

**Flooding Steering Group meeting  
2 December 2016  
Flooding Draft Policy discussion**

Item	Lead	Notes	Actions
1. Introductions		Patricia Cuervo (PC) – Planning and Borough Development Manpreet Kanda (MK) – Planning and Borough Development Amanda Frame (AF) – Kensington Society Libby Kinmonth (LK) – Norland Conservation Society Joanna Burt (JB) – Resident Gregory Hammond (GH) - Resident	
2. Draft Policy Discussion (Reasoning justification information)	<i>PC</i>	<p>PC gave an introduction to the review of the local plan and timescales before introducing Chapter 36 (Respecting Environmental Limits) which is the chapter containing the flooding policy CE2.</p> <p>AF explained that Air Quality did not have enough relevance at the beginning of the chapter and that reference to the NICE guidelines and the Council’s Wellness report should be included there.            PC said that she will talk to the Environmental Health officer to give feedback.</p> <p>GH said that paragraph 36.3.20 should use correct risk management language. He suggested some changes on the second sentence to read: “The probability of fluvial flooding is low but the consequences could be very significant. Sewer flooding occurred (...)’</p>	<p>PC said that she will circulate the Environmental Health Officer’s contact: <a href="mailto:Guy.Denington@rbkc.gov.uk">Guy.Denington@rbkc.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Noted.</p>

		<p>AF said that something should be included in the reasoning justification about the consequences of the loss of industry which used groundwater and how this affected the groundwater table. Also, she wanted a reference to the need to contact Thames Water in order to discharge groundwater into the sewer system.</p> <p>In paragraph 36.3.24 AF queried the figure of 17% increase of impermeable surfaces in the Counters Creek Area.</p> <p>AF wanted some information regarding the importance of the drains and the fact that they were not to facilitate the removal of construction debris of materials (such as concrete) which could block them. A footnote should link the test with the Highways Act and any potential fines.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>PC checked the figure in Thames Water's website (<a href="http://www.thameswater.co.uk/counterscreek/17232.htm">http://www.thameswater.co.uk/counterscreek/17232.htm</a>) and it was 17%.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>3. Draft Policy discussion (policy wording)</p>	<p>PC</p>	<p>AF wanted to remove the word 'self-contained' in section a of the policy. PC explained that this was national policy and was related to those basements which only had a way of access and egress. She explained that all basement development within a critical drainage area should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>AF said that, under section d(ii) the distance between exit routes should be included to reflect building regulations. PC said that a footnote could be included.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>AF to send a link to the relevant building regulation document</p>

	<p>JB raised concerns about how section e of the policy will affect property owners as they will be liable for maintenance of flood risk assets. It was agreed that it was likely that the responsibility for maintenance will fall with the owner.</p> <p>GH wanted section g to read: 'require major development to achieve greenfield run-off rates (...)' and to remove the 'aim to' to make the policy stronger.</p> <p>AF wanted the section g(i) to be reworded to be more positive and to read: 'the increase of permeable surfaces'.</p> <p>AF and LK wanted to remove the reference to 'where planning permission is required' of section i as this will not be relevant if planning permission is not required.</p> <p>LK also said that while the Council is keen to promote SUDS and permeable surfaces– the back gardens which are natural soakaways are ever more vulnerable to development. Could an Article 4 be placed on ALL garden development eg: garden houses, terracing, paving, in the Conservation Area regardless of whether the house/property in question is listed or not.</p> <p>Front gardens are now protected from being paved over and made into car parking spaces – it is now time for the back gardens to be protected in the same fashion, particularly as the gradual infill and erosion of gardens - with their mature trees and</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. PC explained that an article 4 direction should be supported by sufficient evidence base information.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>shrubs all providing natural ways of absorbing water - has increased in the last few years.</p> <p>All of the attendees wanted a policy recognising the problem of the Counters Creek lack of capacity. PC explained that section I was there to address Counters Creek but she said that she would think about the wording and would circulate.</p>	<p>PC drafted a policy: work with others to address the Counters Creek lack of capacity and support sound and holistic projects which will provide a long-term solution to the problem. However, she explained that the existing draft policy could also be used to address the Counters Creek and the need for a separate policy was not clear.</p>
--	--	---	--