Regional Flood and Coast Committee.

An Outline Business Case (OBC) for change at Fleetwood and Copse Brook was submitted and approved in May 2023, recommending the development of a comprehensive scheme to raise the standard of protection against tidal and fluvial flooding to a 0.5% AEP. Post OBC approval, the existing landowners (ABP) have entered into an agreement in principle to sell the landholding to 3 another party (Fox Group). This has added extra complexities to scheme progression as we negotiate agreements with partners and means we are unable to progress currently with detailed design.

It is our ambition that the scheme will provide a catalyst for the wider regeneration of Fleetwood by injecting capital investment into the frontage, whilst unlocking large areas of derelict land for redevelopment. The Our Future Coasts project being led by Wyre Council has an ambition to create an area of saltmarsh in front of the quayside and this would be complimentary to the Flood Risk Management Scheme, as it would provide a natural protection to the quayside on which the new flood defence would be built upon. It would also create habitat and lead to a significant amount of carbon storage. We are therefore working very closely with Wyre Council and Associated British Ports (ABP - current landowners) to ensure these intertwined ambitions are delivered together. We have also started discussions with the boat owners at Jubilee Quay regarding our proposals and how it will affect their activities.

Further information on the scheme can be found on the flood hub: [Fleetwood Flood Risk Management Scheme | The Flood Hub](#)

Upper & Mid Wyre Asset Management Project (following on from the Upper and Mid Wyre Review)

The Upper and Middle Wyre Asset Management (U&MWAM) Project was developed in 2017, but due to constraints in available Capital and a low Partnership Funding score was deferred. There have been limited opportunities to progress this project since then as there remains a large funding gap for delivery of the preferred way forward. Key strategic partners for funding could include other government departments, Wyre Council and key businesses in the local area, from where an external contribution of over £11.6 million is required to make a scheme viable. This does not take into account recent inflationary pressures on the Environment Agency's Capital Programme resulting in Grant in Aid (GiA) being prioritised onto more viable schemes across Lancashire as follows on the coast: near Cleveleys; Blackpool; and St Annes and also on rivers at Hambleton: Preston & South Ribble. In summary, because of current financial challenges, the U&MWAM Project is unfunded in the capital programme and without significant partnership funding it will remain on hold for the foreseeable future.

Local Planning and Managing Flood Risk (Part 1)

Len Harris (WBC)

Contents

- Wyre Local Plan review – Issues and Options
- Proposed changes to the planning system
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Wyre Local Plan policy CDMP2
- Reviewing the Local Plan
- Conclusions

Local plan review – Issues and Options

- Plan led system - primacy of the local plan – decide planning applications in accordance with the local plan unless other material considerations dictate otherwise.
- Current local plan published early 2023 and is based on the 2019 Local Plan. Runs to 2031.
- Current local plan is being reviewed. This will include reviewing policies relating to flood risk and water management and updating the evidence base.
- Current stage – Issues and Options. Consultation closes 10 September. See <https://www.wyre.gov.uk/localplan>
- However, the government has proposed changes to the planning system.....

Proposed changes to the national planning system

- Broad approach – emphasis on development
- Revised “standard method” for calculating the housing requirement.
- Proposed new housing targets – Wyre goes from 280 dwellings p.a.(which we assumed for the I&O consultation) to 637 dpa.
- Amendments to the **National Planning Policy Framework** particularly focused on housing delivery. Draft amendments have been published. At the moment no changes to the flood risk text, but.....
- Flood risk – National Government - “we have heard that aspects of current planning policy for flood risk could be clearer or more proportionate...”
- ALSO National development management policies – consultation later this year.

National Planning Policy Framework

- The NPPF is a material consideration when drafting local plans and making planning decisions.
- Also additional guidance in the form of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change National Planning Practice Guidance.
- Local plan policies should be in compliance with the NPPF.
- The presence of areas at risk of flooding or coastal change remains a justification for not meeting development needs BUT this was not accepted for the 2019 Local Plan.
- Local plans should be informed by a **Strategic Flood Risk Assessment** and should be designed to manage flood risk from all sources taking into account cumulative impacts.

National Planning Policy Framework

- Direct development away from areas at highest risk of flooding from any source (now and in the future).
- Where development is necessary in such areas it should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- Two tests (for plan making and decisions on planning applications):
 - **Sequential test** – are there suitable sites available in an area of lesser flood risk, taking into account all sources of flood risk and current and future impacts of climate change?
 - **Exception test** – depends on the vulnerability of the development type – applies if and only if the sequential test is passed - two elements:
 - Sustainable benefits – WBC – do the sustainability benefits outweigh flood risk matters?
 - Technical assessment – Environment Agency – can the development be made safe for its lifetime taking into account the vulnerability of the users and not cause increased flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.
- A site-specific flood risk assessment may be required.
- Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless this is inappropriate.

NPPF Flood risk vulnerability classification

- Essential infrastructure
- Highly vulnerable
- More vulnerable – this includes residential development
- Less vulnerable
- Water compatible development

NPPG flood risk vulnerability and flood zone incompatibility

✓ = exception test **not** required

X = development should not be permitted

| | Essential infrastructure | Highly vulnerable | More vulnerable | Less vulnerable | Water compatible |
|------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| FZ1 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FZ2 | ✓ | Exception test required | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FZ3a | Exception test required | X | Exception test required | ✓ | ✓ |
| FZ3b | Exception test required | X | X | X | ✓ |

Wyre Local Plan – CDMP2

- **NOTE – we can only require development to mitigate its own impacts, not those that pre-exist in the area.**
- **Policy CDMP2 Flood Risk and Surface Water Management** in summary states that:
 - Part 1 – development must comply with the latest SFRA.
 - Part 2 - development will be required to **demonstrate** it will not be at risk of flooding, will not lead to an increased risk of flooding elsewhere and would not affect the integrity of flood defences.
 - Part 3 of the policy specifically requires development proposed in areas at risk of flooding to demonstrate that the **sequential test** has been applied and that there are no reasonable available alternative sites at lower risk.
 - Part 4 of the policy states that development in areas of flood risk will only be permitted where the **sequential** and **exception** tests have been passed and appropriate mitigation/adaption measures are proposed.
 - Part 5 of the policy requires major development to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).
 - Parts 6 and 7 of the policy states that where possible development should achieve **greenfield run off rates** and comply with the **surface water management hierarchy**.
 - Part 8 requires an adequate surface water drainage system to be demonstrated for the lifetime of the development.

Reviewing the Local Plan

- Policy review – we will be reviewing CDMP2 and its operation. Does it work as intended? E.g. difficult to get developers to consider rainwater harvesting.
- Allocating sites – sequential and exception tests when allocating land for development. Significant allocations required to meet proposed housing target. Water management considerations will be an issue.
- SFRA – level 1 – general review of flood risk from all sources; level 2– detailed site-specific review.


Conclusion

- Flooding is well understood to be a critical issue in Wyre.
- Unlikely to limit total development needs but will influence where development does go.
- More pressure on areas not subject to flood risk.
- Key issues – climate change, site specific and cumulative impacts, reviewing CDMP2, updating the evidence base.
- Next steps – continue with the Local Plan review. Understanding the implications of government changes to the planning system. SFRA level 2 for site specific understanding of flood risk implications.

Appendix C



Key areas of the frontage through the proposed scheme area



The frontage of the estuary through the scheme area can broadly be divided into 3 areas, as shown in the Figures above:

- Wall A – 226m linear length of sheet piled wall, retaining Jubilee Quay
- Wall B – 65m linear length of rubble revetment
- Wall C – 451m linear length sandstone masonry retaining wall

Preferred option comprises:

- A new flood defence, from the northeast end of Dock Street towards the southwest end of Bridge Road,
- Replacement of 80m of existing sheet pile wall at western end of Jubilee Quay
- Copse Brook outfall flap replaced.

There is a proposal to create saltmarsh to stabilise the quayside through Walls A and B, across the area of sheet piling and unprotected frontage.

An Outline Business Case for change at Fleetwood and Copse Brook was submitted and approved in May 2023, recommending the development of a comprehensive scheme to raise the standard of protection against tidal and fluvial flooding to a 0.5% AEP. Post OBC approval, the existing landowners (ABP) have entered into an agreement in principle to sell the landholding to another party (Fox Group). This has added extra complexities to scheme progression as we negotiate agreements with partners and means we are unable to progress currently with detailed design.

Scheme Benefits

- Reduced health and safety risks
 - EA operatives when operating and maintaining Copse Brook outfall
 - Fishing boat operators
 - General public
- Reduced flooding flood risk to at least 3,095 residential and 447 non-residential properties through providing a consistent standard of protection along the Wyre Coast.
- The salt marsh creation option has benefits for sustainability, carbon reduction and biodiversity
- Support the regeneration of Fleetwood through unlocking land for development, specifically the quayside area – providing better linkages between the town centre, waterfront, outlet village and marina.
- Over the 100-year Duration of Benefits, the scheme will deliver £123M of benefits (OM1A), with cost-benefit ratio of 4.2, and results in 556 households better protected against flood risk at present day (OM2A).

Scheme Costs

- Total Cost = £13m
- FDGIA Contribution = circa £7m
- Partnership Funding Requirement = £5m
- Local Levy Allocated Funding = £1.6m (Unsecured)

