

Appendix B – Consultation Responses

Question 1 - Do you disagree with any of the objectives or would you like any additional objectives included?

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
Local resident	I suggest that the opportunity is taken to review development decisions made over the last 20 years where flood risk was considered at the time to determine if these decisions turned out to be correct. In other words to learn from past mistakes.	The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy has strong ties with the Local Development Framework and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
Local resident	The proposed building of additional housing between Waller Drive and Stoney Lane, heading to Yates Cops is unlikely to benefit the already trouble watercourses that drain and, more importantly, soak up, water heading down the hill towards Newbury. It has been highlighted in many reports that expanding areas of concrete with no soak-away drainage areas, such as natural land increase the risk of flooding further down the watercourse. With this specifically in mind, building more houses in a "valley" and basically wet-land area will simply exacerbate the issues.	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Stoney Lane Residents Association member (individual)	There is a proposal for housing development in the valley leading to Waller Drive across to Stoney Lane and behind Yates Copse	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Roger Hunneman, West Berkshire Councillor - member for Victoria ward, Newbury	I would like to comment on the effectiveness of the recently finished Newbury Flood Alleviation scheme on the Kennet in Newbury. It undoubtedly saved many properties from flooding in the recent period of exceptionally high water in the Kennet. However there are two additional objectives I would like to see added in the light of the recent flooding:- 1) I would like to see the problem of the accumulation of rain and groundwater on the "dry" side of the Flood Protection wall in the Northcroft Lane area dealt with, possibly by the installation of a submersible drainage pump in the existing sump outside the Salvation Army Shop. The EA had to pump this area for over two weeks in order to reduce the impact of flooding here. In the event several properties, gardens and car parks in the area were flooded and sewers were surcharged. I would like to see a solution to this problem as an additional objective 2) In the Shaw area of my ward - Shaw Road and Newport Road - flooding occurred from the River Lambourn, much of the problem in this area was caused by the local surface water drainage systems being directly connected to the River - this caused the flooding of the Highway in Shaw Road and the car parking areas at the end of Newport Road and the water from this area then flowing into the gardens of Doveton Way and probably leading to the sewer surcharge problems in the Newport Road area. I would like an additional objective of a Flood Alleviation scheme for this area of the lower River Lambourn to be included	Comments re the Newbury Flood Alleviation Scheme noted. 1) Discussion is on-going with the EA regarding solutions to the flooding issue on Northcroft Lane and to the east of the bund on Glodwell Park. The Ward member will be kept informed of discussions. 2) A section 19 investigation report under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 will be carried out into the flooding in Shaw. This will be made public in the summer.
Local residents	Stop building on high level land to allow rain water soak into the ground so preventing run off. Stop residents paving over front of houses for car parking. Persuade residents to remove paving from front of houses except for footpaths and car tracks Clear roadside gutters of tree leaves and other debris in early autumn before drains are clogged	The LFRMS and Sustainable Drainage element of the FAWMA will help reduce the flood risk from future developments.
Streatley Parish Council (Floodline Developments) - Water Engineering Consultant and Developer	SPC fully supports the objectives of the Strategy. Other objectives: - To identify alternative funding opportunities for water management and flood risk mitigation work - To ensure planning decisions take full account of energy efficient flood resilient buildings which are ideally suited for new or replacement development in existing flood risk areas	Comments noted. The Council is committed to pursuing all available funding avenues and has been successful in recent years in securing funding for flood risk management. Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team.
Local Resident	Many of the maps are presented at such a small scale that the information they are trying to convey is lost. - Objective all published information should be readable. The references to 1 in 100 or 1 in 200 year event (and from the Thatcham SWMP 1 in 237) lend a specious sense of precision - Objective to properly convey the uncertainties and variability of the future problem regarding the extent and severity of various problems. There is no obvious mechanism to identify how the problems engendered by previous planning decisions (e.g. the differences between July 2007 and 1947 floods or how planning decisions were based on (in retrospect) suspect information supplied with the application) - Objective to provide a means to analyse planning performance on both a historical and ongoing basis to provide improvements to the process. There is a general trend to rely upon computer models both in creating reports such as this and also planning applications. Objective to ensure that evidence is readily verifiable, all values, predictions and assumptions capable of being expressed in numerical form shall be expressed in SI Units as well as the model/graphical form.	Comments noted. Respondent will be contacted and invited to view the plans at a larger scale.

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
Councillor Alan Macro	<p>To understand the way that the different catchments operate. In particular, the lower Kennet To understand the different responsibilities of the Environment Agency, Canal and Rivers Trust and West Berkshire Council with regard to managing the flow of the River Kennet below Newbury To establish a structure for managing the flow of the lower Kennet To ensure that employees of all organisations with flood responsibilities are trained so that they are familiar with the responsibilities of all the organisations To ensure that all organisations (such as Parish and Town Councils and Neighbourhood Wardens) with no formal flood responsibilities are fully informed so as to be familiar with the responsibilities of all the organisations that do have such responsibilities</p>	<p>A very good point regarding the Lower Kennet and one which will be included in the LFRMS Action Plan. Over recent years the Projects Team has been improving its knowledge of the complicated sluice system in this area. Further work will be carried out to formulate a management strategy.</p>
Local Resident	<p>The development plan for houses to be built in the valley From Waller Drive up to Stoney Lane. With the recent flooding crisis I cannot understand why this is even an option. Common sense seems to have eluding the planners of this proposed development. Flooding is a real concern for residents and also the increased volume of traffic in an already busy area is of great concern. I feel Newbury is becoming over developed with more and more flats being built. Plans are already proposed around the Vodafone site, how long will it be before these two proposals join up to make one massive housing estate. Newbury was built on a flood plain, why build in an already vulnerable area.</p>	<p>Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.</p>
Local Resident	<p>In 2007 several house in Yates Copse and Huntington Gardens were affected by flood water coming up from the drains, this included sewage. Flash flooding also caused problems in other locations on Manor Park and caused houses to flood on Turnpike Road. Everytime it rains heavily residents voice concerns that they hope the area doesn't flood again. Recently due to the bad weather there has been a lot of water on the roads especially coming from behind Yates Copse and the farm track and fields. If more houses are built the drainage on Manor Park especially on Yates Copse and Huntingdon Gardens needs to be improved.</p>	<p>Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.</p>
Local Resident	<p>The strategy's objectives mention plans only in two respects: - To develop plans to reduce existing flood risk, - To ensure that emergency plans are effective. I suggest the draft strategy should meet all of above objectives AND outline an implementation plan with a roadmap of activities, which can be costed and prioritised. Otherwise we run the risk of the strategy remaining a strategy with insufficient follow-through and lack of rigorous implementation.</p>	<p>The Action Plan has includes capital projects that will be costed. This will then be used to bid for funding.</p>
Stoney Lane resident	<p>In regards to the proposed development by Stoney Lane/Yates Copse. This would greatly increase the risk of flooding for Manor Park, especially flash flooding from the run off created by the clay valleys. We strongly object any plans for development.</p>	<p>Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.</p>
West Berks resident	<p>agree and in particular the importance that planning decisions ensure that developments do not go forward where the risk is to cause or contribute to flooding</p>	<p>Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.</p>
Local resident	<p>You should also be responsible for ensuring developments prevent additional flooding. Or create any flood risk to existing properties.</p>	<p>The SuDS element of the Flood and Water Management Act, included in the LFRMS is directly aimed at reducing the flood risk from future developments.</p>
Stoney Lane Residents Association member	<p>I am concerned of the potential impact any housing development in the Waller Drive/Stoney Lane/Yates Copse area may have on already stretched drainage and sewerage systems.</p>	<p>Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.</p>
Local resident	<p>The existing flood plans and defences have been proved to be wholly inadequate and building more homes on the clay based grounds of north Newbury will only exasperate matters. Councils and governments hide behind the global warming banner to conceal the lack of planning & investment yet this winter was not even the wettest on record. (1910). The residents of West Berkshire pay their rates and put their faith in the councils planning department. Your lack of action, lack of foresight, and let's face it lack of simple common sense, have let down the community. You cannot afford to let this happen again.</p>	<p>This strategy is aimed at reducing flood risk and formulating an Action Plan against which all possible funding avenues can be explored. Comments regarding the Council's planning department will be discussed with the Planning Policy Team.</p>
A council tax payer	<p>Comments on bullet point 4:- 1. Whatever happened to Water Bailiffs? Presumably these used to be employed by the local council? 2. Start dredging of rivers and canals. 3. Keep ditches clear. (Fly tipping a problem.)</p>	<p>Comments to be discussed with the Environment Agency.</p>
M C Spence	<p>Objective 4 should include a requirement to oversee implementation of the Action Plan. Add to the fourth objective "and to oversee that action is taken accordingly".</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Local resident	<p>A primary objective should be to establish an effective system of two way communication between WBC and those who are under duress</p>	<p>Comments noted. One of the aims of the</p>

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	at the time of flooding. For the affected public to report incidents back to you as LLFA and for you to be able to confirm receipt of this information and next steps where appropriate. It has been difficult to access information regarding the public consultation and the relevant documentation. It was next to impossible to find the survey monkey link! "Increase public awareness" is not the issue as the public the flooding relates to are well aware - but have no idea whether anyone is interested / can help. We did ask for sandbags to protect our em Electricity supply but this was refused - presumably because of Chinese whispers and miscommunication. to liaise with. Should read existing "and future" flood risks as we know this will continue. Other than this, objectives all clear	strategy is to make residents aware of the responsibilities of each organization and who to contact in an emergency situation. Much of this work has also been carried out through the Council's Emergency Planning team.
Local resident	The following objective should be clearly stated and included in the strategy document:- - To inform the decision making for the sanction of funds necessary to support the enactment of the strategy.	The Action Plan will be reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on an annual basis. The Action Plan will directly support the bidding process for funds and will inform decisions.
Local resident	I miss a clear objective to prevent or minimise housing or commercial development in areas prone to ground water or any other flooding. As building on and tarmac off flood planes on ground water flooding areas can cause severe problems in lower areas. E.g. the proposed development of "Newbury North" will probably cause ground water streams to run into the lower parts of Newbury. The current draft strategy ensures that planning decisions take full account of flood risk, but I would like to see that changed in a more bold strategy where the council upfront declares areas as "not fit for development"	Preventing inappropriate development is endemic to the LFRMS. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Local resident	To identify measures that aim to reduce existing flood risk; Within your budget I believe that you do a good job, however, I believe that because of cuts and extra housing certain areas are allowed to flood MORE than is necessary. For example, if the river Thames banks were maintained to an acceptable level then there would be fewer breaches of the banks in medium flood conditions thereby delaying houses being flooded before a major flood occurred.	Comments noted and to be discussed with the Environment Agency.

Question 2 - Do you have any comment on these measures and do you feel there are any additional measures that should be included to achieve the objectives of the strategy?

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
Local resident	There is a presumption that SuDS works. Given the ground conditions in some of the affected areas, such as sloping clay hills, this may not be the case and even if water can be made to soak into the ground it can emerge to cause damage elsewhere.	Noted. National SuDS guidance will be used when considering sustainable drainage solutions for developments. If SuDS are not appropriate then approval to connect to public sewers can be sought, but this should be a last resort.
Local resident	A more strategic approach is needed. Referring again to the Waller Drive expansion this is an area that is to be studied with no completion date. Building should be postponed until this study is completed	Comments to be discussed with WBC Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Great Shefford Parish Councillor	Measures M9 & M10 - in relation to progress, capital programme and grant bids should be undertaken when the ability arises not just annually.	Noted. The annual review is for guidance to mirror current central government capital allocations. Bids will be submitted whenever funding comes available.
resident Ingoldsby Copse, Manor Park, Newbury	As most of the document appears to have been created before the recent flooding it may be prudent for the authors to revisit the objectives and responses to check for completeness. For example there are a number of actions that have a status of "completed" may be there are extra bits that can be / should be added Living just off Waller drive item C36 is off special interest to my self The recent "floodings" have caused issues that previous floods have not such as- the long term raise of the water table and its effect on the length of time taken for normality to return the issues around "sewage" in roads such as Newport road and the immediate responses who is ultimately responsible for dealing with such incidents as Newport road was the control and command for this series of events satisfactory and should any learning points be incorporated is the general contingency planning robust	Points noted. It is the intention that the LFRMS is a 'live' document. As one flood event is never the same as another the Strategy and Action Plan will be constantly updated with new and emerging information. The strategy will be updated following the investigations into the 2013/14 flooding event.
Ian King (Clerk) - Streatley	Objective 1: SPC fully supports the coordinated approach of the relevant agencies to flood risk management, but would also like to see	Comments noted. Other than the Water

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
Parish Council	<p>SSE Plc (Electricity) involved, given the location of electricity sub-stations and power lines in the affected areas. At the local level, SPC supports the setting up of a Streatley Flood Forum and preparation of a Community Flood Plan to coordinate flood risk management actions for Streatley. Objective 2: SPC wishes to bring WBC's attention to the fact that Streatley is an area of significant flood risk. There have been five flood events at Cleeve Court, Streatley, over the last 13 years. It is understood that a Section 19 flood investigation has recently commenced at Cleeve Court, but note Appendix 1 (at G45) refers to Cleeve Court, Woolhampton, and needs to be corrected to Cleeve Court, Streatley. SPC supports the policies and procedures that have been established for the investigation of flood events, the online reporting facility and database. Details of the five flood events at Cleeve Court, Streatley, are set out in the consultation response of the Cleeve Court residents. Objective 3: SPC supports all efforts to secure government funding for flood alleviation schemes. However, it would also request that information about government funding and other non-government sources of funding for property flood protection measures be widely disseminated and made readily available to local residents and businesses, particularly riparian owners. Objective 4: SPC supports WBC's proposed flood investigation policy and the ongoing review of all measures to reduce or mitigate flood risk. Objective 5: SPC considers planning decisions should take full account of flood risk and that WBC and SODC should work together to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk due to new development. In terms of strategic land allocation for flood alleviation, SPC would request that every effort is made to ensure that such measures whether upstream or downstream of Streatley do not detrimentally affect Streatley. Objective 6: SPC wholly supports the proposed emergency planning and dissemination of information regarding flood risk. In addition, SPC would ask that particular consideration is given to electricity substations located on the flood plan. There is a SSE sub-station located next to Cleeve Court, Streatley, and the concern is that if this substation is flooded, then there will not only be loss of power but that may also be a potential safety hazard.</p> <p>SPC notes that G45 refers to a s19 Investigation Report at Cleeve Court in Streatley, but incorrectly refers to Woolhampton instead of Streatley. Please could you ensure that this is corrected. Generally, SPC feel that Streatley has been overlooked despite the repeated flooding of riverside properties. The historic details are set out in the response that has been submitted by the residents of Cleeve Court. Most particularly, SPC would ask that any future plans take account of the SSE sub-station located next to Cleeve Court, as the concern is that if this substation is flooded, then ..</p>	<p>Authority, utility companies have no direct role in flood risk management, other than to ensure their apparatus is suitably protected from flooding. It is the intention to contact SSE regarding at risk sub stations to make them aware of their responsibilities. SPC will be contacted about forming a flood forum and community flood plan.</p> <p>SPC to be contacted about potential funding sources for flood risk management schemes. Comments regarding Objectives 4 and 5 noted.</p> <p>The Action Plan has been corrected. Cleeve Court now refers to Streatley.</p> <p>The information provided by SPC regarding the flood incident is welcomed.</p>
(Floodline Developments) - Water Engineering Consultant and Developer	<p>Measure 10 should say '...actively apply for government AND COMMERCIAL SECTOR funding to implement flood risk management. We have come across many cases where state funding will never be available but other commercial sources are available to implement a flood protection scheme coupled with proposals for flood resilient development and affordable development to meet housing shortages. Measure 22 should be added stating West Berkshire Council will review and consider the allocation of flood resilient properties which are appropriate for areas at risk of flooding. This will form part of the appropriate development opportunities in areas where new or replacement development is proposed in conjunction with a flood mitigation proposal.</p>	<p>Comments noted. WBC will always seek funding from the beneficiaries of any flood alleviation scheme, which could include commercial businesses (Newbury Flood Alleviation Scheme being an example). With regards the additional measure (22), Objective 5 is aimed at ensuring development is sustainable and takes account of flood risk.</p>
Local resident	<p>Planning applications in areas subject to or affecting any form of flooding should have their design measures and predictions subjected to stress testing to demonstrate how robust the predictions are. All presentations should include numerical information in SI Units. There are no strategic measures to learn from experience.</p>	<p>Objective 5 is aimed at ensuring development is sustainable and takes account of flood risk. A Sustainable Drainage Approval Board will be established to review new planning applications and ensure the drainage design is adequate and sustainable.</p>
Councillor Alan Macro	<p>A set of strategic measures for the Lower Kennet Valley is required, similar to those for the other catchments. This should include, at a minimum: A Flood Risk Management Plan An understanding of the way the Lower Kennet catchment operates A river and canal maintenance plan Formal procedures for operating the sluices and lock paddles on the Kennet and its tributaries Identification of those responsible for operating the sluices and lock paddles on the Kennet and its tributaries. This may require roles to be identified Identification of properties, both domestic and commercial, at risk of flooding, and measures to reduce the risk of property flooding Identification of key infrastructure structures, such as electricity substations and railways, at risk of flooding and measures to protect them.</p>	<p>Noted. A management plan for the Lower Kennet will be placed in the Action Plan.</p>
Local resident	<p>Improve the drainage on Manor Park especially in Yates Copse and Huntingdon Gardens to ensure the area doesn't flood again damaging property.</p>	<p>Already identified in the Action Plan.</p>
Local resident	<p>Where in Appendix 1, Objective 5 is taken into account that any new planning permissions for new residential or commercial estates should be scrutinised in terms of: - impact on flood risk on the NEW estate itself from the different risk sources including local surface flooding - impact on flood risk on ADJACENT existing residential and business areas due to change in environment like elimination of</p>	<p>Noted. This will be the role of the Sustainable Drainage board as set out in the strategy, to ensure the drainage proposals of new</p>

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	<p>flood plains, or due to negative impact on existing flood prevention assets - impact on future flood risk on the new and on existing neighbouring estates due to the geological makeup of the ground, - to which extent such construction plans explicitly cater for mitigation of the most important flood risks (e.g. flash flooding, surface flooding) through particular, future-proven mechanisms, installations or assets. Further, related to the same Objective 5, what shall be the strategy to handle conflicts of interests: Example: conflicts of interest arise when landowners are encouraged or incentivised to sell their land to builders, who then build on floodplains or in local areas where additional housing developments increase the risk of floods (in particular surface floods). Their interest is in strong contrast to the interest of the existing, local population, home owners and tenants, who would negatively be impacted by the new housing developments as an externality. Is the strategy fully quite about a) the existence of such conflicts of interest and b) how to resolve them? This is not sufficiently clear from M15 - M18</p>	<p>developments is appropriate and sustainable. There will be no conflict of interest with planning applications as developments must satisfy the requirements of the Core Strategy and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
Stoney Lane Residents Association member	<p>I am concerned of the potential impact any housing development in the Waller Drive/Stoney Lane/Yates Copse area may have on already stretched drainage and sewerage systems.</p>	<p>Objective 5 is aimed at ensuring development is sustainable and takes account of flood risk.</p>
Local resident	<p>Para 3.3 covering risk assessment notes the need for a 'receptor' for flooding to be a risk. The natural issue arising from this is that new 'receptor' should not be built in critical areas - those liable to flooding and those deemed critical surface drainage sites (eg dry river valleys such as the one in Shaw that inundated Vodafone in 2007 and the one on the opposite side of the A339 where the current 2014 inundation is showing the course of the long absent river. Measure 18 covers the identification of areas suitable for flood alleviation schemes, I do not see a measure covering the identification of areas where significant development will exacerbate the flooding risk (eg on chalkland where the addition of impermeable surfaces (roofs, roads, paths, parking, patios, etc) will produce a downstream problem.</p>	<p>Objective 5 is aimed at ensuring development is sustainable and takes account of flood risk.</p>
Local resident	<p>M3: Streatley could potentially benefit from forming a Flood Forum. M5: I welcome the S19 Flood Investigation for Cleeve Court Streatley (G45) M15/18: The area above Cleeve court has suffered from groundwater flooding regularly. it should be considered unsuitable for further housebuilding. M 20: Cleeve Court as a community of 14 houses, could usefully create a Flood Plan. This should (M21) link with a wider plan for Streatley as a whole. I note, for instance, that the footpath passing alongside (and over part of) Cleeve Court has been closed due to flooding.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The S19 investigation into the events at Cleeve Court will be shared with the residents and can form the basis for a Flood Plan for those residents.</p>
Local resident	<p>5.2 should read appendix 3 rather than B? 5.3 elements mistyped M7, 8 and 9 in strange order (when compared with measure headings listed in draft document). Flood recording database by April 2015 is too late a simple and effective one imminently is what is needed. Ditto M15,16 and 17 are out of order. Ditto M20 and 21 Very well thought through document which is tackling a very big issue nationwide. Important that all authorities communicate clearly too so the problem is not just pushed further downstream in terms of rivers. Where riparian owners are involved it is good that the council has powers to achieve measures needed (M12-13). SuDs will bring positive benefits looking ahead.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. Order of measures to be considered.</p>
Local resident	<p>a) Objective 1 - This MUST include some indication of where the funding is coming from to implement the strategy. Therefore Objective 1 to be redrafted to read:- "Objective 1 - Provide a clear explanation of the roles and responsibilities of organisations involved in the management of flood risk and how we will work together to manage AND FUND the risk AND THE RISK MITIGATION MEASURES." "M4** - Clearly identify the sources and uses of funds for the enactment of the Strategic Flood Action Plan." b) Objective 4 - The identification of measures to help reduce the risk needs to include how those with clearly identified roles and responsibilities are going to go about obtaining / sanctioning the necessary funds to enact the measures so identified. Therefore Objective 4 to read:- "Objective 4 - To identify measures AND THE ASSOCIATED FUNDS to reduce flood risks." "M14** - Preparation of a route map for the identification of the sources and uses of funds for the enactment of the so identified flood risk reduction measures." c) General Flood Risk Management Actions The current Strategy MUST include recognition of the area in STREATLEY, RG8 post code area, adjacent to the River Thames which is prone to flooding from both the river and water table levels. Therefore please add in Section G:- "G51 Produce a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for Streatley"; "G52 Investigation Reports for 2003, 2007, 2012 and 2014 flooding at Cleeve Court and The Swan Hotel, Streatley".</p>	<p>Funding for measures will be sought from a variety of sources including the beneficiaries of such measures (not just the risk management authorities). Funding is covered in section 6 of the Strategy. The Council will work with SPC to produce a Flood Action Plan for Streatley.</p>
Local resident	<p>I can see little mention of specific actions in the plan to cope with the existing problems with sewerage overflow and surface water flooding in Donnington. Considering that the existing infrastructure clearly cannot cope, it concerns me that WBC is considering the building of a significant number of homes at several developments in Shaw-cum-Donnington, which are likely to exacerbate this issue. What are WBC's intentions concerning this?</p>	<p>Objective 5 is aimed at ensuring development is sustainable and takes account of flood risk. WBC will be discussing with Thames Water their plans to improve the integrity of their foul sewerage system and these actions will be added to the Action Plan.</p>
Local resident	<p>As stated previously the banks of rivers must be maintained to an acceptable level. Banks are usually eroded by either fast moving craft on the river or by riparian owners allowing cattle to water from the river. The cattle drick at the easiest access point and over the years these points become danger points allowing flood water to escape to early into the field and on to the houses close by.</p>	

Question 3 - Does the strategy clearly define the roles and responsibilities?

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
Mr Keith Benjamin	In my view there remains a lack of clarity concerning the on going checking and maintenance of watercourses and any purpose made flood alleviation measures. Someone has to recognise the need for maintenance then ensure it is done. These responsibilities and "what happens if" are unclear.	In the majority of cases the maintenance of watercourses is down to the responsibility of the riparian owner (section 4.4.2). However section 4 does set out who is the risk management authority for various areas of responsibility.
Clr Roger Hunneman	Document appears to be comprehensive and thoroughly prepared	Noted.
Resident of Ingoldsby Copse, Manor Park, Newbury	There appears to have been a lot of adverse comment ,certainly in the public arena, regarding the responses to flooding in Newport road - there appeared to have been a "not us" attitude taken by certain bodies. If this was incorrect the was a poor control of the communications As residents we would except a seamless response - even if there are tensions and budgets to be sorted out afterwards. When such events happen as this winter there needs to be a clear management structure to serve all the interests of the all the residents I apologise in advance if there is such a structure but that is not the public perception The test of the roles and responsibilities of the various bodies would be how they answer the question " what could we have done better " and what should be incorporated in to any future response	Comments noted. The strategy needs to be updated in light of the sewerage flooding issues experience across the District and a way forward agreed with Thames Water.
Streatley Parish Council	SPC considers that the Strategy clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the RMAs and fully supports their coordinated approach to flood risk management. As stated above, SPC would like to see the role and responsibility of SSE Plc included. WBC considers that the strategy clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the RMAs.	Comments noted.
(Floodline Developments) - Water Engineering Consultant and Developer	The Flood Risk Management Partners should incorporate commercial partners focused on appropriate development which not only includes extensive flood resilient knowledge and technologies but also expertise in securing non-governmental funding to implement extensive flood alleviation schemes throughout the borough. We note that alternative funding can be secured for flood defence works if the council and the business community work closely to implement flood schemes which are never able to secure state funding due to low cost benefit ratios identified. This is a fundamental problem in the borough and throughout the UK.	The Council is open to private investment of flood defences where this does not create a conflict of interest through the development process. Where commercial partners are direct (or indirect) beneficiaries of flood risk management measures, funding will be sought.
Local resident	It's not immediately obvious to me who is responsible for surface water runoff of existing properties.	The Lead Local Flood Authority (West Berkshire Council) is the risk management authority for surface water flooding. However it is the responsibility of individual land/property owners to ensure their actions do not increase flood risk to others.
Councillor Alan Macro	I believe so. However, the responsibilities are not well understood by the public The responsibilities also do not appear to be well understood by Environment Agency employees, particularly in relation to the Canals and River Trust They also do not appear to be well understood by employees of Thames Water in relation to the Environment Agency	Comments noted. Public engagement and engagement with partners is a key part of the Action Plan.
Local resident	A clear risk is that too many organisations and roles are defined and the system of risk management is de facto inefficient given too high complexity. Thus, the call for Simplicity. The draft strategy needs to be reviewed with respect to: Is it simple and elegant, not just elegant and overly complex.	Comments noted, however the unfortunate reality is the Roles and Responsibilities in Flood Risk Management are not simple and need to be defined in a strategy such as this.
Local resident	Much of this is clearly defined but local residents should be able to review all "anti Flood " measures especially when associated with new developments,	Comments noted. These 'anti flood' measures will be available to view through the planning process.
Brightwalton Parish Council	Yes it does, and the diagrams used in 4.2 and 4.3 should be circulated further to make clear to all where the responsibilities lie.	Comments noted.
Local resident	Yes, but it is not clear how these interact. For instance: we have suffered flooding recently which has threatened our electric substation and our sewage pump. Mobile phone communication has been difficult and fallen trees threatened landline communication as well as	The Strategy and Action Plan identifies that further work is needed to inform residents at

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	electricity supply. The drive leading to 10 houses has become passable only by boat. To whom should we turn to for help?	risk about roles and responsibilities and further work will be undertaken to with the Council's Emergency Planning Team to inform communities of who to contact and when during events as described.
Local resident	Yes, all very clear and well expressed.	Noted.
Local resident	The draft strategy MUST clearly define not only roles and responsibilities BUT ALSO the sources and uses of funds for the actions so identified. For example, if a Capital Flood Defence Project has been identified the responsibility for funding the project together with the responsibility for the production of a suitable fit for purpose (fully costed, scheduled, and resourced) plan for the work must be identified. In this way the strategy will lead to an enactment plan (be it mitigation measures to help reduce flood risk or actions in the event of a flood) which can be monitored and controlled. Therefore, "Section 6 - Flood Risk Management Funding" needs to be much more robust.	Noted. This will be taken into consideration when the Strategy is reviewed.
Local resident	To provide a clear explanation of the roles and responsibilities of organisations and individuals and how we can work together to manage flood risk; Farmers and riparian owners should take responsibility of the river bank I To develop a clear understanding of flood risk within West Berkshire and how best to increase the public's awareness; There is a good system in place and it works well I have nothing but praise for the team that worked in and around Purley I To develop plans to reduce existing flood risk while taking account of people, communities and the natural environment; Bank maintenance I To identify measures that aim to reduce existing flood risk; Bank Maintenance and take a lesson from the teams up in Northumberland who are slowing the water at source not trying to deal with the aftermath	Comments noted.

Question 4 - Is there anything else you would like to comment on? Please detail below any additional information you would like to see covered by the strategy

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
Local resident	Too much reliance is placed on historically calculated probabilities of weather events when current experience suggests that they should be revised. Unfortunately any error tends to support doing nothing when it would be safer to take a more pessimistic view.	Comments noted and will be discussed with the Environment Agency.
Stoney Lane Residents Association member	Re: The proposed planning site between Waller Drive across to Stoney Lane, Thatcham. This site, which is a field, is situated on a steep downward slant of a hill, whenever it rains, the bottom half regularly gets flooded due to the ground being made up of clay; the rain water runs down from the hill, neighboring land and the roads., If this land was developed it would over load the drainage system already in place, it would also most definitely flood half the new houses that are to be built. The water has nowhere to go but into an already struggling drainage system that regularly floods with the demand of the water using it. This will cause flooding and misery to the residents of existing houses, and the residents who buy the new houses, as there is nowhere for the water to go. Have we not already seen the misery of the poor people who have had their houses built on similar pieces of land this year? Why should they suffer for the sake of making someone else rich?	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Local resident	On a side topic, if large drains are to be put along most roads, there needs to be widening of the roads or the provision of a safe zone for cyclists as it is NOT safe to ride over drains!	Noted. To be discussed with the Council's Transport Policy Team.
Great Shefford Parish Council	Below are specific comments relating to Great Shefford: 3.2.1 - Flooding from main rivers (list of rivers should include Great Shefford Stream ennamed in 2005). As a general point here, further consideration should be given in this plan that the Great Shefford stream (W114/01), a winterbourne running along the A338 has been designated a main river since 2005 from Mount Pleasant north of the village (opposite Northfield Farm) to the River Lambourn. This is depicted on the EA fluvial flood map. The flooding events experienced along this watercourse should where possible be clarified in the definitions provided (fluvial, pluvial and groundwater) as there is potential for a number of processes affect the flood risk here. Table 3-2 and Table 3-6. These should include historical flooding events (as deemed appropriate from the type of flood) associated with a combination of flooding from the Great Shefford Stream (a ground water rising winterbourne) and ground water flooding. Reference of flood events in 1995, 1999 and again in 2000/01 are provided in the WBC document 'Flooding in West Berkshire, Action Plan for 2001/02' There will also be earlier flooding events on this stream. C16 'This action in the Action plan is incorrectly worded. The action requested during the set up of the Lambourn Valley Flood Action Plan was to review the installation of a permanent solution to accessing the West Berkshire Ground Water Scheme pipeline through the village via means of a sluice at the north end of the village. Given recent events we now consider that the action should be amended in both the Lambourn Valley Flood Action Plan and drafted in this plan as: 'To review the diversion of the flow (or part thereof) of the Great	Strategy and Action Plan to be updated as requested.

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	Shefford Stream into the West Berkshire Ground Water Scheme (WBGWS) culvert via means of a permanent sluice gate at the north end of the village where feasible, and to consider all flood potential alleviation mitigation options through detailed assessment; including improvements to existing culverts (eg the WBGWS), measures to reducing flows north of Great Shefford, and provision of new culverts and drains. To provide the implementation of a solution to flooding issues.	
(Floodline Developments) - Water Engineering Consultant and Developer	We feel that the implementation of the Sequential Test for small developments (1 to 5 homes say) deters local (and appropriate) development because the effort involved in identifying numerous comparable sites goes against the pragmatism and spirit of NPPF. Sequential Test's should be applied to much larger developments which are fundamental within the growth plans for a local authority. It should not be applied to infill developments of a few houses. Of course, the properties must meet the general requirement for dry access and permanent location outside the extreme flood zones. As has been the case for gradual involvement of SuDS in planning requirements, we would like to see the inclusion of flood resilient properties in areas where such buildings are ideally suited for safe living. This format has been applied in other countries throughout the world such as the Netherlands and US and extensive development and building regulations have been in existence for decades. We would ask West Berks to have an open mind to such options and opportunities in areas prone to frequent flood risk but evacuation is not required or desirable in an emergency.	Comments noted and will be discussed with the Council's Planning Policy Team.
Local resident	Better explanations of how the various forms of flooding are modelled showing assumptions, what for example is the formula used to calculate the 1 in 200 rainfall? How do we model ground saturation and have we allowed for 0 permeability (as per 1947). How do we cover combination events (ever heard of the systems engineering term 'requisite variety'?) How does the planning process propose to assess the performance of different forms of SuDS in differing settings and weather events? How will the suitability and sufficiency of measures identified in risk assessments be demonstrated and will this be open to public scrutiny?	Modelling techniques have improved to take into consideration variations in ground saturation. As part of the Sustainable Drainage element of planning applications (where appropriate) this information will be asked for.
Local resident	Development of sites in the Manor Park/Stoney Lane area would dramatically increase traffic on roads, and the stress on our local drainage system could be catastrophic. The risk of personal upset, disruption and cost that flooding in our area would cause must not be underestimated. In particular, we would highlight the dangers of flash flooding from the run off created by the clay valleys of the area.	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Councillor Alan Macro	The operation of the lower Kennet and its tributaries seems very poorly understood. Understanding this is essential to minimising flood risk. Nobody appears to have overall responsibility for controlling the flow of the lower Kennet or some of its tributaries. Agreeing these responsibilities is also essential to minimising the flood risk,	To be included in the LFRMS Action Plan.
Local resident	I don't know all about the flood defences you wish to put in. All I know is that having been a resident of Waller Drive for 17 years I have had to witness and cope with flooding. 2007 being the worst year. And this is when we have had no new building work done in the area. The open fields absorbed a lot of the water, will the same be said in years to come if they are built on these plots. I think not. If you had to live with the damage done to homes because of flood in your area, maybe you would think twice about building new homes.	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Local resident	I think that you should be looking into the amount of proposed development in West Berkshire and the impact this will have on not only roads but local drainage system. I live in the Manor Park area and the fields around this (backing onto Stoney Lane, Waller Drive and Yates Copse) are continually soaked with water running down into houses on the estate. There is always road surface water which when cold turns into black ice. This area was flooded in 2007/08 and I fear that more building will increase the flood risks locally.	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Local resident	Here a few additional comments: 1) Page 40 refers to current flood risk management studies. It raises concerns that some of these studies have no scheduled completion date, though it is laudable that particular studies are listed to be undertaken. Here the strategy or the owners or sponsors of those studies should be clearer: either studies are undertaken and have target completion dates, or they are declared obsolete. It doesn't inspire trust to see 'current' studies listed with no completion dates. An example is Waller Drive, where 2007 severe flooding occurred, most likely driven by the run off from the clay ground in the area. 2) Once mistakes are made it is very difficult and very costly to rectify them. Without any doubt, the flood risk in the West Berkshire is going to increase in the years to come. As the development of flood risk management strategies takes time and the implementation of risk management actions takes even more time and budget, the biggest risk might actually lie in mistakes and bad decisions being made during the time period between now until the risk management strategy has matured and implementation can actually begin. What are the consequences of say the strategy being finalised by end 2014 and flood risk studies being completed in some areas by end 2015 and possible flood risk mitigation actions then funded and completed by end 2017, if in the meantime local planning permissions are given to new housing developments that create negative externalities and increase flood risk to existing housing estates? To this end, any new plans for housing developments should be particularly scrutinised with regards to risk factors already well outlined in this draft strategy. 3) As a tangible example, let me mention Waller Drive, and the idea to free up the area behind Yates Copse up to Stoney Lane for new housing development. It would be imprudent to agree to such housing developments without thorough study of impacts from flood risk on both potentially new and existing residential estates. This is the more important as Waller Drive is an area that got seriously flooded in 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Completion dates to be added to the studies listed in the LFRMS document. 2) Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'. 3) As 2) above. 4) Agree with the comments that we should 'think big' and learn from best practice from other countries. The LFRMS is a framework upon which the ideas will be formed and projects will be developed.

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	<p>due to too much surface water. 4) Climate change and England's exposed geography to the Jet Stream should warrant unconventional thinking and unconventional measures. My plea is to 'think big'. Unfortunately we cannot change the big trends in nature and in our environment. When big trends materialise (like much wetter weather), we in England need to adapt to these big trends in big ways (risk management is good, but innovative thinking in risk management is even better). An example are the Dutch with their sea flood protection mechanisms, or countries in central Europe like Switzerland, Austria and Germany, where horrible floods from rivers occurred in the past, but lessons were learned and lots of capital was invested in securing riverbeds, constructing dams etc. My point here: The Flood Risk Management Strategy should incorporate 'big ideas', adequate for the much increased flood risk in this century. It shouldn't read like a report that would be adequate say for the 1980s. In this respect, I'm still searching for the big ideas in the report. 5) The draft strategy report uses the word 'benchmark' exactly once on page 11. What is missing there: That we should benchmark our West Berkshire flood risk management strategies and activities against strategies applied elsewhere, say in flood risk management role-model countries. Why not look across the borders? Why trying to re-invent all ourselves? What is done in terms of risk management against surface floods in other countries? I argue, we don't have time to re-invent the wheel nor do we have time to debate this at length. Instead, we should be smart in learning fast, including from others. The next conveyor belt of storms driven by the Jet Stream is not waiting for us to complete our thinking. Apart from that, it is indeed good to see that work is intensified to tackle this new challenge for all of us.</p>	
Jon Thompson	<p>I am concerned that planning consideration is currently in process for a development in waller drive stoney lane which is a flood risk area</p>	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Mark Huish	<p>The proposals for Stoney Lane area will cause flash flooding from the clay valleys in the area</p>	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Nigel Seymour Powers - Resident of Naseby Rise, Newbury.	<p>There has frequently been planning applications put forward for development in the Cold Ash Parish Council area and I am sure there will be more made due to the recent Government call for landowners to put forward sites for housing development. I am extremely concerned about the effect more development in this area will have on our local drainage system. It is clear that the dangers of flash flooding from the run off created by the clay valleys in the area would be substantially increased should further development take place in this specific area as this would increase the run-off volume and rate.</p>	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
G Price	<p>The nature of Clay soils and Valleys needs to be clearly highlighted. It is easy to identify flood plains but the effects of flash flooding caused by sudden deluge (as in 2007) can be devastating. This effect is magnified by housing developments in valleys as even less water can be absorbed into the ground.</p>	Comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'.
Local resident	<p>1. GENERAL REVIEW Executive Summary Flood Risk Management is not just about communication and information gathering to be able to effectively respond to floods, indeed the focus should be more about proactive strategies for reducing flooding in the future. In the list of objectives, plans to reduce existing flood risk are not mentioned until O3, we would recommend that O3 and O4 should be raised to replace O1 and O2 and become the prime objectives. Government is seeking an increase in private sector investment in flood defence measures; the private sector needs to have a financial return as an incentive for such investment. It is clear that we have a legacy of inappropriate development in floodplains but we are well able to design sustainable and appropriate floodplain development which is properly protected (both for today and the future) and can be used as a funding vehicle for flood defence measures to the benefit of existing properties at risk. This source of potential funding should be included in the bullets listed at page 2 as should the possibilities offered by contributions from Community Infrastructure Levy in suitable cases. Introduction As in the previous section the strong emphasis on communication and understanding needs to be changed to strategies for reducing flood risk, such strategies are mentioned but not given the main focus. It is stated that 'Flooding is a natural process that will occur despite all efforts to prevent it', as a global phenomenon this is quite correct but at a local West Berks Council scale it is not correct. This is giving completely the wrong message when we are striving to control flooding of property. We can prevent flooding; just not everywhere, as the floodwater does need to be stored somewhere. While it is understood that WBC only has responsibility for the management of ordinary watercourses and the Environment Agency (EA) is the responsible authority for Main River, it needs to be recognised that as WBC is the planning authority then it has the responsibility for planning of Main River floodplain development rather than the EA. It is important for this to be recognised if there is to be a strategy for using floodplain development as a funding vehicle for flood defences (including making use of the recently introduced Community Infrastructure Levy since there may often be severe downstream as well as local consequences). The third bullet point on page 4 needs to be amended from '...the environment will not be adversely affected, to 'the environment will not be unduly'</p>	Some very useful feedback. Private/commercial finance is often sought for flood relief and will be included in the document. Guidance on the use of Community Infrastructure Levy is still emerging however the possible use of this for flood risk management will be fully explored. Objective 5 of the strategy is to ensure that development is sustainable and that will include, where appropriate, sacrificial flood areas to ensure capacity is available and that the flood risk to others is not increased. Through the action plan and flood forums LFRMS will be a vehicle for engaging with affected communities to ensure local residents are involved in the decision making process. Although WBC is defined as not having any areas of specific risk under the EU Floods Directive, this has no bearing on the priority the

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	<p>adversely affected'. The recent floods have taught us that people and their livelihoods need to be given a higher profile in the decision making process. Legislative and Policy Context In the list of bullets at 2.1.2 on page 6 the LLFA responsibilities need to include for Main River as appropriate, it is not acceptable to simply ignore Main River issues just because the EA has a role to play in this regard. This particularly applies to assets performing a flood defence function. It is noted at 2.1.3 that 'West Berkshire does not have any areas defined as being at significant risk' so does not need to act in respect of the EU Floods Directive, while this may be the case in respect of specific definitions therein (we have not checked this), it is rather misleading as a statement if taken out of context. This is evident when reference is made to areas at risk of flooding later in the document. Perhaps this point should be clarified at the end of the bullet points. The use of the term 'risk' in the context of 'flood risk' has a very specific definition based on there being a combination of probability and consequence. The much heralded 'risk based approach' needs to recognise this definition so that actual risk is that which pertains upon completion of any scheme. The EA flood zones only show probability, they do not represent risk, this differentiation is clear in the Technical Guidance to NPPF. Local Flood Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities Under section 4.4.2, it states that that the 'Riparian owners have a right to protect their property from flooding' which is a correct interpretation of the Common Enemy Doctrine but it should be clarified that this is subject to planning and land drainage legislation. Spelling and Typographical errors Although of no great importance, we thought it would be useful to point out a few spelling and typographical errors. The term 'watercourse' is one word, as are the terms 'floodplain' and 'groundwater', in the text these words are sometimes spelled correctly and at other times incorrectly. It is also 'The Canal and River Trust' rather than the 'Canal and Rivers Trust'...only a small point. At page 12 there is reference to both 'Technical Note' and 'Technical Guide' to NPPF, it is actually 'Technical Guidance', under this section the Exception Test and Sequential Test should be with a capital 'T' for Test. Under section 3.2.5 the reference to 'from sewer containing sewerage.' should be corrected to 'from sewers containing sewage.' References to the Kennet and Avon Canal should be amended to differentiate between the 'canal' and the 'river navigation' as both are within WBC administrative area but have fundamentally different characteristics in relation to flood risk. On page 25 it is the 'Source-Pathway-Receptor model' rather than 'Source Pathway receptor model'. 2. FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT IN BASILDON While Lower Basildon is on the edge of the River Thames floodplain, most properties are sufficiently raised above flood levels to as not be at undue risk of fluvial flooding. Upper Basildon is on the relatively flat plateau on top of the hill beside Lower Basildon. The general geology in Upper Basildon is clay overlying chalk at depth. The clay is relatively impermeable so that the traditional method of employing soakaways for disposal of surface water is ineffective in times of more intense rainfall. As the roads are mainly historic country lanes, the surface water runoff was based on side discharge to adjacent fields but as the drainage connections to the fields have become interrupted by ribbon roadside development, the surface water drainage is increasingly constrained on the road surface which becomes a flood flow conveyor. This has caused increased flood risk to properties on the downhill side of such lanes as in the cases in Bethesda Street and Park Wall Lane. In times of intense rainfall there is also significant ponding on the road surface which can lead to undue damage to the carriageway wearing course and base course plus a safety concern for vehicular traffic. It is strongly recommended that a flood/drainage management scheme is developed for Basildon where existing drainage low points are identified and 'side discharge' grips' both installed and maintained to ensure effective drainage to reduce flood risk to third parties. These side 'grips' need to be protected in perpetuity and will effectively be flood management assets so should be registered as such on the Flood and Water Management Act S21 register. The village is acutely aware of the increase in flood risk to Bethesda Street, Blandys Lane and Park Wall Lane as a result of the loss of the previous such side discharge assets. It is important to formalise the recognition of such flood routes to ensure against the future exacerbation of an already undesirable flood risk situation.</p>	<p>Council gives to the known Local Risks of flooding and this is hopefully apparent throughout the Strategy. Section 4.4.2 to be clarified Basildon Parish to be contacted regarding the surface water issues raised.</p>
Brightwalton Parish Council	<p>We understand that the purpose of this strategy document is to outline West Berkshire Council's objectives and responsibilities rather than state actions that will be taken. In relation to specific actions following this strategy, we have the following input - from our Parish Council's point of view where regular surface flooding on the road surfaces has been a regular issue, we would like to see details of actions that will be taken in these areas and would like to see specifically: - Road surfaces that drain - Thorough and scheduled maintenance of highway grips and roadside gullies. - A help desk that these issues can be reported to, with feedback acted upon quickly and efficiently and actions reported back. Thank you</p>	<p>Brightwalton Parish Council will be contacted to discuss their specific concerns and formulate a way forward.</p>
Streatley resident	<p>We live at 3 Cleeve Court, Streatley and there will be a joint response from the 15 properties involved. We were concerned not to be included in any documentation showing recent floods and, once this occurs, we do have a real problem in terms of access. The (usually minimal) water course to the west of the Thames becomes swollen with river and ground water flooding and the current flowing south becomes very strong. We all very much appreciate that a survey has been instigated. We are individually planning to install water pumping systems but this is expensive. If the WBC can help defray these costs and / or the remediation drainage / channelling of the surrounding lands which the survey may highlight, we would welcome and appreciate this.</p>	<p>At the next refresh the document will be amended to include the flooding at Cleeve Court in Streatley.</p>
Streatley resident	<p>The following advice may be useful:- i) The document currently fails to recognise Streatley, West Berkshire as a flood risk area. The document must be updated to include the Streatley area; ii) Regular clearance of debris from the River Thames, and other rivers in the</p>	<p>At the next refresh the document will be amended to include the flooding at Cleeve</p>

Individual or organisation	Response	Officer comment
	<p>West Berkshire region, together with other measures which help avoid flow restriction (dredging, bank maintenance, etc.) must be identified. Responsibilities must be clearly defined together with how these measures are going to be monitored and controlled; iii) Planning applications associated with river flow turbine generation must take into account the effects of river flow restrictions and changes to river levels that could result from such an installation; iv) Any "new build" in areas adjacent to rivers and in flood plains must be subject to clear planning guidelines. As a real example, the level of some new garages was restricted by the planning authorities. As a direct result of this limitation the garages are now subject to regular flooding (which was perfectly avoidable)! At the same time planning authorities must be open to the approval of appropriate flood mitigation measures proposed to avoid flooding of "already built" properties. The Strategy document should, therefore, encourage the planning authorities to be flexible on allowing mitigation measures for existing properties; v) During flood conditions major "utility services" infrastructure (electricity, sweet and foul water, telecommunications, etc.) come under threat. The West Berkshire Council in conjunction with the utility providers must have in place mitigation measures to maintain these services. For example, the location and level of electricity distribution substations must be investigated, and if required raised to the appropriate level and / or sandbagged to prevent water ingress leading to equipment failure under flooding conditions; Please add this investigation and any remedial works to your actions lists. vi) The current document does not make clear how the responsibilities for local drainage (clearance of ditches, etc.) are going to be checked and if necessary enforced; vii) Preparation for flooding and the timing of mitigation measures is vital. Flood warnings by the Environment Agency have much improved over the last few years. However, these must be timed so as to trigger the necessary flood risk mitigation measures. The strategy document should clearly state what is expected in this regard. (The inclusion of this point in the Strategy document is intended to help West Berkshire demonstrate "reasonable care" and to avoid the seemingly dilatory actions which delayed triggering pumping as reported in the Somerset Levels in 2014); viii) p25 of the draft Strategy defines risk = hazard x probability. Mathematically "risk = probability x consequence". Further, "hazard" is usually defined as the ability of an action, event, or material, etc. to cause harm. You may wish to define what is meant by hazard if you wish to retain the diagram on p25. In summary, my input to the draft Strategy is as follows:- A) Streatley (post code RG8) must be included as a potential flood area in your Strategy document; B) The Strategy document must clearly define not only roles and responsibilities for identification and actions BUT ALSO clearly state the responsibilities, sanctioning processes, sources and uses of funds to support these actions; C) An overview of the adequacy of the siting of important infrastructure installations (electricity substations, fresh and foul water pumping stations, etc.) to withstand flooding together with the resulting required upgrades is to be added to the document; D) The timing of flood warnings and the resultant triggering of mitigation measures is to be better defined.</p>	<p>Court in Streatley. Comments regarding the Thames maintenance will be discussed with the EA. Planning comments to be discussed with the Planning Policy Team. Objective 5 of the strategy aims 'to ensure that planning decisions take full account of flood risk'. Other suggested amendments to be taken into consideration at the next review.</p>
Local resident	<p>I have two comments as follows: 1. Item 3 Flood Risk Within Berkshire: I note that the 2007 flood is categorised as a Surface Water Flood (para 3.2.2). Whereas the prime cause of flooding in Pangbourne was the over-banking of the Sulham Brook and subsequent over-banking of the School Ditch. This was because the culvert under the A329 could not cope with the volume of water coming down Sulham Brook. The Sulham Brook had been overwhelmed with water coming over from the Pang which had over-banked from the BBOWT reserve down through Tidmarsh and beyond. Thus the prime cause of the flood was from Rivers & Streams and should therefore appear in para 3.2.1 and Table 3-2. No doubt there was additional water from surface water flooding down Purley Rise but this was not the prime cause. I raise this as an issue because I believe that proper maintenance of the Pang and Sulham Brook is vital in the prevention of flooding in east Pangbourne. Therefore the Pangbourne 2007 flood should appear in 3.2.1 even if it appears again in 3.2.2 2. Item 5 Measures to Reduce and Manage Flood Risk: I am delighted to note in 5.1.4 Pending Flood Alleviation Schemes that the A329 culvert and flood prevention barrier comes into Table 5-3. This acknowledges the point I have made above. How likely is the grant application to be successful? What is the target date for the work? Where is the proposed FP barrier to be installed?</p>	<p>Maintenance of the Pang and Sulham brook to be discussed with the Environment Agency.</p>
Local resident	<p>If prevention measures like those in place in Northumberland were implemented the flow of river water would be reduced further down river allowing surface water to filter into the river and the whole aspect of flooding would be managed more efficiently. So: 1 Build small prevention measures in the fields and woodlands (in the tributaries) above the main areas that are flooded. 2 Build small prevention measures along the woodland by the banks of the river 3 Maintain the river banks in order to prevent early flooding 4 Carry on managing the river flow as you are because you're doing the best of a bad situation. We need more funds or volunteers to help prevent drastic situations occurring again</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>