

STOCKPORT DRAFT LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

CONSULTATION REPORT

JUNE 2016

STOCKPORT DRAFT LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

CONSULTATION REPORT

Stockport Council

Project no: 70021752
Date: June 2016

WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff

The Victoria
150-182 The Quays
Salford
Manchester
M30 3SP

Tel: +44 161 886 2400
Fax: +44 161 886 2401

www.wspgroup.com
www.pbworld.com

QUALITY MANAGEMENT

ISSUE/REVISION	FIRST ISSUE	REVISION 1	REVISION 2	REVISION 3
Remarks	DRAFT	FINAL	REV1	
Date	22/04/2016	09/05/2016	21/06/2016	
Prepared by	AP	AP	AP	
Checked by	EH	EH	EH	
Authorised by	EH	EH	EH	
Project number	70021752	70021752	70021752	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2	LFRMS BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY.....	1
	LFRMS AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	2
	LFRMS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....	2
1.3	REPORT STRUCTURE.....	2
2	METHODOLOGY.....	3
2.2	CONSULTATION AIMS, AUDIENCE AND TIMESCALE.....	3
2.3	METHODS OF CONSULTATION AND CONSULTATION SUPPORT.....	3
	LETTER.....	3
	WEB PAGES AND SOCIAL MEDIA.....	5
	CONSULTATION SUPPORT.....	5
	AREA COMMITTEE OPEN FORUMS.....	5
	ONLINE SURVEY.....	6
2.4	APPROACH TO ANALYSIS.....	6
3	RESPONSES RECEIVED.....	7
3.2	EMAILS.....	7
	VIRGIN MEDIA.....	7
	HISTORIC ENGLAND.....	7
	NATURAL ENGLAND.....	7
	STOCKPORT COUNCIL CIVIL RESILIENCE.....	8
	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY.....	8
	FRIENDS OF TANGSHUTT FIELDS.....	9
3.3	ONLINE SURVEYS.....	9
	INTEREST IN FLOODING.....	9
	LFRMS STRUCTURE.....	10
	LFRMS INFORMATION.....	10
	LFRMS OBJECTIVES.....	10
	LFRMS IDENTIFIED MEASURES.....	11
	ADDITIONAL LFRMS MEASURES.....	12
	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.....	13
	HRA STAGE 1 SCREENING.....	13
3.4	OPEN FORUMS.....	14
	WERNETH.....	14
	HEATONS AND REDDISH.....	14
	STEPPING HILL.....	14
	CHEADLE.....	14
	MARPLE.....	15
	CENTRAL STOCKPORT.....	15
	BRAMHALL AND CHEADLE HULME SOUTH.....	15

4	CONCLUSION	16
---	-------------------------	-----------

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	DRAFT LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY DOCUMENT
APPENDIX B	DRAFT LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY – SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
	APPENDIX B-1 STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
	APPENDIX B-2 HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT STAGE 1 SCREENING
APPENDIX C	CONSULTATION LETTER
APPENDIX D	CONSULTATION RESPONSES
	APPENDIX D-1 EMAIL RESPONSES
	APPENDIX D-2 ONLINE SURVEY RESPONSES

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1.1 This report presents the findings from the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council consultation on the *Draft Local Flood Risk Management Strategy* (LFRMS) and supporting documents, the *Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)* and *Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Stage 1 Screening*.
- 1.1.2 The consultation was held over a three week period between Monday 14th March and Friday 1st April 2016, and this report details the response.
- 1.1.3 The consultation has been undertaken to inform those who may be affected by flooding and/or hold an interest in the LFRMS and capture their comments.
- 1.1.4 Once finalised, the LFRMS will be a 'live' document that will be reviewed periodically as the measures and actions detailed therein are developed and implemented.

1.2 LFRMS BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

- 1.2.1 Under the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) Stockport Council became a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) responsible for managing local flood risk from surface water, ground water and ordinary watercourses in Stockport. One of the new duties placed upon Stockport Council to assist in the management of local flood risk as LLFA is to 'develop, maintain, apply and monitor a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy'.
- 1.2.2 The Draft LFRMS, included at **Appendix A**, is intended to demonstrate Stockport Council's understanding and role in managing the flood risk within the borough of Stockport and its role in working with other key stakeholders and the local community.
- 1.2.3 It includes information on potential flooding risks in Stockport, the legislative background and duties of Stockport Council with respect to managing flood risk and the objectives of the strategy. The objectives are supported by a number of measures and an action plan.
- 1.2.4 Recent flood events in the UK have highlighted further the fact that flood risk in England is expected to increase due to climate change and development in areas at risk. It is not possible to prevent all flooding, but there are actions that can be taken to manage these risks and reduce the impacts on communities, the environment and infrastructure.
- 1.2.5 Flood risk from Main Rivers such as the Mersey, Goyt and Tame, although a concern and duty for Stockport Council, are still under the management of the Environment Agency. It is predominantly what is classed as Ordinary Watercourses, Surface Water and Ground Water flooding that the LFRMS seeks to address.
- 1.2.6 Stockport Council will take a proportionate risk-based approach using the budget and resources available to reduce both the likelihood of flooding and the impacts of flooding should it occur.

LFRMS AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 1.2.7 A fundamental aim of the LFRMS is that Stockport Council embraces and supports its role as LLFA. This means taking the lead in helping with infrastructure development and re-development and working with other bodies in dealing with flood risk. Stockport Council wants to encourage and wherever possible enforce current thinking and guidance, and be able to provide improvements through working better together in terms of supporting communities to help themselves.
- 1.2.8 The specific objectives of the LFRMS are:
- to better understand local flood risk and make best use of available information in order to better manage flood risk to people, businesses, property, infrastructure and the natural environment;
 - to reduce the potential impact and costs of flooding in the Borough;
 - to ensure resilience of local water bodies and drainage assets;
 - to ensure appropriate development in areas of flood risk;
 - to develop a collaborative partnership approach to flood risk management, and cooperate with other Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) and key stakeholders working across catchments; and
 - to assist communities in understanding information on flood risk and supporting themselves.
- 1.2.9 Within the Draft LFRMS document the objectives are supported by a number of measures and an action plan.

LFRMS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- 1.2.10 As part of the consultation, Stockport Council also sought to capture comments on the SEA and HRA Stage 1 Screening that have been produced as supporting documents to the LFRMS.
- 1.2.11 These documents are included at **Appendix B**.

1.3 REPORT STRUCTURE

- 1.3.1 Following this introduction:
- **Chapter 2** presents the consultation methodology;
 - **Chapter 3** provides a summary of the consultation responses received; and
 - **Chapter 4** summarises and concludes the key findings from the consultation.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1.1 This chapter presents the consultation methodology including details of the aims, audience, timescale and methods of consultation.

2.2 CONSULTATION AIMS, AUDIENCE AND TIMESCALE

2.2.1 The purpose of the consultation was to inform those who may be affected by flooding and/or hold an interest in the LFRMS and capture their comments.

2.2.2 The consultation has been undertaken during a period when the LFRMS is at a formative stage, and has presented detailed information to allow those consulted to provide intelligent considerations and an informed response.

2.2.3 The three week consultation period between Monday 14th March and Friday 1st April 2016 has allowed adequate time for responses to be submitted. Furthermore, responses received up to and including Monday 20th June 2016 have been included in this report.

2.2.4 Once finalised, the LFRMS will be a 'live' document that will be reviewed periodically as the measures and actions detailed therein are developed and implemented. Stockport Council will continue to work to ensure that information is communicated to those with an interest in the LFRMS with regards to its development.

2.3 METHODS OF CONSULTATION AND CONSULTATION SUPPORT

LETTER

2.3.1 A letter was distributed to those who may hold an interest in the LFRMS, as included at **Appendix C** to provide a background to the strategy, details of how to find out more and information on how to respond.

2.3.2 The letter was distributed by email or post to the following stakeholders:

Utilities

- Openreach (BT);
- City of London Communication (COLT);
- Electricity North West;
- National Grid;
- United Utilities;
- Virgin Media;
- Scottish Power (Manweb);
- O2 (UK) Ltd;
- Fulcrum Pipelines;
- Instalcom on behalf of Gamma;
- T-Mobile (UK) Ltd;
- Aptus

Public Transport

- Network Rail;
- Northern Rail;
- Arriva Trains;
- Virgin Rail;
- Stagecoach Bus;
- Stotts Bus;
- First Bus;
- Arriva Bus;
- High Peak Bus;
- MCT Bus;

Government Bodies / Statutory Consultees

- Environment Agency;
- Historic England;
- Natural England;
- Tameside Council;
- Manchester Council;
- Cheshire East Council;
- Derbyshire Council;
- Peak District National Park;
- High Peak Council;
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA);
- Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM);
- Highways England;
- Fire Service;
- Police Service;
- Greater Manchester Civil Contingencies and Resilience Unit;
- Stockport Council Planning;
- Stockport Council Network Management;
- Stockport Council Public Space;
- Stockport Council Maintenance;
- Stockport Council Civil Resilience;
- Stockport Council Economic Development;
- Stockport Homes;

Interest Groups / Societies

- Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce;
- Greater Manchester Local Enterprise Partnership (GM LEP);
- British Horse Society;

- National Farmers Union (NFU);
- Country Landowners Association;
- Canals and Rivers Trust;
- Cale Green Residents Association;
- High Lane Residents Association;
- Woodford Community Council;
- Heald Green Rate Payers Association; and
- Marple Civic Society.

- 2.3.3 The letter was also sent to businesses and landlords, walking, equestrian and cycling groups via contacts within Stockport Council.
- 2.3.4 Furthermore, a copy of the letter was sent to local Councillors and approximately 120 developers.
- 2.3.5 The letter advised that comments on the LFRMS can be made via the consultation supporting contact methods identified below.
- 2.3.6 As it was recognised that respondents would need additional information beyond that contained within the letter in order to inform their response, the letter signposted to web pages containing the LFRMS and supporting documents, and details of how to find out more.

WEB PAGES AND SOCIAL MEDIA

- 2.3.7 As well as the letter, an LFRMS specific consultation web page was set up via www.stockport.gov.uk/consultation to provide a background to the strategy, a link to the Draft LFRMS and supporting documents, details of how to find out more and information on how to respond.
- 2.3.8 An article about the consultation, linking to the above was included on the www.marketingstockport.co.uk news pages to further inform businesses of the consultation. The article also featured in the associated newsletter distributed to approximately 1,000 contacts.
- 2.3.9 Furthermore, reference to the consultation was made on Twitter via the Stockport Council business account.

CONSULTATION SUPPORT

- 2.3.10 A dedicated phone line (0161 474 2299, 9am-5pm Monday-Friday) and email mailbox was active throughout the consultation period to take consultation queries and associated comments.

AREA COMMITTEE OPEN FORUMS

- 2.3.11 During the consultation the Draft LFRMS was presented at Open Forums at Stockport Council's Area Committees, as identified in **Table 2.1**, to allow those who may hold an interest in the strategy to view the documents and provide their comments. The Open Forums were referred to in the letter and on the consultation web page.

Table 2-1 Open Forums

DATE	TIME	AREA COMMITTEE (LOCATION)
Monday 14 th March 2016	6pm	Werneth (Woodley Civic Hall)
Monday 14 th March 2016	6pm	Heatons and Reddish (Stockport Town Hall)
Tuesday 15 th March 2016	6pm	Stepping Hill (Stockport Town Hall)
Tuesday 15 th March 2016	6pm	Cheadle (Ladybridge Park Residents Club)
Wednesday 16 th March 2016	6pm	Marple (Marple Senior Citizen's Hall)
Thursday 17 th March 2016	6pm	Central Stockport (Stockport Town Hall)
Thursday 17 th March 2016	6pm	Bramhall and Cheadle Hulme South (Bramhall Village Club)

2.3.12 The feedback captured from the Open Forums is summarised in **Chapter 3**.

ONLINE SURVEY

2.3.13 A link to an online survey was provided in the letter and on the consultation web page. The survey sought the following feedback:

- why the respondent is interested in flooding;
- to what extent the respondent agrees/disagrees with the structure of the LFRMS;
- to what extent the respondent agrees/disagrees that the information presented in the LFRMS is clear and coherent;
- how important/unimportant the respondent considers the LFRMS objectives to be;
- whether the respondent thinks the measures identified will allow the objectives to be met;
- whether the respondent has any suggestions of additional measures to support each objective;
- additional comments on the LFRMS, SEA and HRA Stage 1 Screening documents;
- the capacity of the respondent (an individual or on behalf of an organisation) and respondent organisation (if applicable); and
- the respondent postal and email addresses, phone number, gender, age and disability information (to capture the profile of respondents).

2.3.14 The feedback captured from the online survey is summarised in **Chapter 3**.

2.4 APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

2.4.1 A summary of each response received during the consultation is included within this report at **Chapter 3**.

2.4.2 The feedback received has been passed to the LFRMS team to enable consideration of the greater detail contained therein.

3 RESPONSES RECEIVED

3.1.1 This chapter summaries the volume and content of the comments received during the Draft LFRMS and supporting document consultation.

3.1.2 A total of 11 responses were received as identified below:

- Email from Virgin Media;
- Email from Historic England;
- Email from Natural England;
- Email from Stockport Council Civil Resilience;
- Email from Environment Agency;
- Email from Friends of Tangshutt Fields; and
- Five completed online surveys, including one each from Stockport UNISON, Marple Civic Society and Natural England.

3.1.3 Additionally, minutes have been obtained from the Stockport Council Area Committee meetings at which the LFRMS Open Forums took place.

3.2 EMAILS

3.2.1 The following summarises the feedback received via emails. A copy of each email and associated attachments is included at **Appendix D**.

VIRGIN MEDIA

3.2.2 A representative of Virgin Media suggested in an email of 21st March 2016 that they are interested in being involved in the development of the strategy as their “*subsurface apparatus may be affected by your proposals*”, identifying “*a valuable opportunity to consult on prevention of damage to avoid unnecessary harm to our network as a result of water ingress*”.

HISTORIC ENGLAND

3.2.3 In a letter emailed on 29th March 2016, a representative of Historic England stated that they have no comments to make on the consultation at this time.

NATURAL ENGLAND

3.2.4 In an emailed letter of 30th March 2016, a representative of Natural England identified themselves as a non-departmental public body with the statutory purpose “*to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development*”.

3.2.5 It is suggested that “*Natural England has no substantive comments to make in respect of this consultation*”, but the following general comments were provided:

LFRMS

- “*Natural England are pleased to note the inclusion of objective 7: to encourage, support and provide flood risk management which seeks to enhance and protect the environment.*”

→ *We broadly support the objectives identified in the strategy.”*

SEA

→ *“The approach and methodology used are appropriate and in line with advice that would be offered by Natural England, covering the topics and issues we would like to see considered in such a document. Relevant legislation has been identified and sourced together with appropriate designated sites being identified and referenced.*

→ *We are pleased to note that the submitted SEA has taken into account the recommendations/advice given in our SEA scoping response (dated 7 January 2016). Natural England concurs with the conclusions of the assessment.”*

HRA Stage 1 Screening

→ *“Natural England concur with the conclusion that the Strategy will have no likely significant effect on the international sites considered in this assessment.”*

STOCKPORT COUNCIL CIVIL RESILIENCE

3.2.6 The following comments were provided by a representative of Stockport Council Civil Resilience by email on 25th April 2016:

- *“I wonder why Rochdale is mentioned. However I understand that there is partnership work taking place across Greater Manchester.*
- *Worth adding? The desk-top testing of Stockport’s Multi-Agency Flood Plan took place in June 2015. This was a multi-agency event with representatives from key agencies attending the training session in Stockport Town Hall.*
- *Worth adding? Greater Manchester borough Multi-Agency Flood Plans were invoked following widespread flooding across the county at the end of last year. The flooding of domestic properties and businesses began on Boxing Day and the recovery, in some cases, is ongoing.*
- *The map [LFRMS page 13] is unclear.*
- *Is it worth mentioning somewhere that there are documents relating to flood risk including the Stockport Multi-Agency Flood Plan, the Greater Manchester Multi-Agency Flood Plan, and the Greater Manchester Multi-Agency Offsite Reservoir Emergency Plan.”*

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

3.2.7 A representative of the Environment Agency provided the following comments by email on 4th May 2016:

- *“The last sentence of the 5th paragraph [page 4] has a typing error.*
- *Page 22 talks about coastal erosion but this is not applicable to Stockport Council.*
- *[Page 23] The Flood Defence Consent under Section 109 of Water Resources Act 1991 has now been replaced by the Environmental Permitting Regulations.*
- *[Page 25] We would recommend that ‘...all forms of flooding’ is replaced by ‘...all sources of flooding’.*
- *The 4th paragraph [page 41] needs revising as the wording is unclear. Also, the last paragraph needs revising.”*

FRIENDS OF TANGSHUTT FIELDS

3.2.8 A representative of Friends of Tangshutt Fields, Romiley provided the following comments by email on 20th June 2016:

- *“Although the draft mentions the sandstones in the west of the borough there are also sandstones to the east of the borough but these sandstones of Upper Carboniferous age are also interbedded with much less permeable shales and mudstones which affect groundwater flow and drainage.*
- *The younger Permian and Triassic sandstones to the west of Stockport don't tend to be interbedded with shales and mudstones like the older sandstones. There are a few marl layers (lime rich clay) interbedded with the younger Permian and Triassic sandstones but on the whole the sandstones are permeable and water stored in them has long been used as a source of water in Stockport's breweries. I think Robinson's brewery still has a borehole taking water from these younger rocks.*
- *Much of Stockport, both east and west is cloaked in clay, mainly Boulder Clay left behind after the ice ages of the Pleistocene. This clay as the draft mentions is impermeable and does not allow the free drainage of water to the rocks below.*
- *I would like to mention the culvert of the stream running through Tangshutt, further downstream of Dingle Hollow in Romiley. The culvert at Tangshutt, close to the railway line has blocked up many times. People recall it being so bad sometimes that they could sail dingy's on the 'lake' that formed as a result. Increased pore water pressure from flooding in this area could lead to increased land slip along this valley, part of which supports the popular Safe Route to School through Tangshutt. There's already a sizable landslip on the Council managed land up stream of where the Safe Route to School crosses the stream.*
- *I regularly survey the biological life in the stream through Tangshutt which indicates that the water quality is generally good but with episodes of pollution. There is also a small regular seepage of iron ochre into the stream just below where the path crosses the stream. This could, as in other areas be associated with ground water moving through local coal bearing rocks of the Upper Carboniferous and/or with former coal mining.*
- *The draft also mentions sewage flooding into properties and there has for many years been a problem with this along certain parts of Cherry Tree Estate in Romiley. Gotherage Lane in particular has had problems with sewage in residents gardens and sewer collapses on Gotherage Lane and on the junction with Cherry Tree Lane and Compstall Road. There was also a road collapse on Cherry Tree Lane. All these within approx the last five years. A resident on Gotherage Lane had their own independant survey done of the sewage and drainage and was told the number of houses was far too large for the existing infrastructure to support.”*

3.3 ONLINE SURVEYS

3.3.1 A total of five online surveys were completed in response to the consultation; one in the capacity of an individual, three on behalf of an organisation (Stockport UNISON, Marple Civic Society and Natural England – note receipt of email summarised in **Section 3.2**) and one anonymously.

3.3.2 The following details the feedback received from the online surveys. A copy of each completed survey is included at **Appendix D**.

INTEREST IN FLOODING

3.3.3 The representative of Stockport UNISON stated that they are interested in flooding because it **has/could affect their home, has/could affect their business, has/could affect their travel and has/could affect the wider environment.**

- 3.3.4 The representative of Marple Civic Society stated that they have an interest in matters affecting Marple.
- 3.3.5 The representative of Natural England stated that their interest in flooding is as a statutory consultee.
- 3.3.6 The individual and anonymous respondents identified the following reasons for being interested in flooding (note more than one answer could be provided to this question):
- It has/could affect the wider environment – 2
 - It has/could affect their travel – 1

LFRMS STRUCTURE

- 3.3.7 The representative of Stockport UNISON stated they have **no feeling either way** on the structure of the Draft LFRMS.
- 3.3.8 The representatives of Marple Civic Society and Natural England stated that they **agree** with the structure of the Draft LFRMS.
- 3.3.9 The individual respondent stated they have **no feeling either way** on the structure of the Draft LFRMS, while the anonymous respondent stated they **strongly agree** with it.

LFRMS INFORMATION

- 3.3.10 The representative of Stockport UNISON stated they have **no feeling either way** on whether the information presented within the Draft LFRMS is clear and coherent.
- 3.3.11 The representative of Marple Civic Society and Natural England stated they **strongly agree** and **agree** respectively that the information presented within the Draft LFRMS is clear and coherent.
- 3.3.12 The individual respondent stated they **disagree** that the information presented within the Draft LFRMS is clear and coherent, suggesting to *“be specific above ‘sustainable development’”* and *“it should be no development or a return to permeable surfaces”*.
- 3.3.13 The anonymous respondent stated they **strongly agree** that the information presented within the Draft LFRMS is clear and coherent.

LFRMS OBJECTIVES

- 3.3.14 The survey specified a scale of 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important) with respect to the LFRMS objectives. The response is summarised in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3-1 LFRMS objective importance – online survey response

OBJECTIVE	LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE IDENTIFIED				
	STOCKPORT UNISON	MARPLE CIVIC SOCIETY	NATURAL ENGLAND	INDIVIDUAL	ANONYMOUS
To better understand local flood risk and make best use of available information in order to better manage flood risk to people, businesses, property, infrastructure and the natural environment.	4	5	-	4	4
To reduce the potential impact and costs of flooding in the Borough.	4	5	-	4	4
To ensure resilience of local water bodies and drainage assets.	3	5	-	4	5
To ensure appropriate development in areas of flood risk.	4	5	-	5	4
To develop a collaborative partnership approach to flood risk management, and cooperate with other Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) and key stakeholders working across catchments.	5	5	-	4	5
To assist communities in understanding information on flood risk and supporting themselves	4	5	-	3	4

LFRMS IDENTIFIED MEASURES

3.3.15

The survey asked whether the respondent thought the measures identified in the Draft LFRMS will allow the objectives to be met. The response is summarised in **Table 3.2**.

Table 3-2 LFRMS measures to allow objectives to be met – online survey response

OBJECTIVE	ALLOWED TO BE MET BY MEASURES PROPOSED				
	STOCKPORT UNISON	MARPLE CIVIC SOCIETY	NATURAL ENGLAND	INDIVIDUAL	ANONYMOUS
To better understand local flood risk and make best use of available information in order to better manage flood risk to people, businesses, property, infrastructure and the natural environment.	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
To reduce the potential impact and costs of flooding in the Borough.	Yes	Yes	-	No	Yes
To ensure resilience of local water bodies and drainage assets.	Yes	Yes	-	No	Yes
To ensure appropriate development in areas of flood risk.	Yes	Yes	-	No	Yes
To develop a collaborative partnership approach to flood risk management, and cooperate with other Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) and key stakeholders working across catchments.	No	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
To assist communities in understanding information on flood risk and supporting themselves	Yes	Yes	-	No	Yes

ADDITIONAL LFRMS MEASURES

- 3.3.16 The representative of Stockport UNISON suggests the following measures to support the objective identified:
- to better understand local flood risk and make best use of available information in order to better manage flood risk to people, businesses, property, infrastructure and the natural environment;
 - *“more needs to be mentioned of the science of climate change.”*
 - to reduce the potential impact and costs of flooding in the Borough;
 - *“there is little or no mention of proactive interventions of community groups such as Moors for the Future which are taking actions to reduce flooding at source.”*
 - to ensure resilience of local water bodies and drainage assets;
 - *“a different balance between sustainable drainage and hard infrastructure – more of the former perhaps!”*
 - to develop a collaborative partnership approach to flood risk management, and cooperate with other RMAs and key stakeholders working across catchments;
 - *“more reference to working with partners that are 'literally upstream' from us, i.e. those seeking to prevent flooding in the first place. Prevention is better than cure.”*
 - to assist communities in understanding information on flood risk and supporting themselves;
 - *“reference to working with academic sources and climate change groups with reference to being more informed of the causes of climate change and flooding, and actions that can be taken to prevent it happening.”*
- 3.3.17 The representative of Marple Civic Society suggests the following measures to support the objective identified:
- to better understand local flood risk and make best use of available information in order to better manage flood risk to people, businesses, property, infrastructure and the natural environment;
 - *“improved consultation with local groups and stakeholders. Two weeks consultation period for the draft strategy is not sufficient. The presentation to Marple Area Committee was cursory - no presentation, explanaton or discussion. This is not satisfactory for a document of such importance to our community and it does not do justice to the amount of work that has clearly gone into preparing the document.”*
 - to reduce the potential impact and costs of flooding in the Borough;
 - *“see above.”*
 - to ensure resilience of local water bodies and drainage assets;
 - *“see above.”*
 - to ensure appropriate development in areas of flood risk;
 - *“a robust planning policy on development in flood risk areas in a Neighbourhood Plan for Marple would help.”*
 - to develop a collaborative partnership approach to flood risk management, and cooperate with other RMAs and key stakeholders working across catchments;
 - *“see above.”*

- to assist communities in understanding information on flood risk and supporting themselves;
 - *“improve the consultation process. It is suggested that personal contact with an officer is desirable as part of the consultation to enable communities to engage in a meaningful way.”*

3.3.18 The individual respondent suggests the following measures to support the objective identified:

- to better understand local flood risk and make best use of available information in order to better manage flood risk to people, businesses, property, infrastructure and the natural environment;
 - *“encourage home owners not to pave over gardens...council tax?”*
- to reduce the potential impact and costs of flooding in the Borough;
 - *“more trees in the moors;*
 - *stop heather burning;*
 - *overspill sites.”*
- to ensure resilience of local water bodies and drainage assets;
 - *“overspill areas”*
- to ensure appropriate development in areas of flood risk;
 - *“no development except ones that improve the drainage.”*
- to develop a collaborative partnership approach to flood risk management, and cooperate with other RMAs and key stakeholders working across catchments;
 - *“tax breaks for green roofs and permeable surfaces.”*
- to assist communities in understanding information on flood risk and supporting themselves;
 - *“leaflets to households.”*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

3.3.19 The representative of Stockport UNISON provided the following additional comments:

- *“Council needs to promote grey water technology and green roofs, and removal of bound driveways.*
- *We would like to suggest that the Council considers reducing businesses rates to enable such 'green' businesses to provide these services. Additionally provide residents with incentives to, e.g. grants, to install these solutions. This should be a cost neutral program.*
- *Perhaps consider working with local colleges in providing courses to enable residents to take sustainable actions to reduce flooding.*
- *Is 'once in 100 years' terminology meaningful?*
- *Is there a reason why the Mersey can't flood Stockport Town Centre in the way that the Roch did in Rochdale? Run model that has highest intensity UK winter 2015/16 rainfall on local rivers, and re-calibrate Stockport flood risk areas as necessary.*
- *Would like to see reference to the fact that environmentally sustainable flood management can be a long-term source of skilled job creation (search 'One Million Climate Jobs').”*

HRA STAGE 1 SCREENING

3.3.20 The individual respondent commented on the HRA Stage 1 Screening, suggesting to *“restore the rivers original course where possible”*.

3.4 OPEN FORUMS

3.4.1 The following details the feedback from the Stockport Council Area Committee Open Forums, as included in the respective meeting minutes.

WERNETH

- *“A number of the issues in the Stockport area were the result of a high water table, natural water drainage from hillsides and clay in the soil.*
- *It was noted that water companies had a responsibility to maintain a register of incidences of sewage water flooding and had targets to reduce such occurrences. Such problems largely related to flooding from combined sewers and changing rainfall patterns were contributing to an associated increase in risk.*
- *There needed to be an increased awareness around the problems caused by the blocking of streams, the creation of additional culverts and the introduction of additional hardstanding without sufficient drainage.*
- *Local residents raised concerns about the potential for existing issues with natural springs around the University Estate in Woodley to be exacerbated as a result of additional building associated with proposals for the redevelopment of Greave Primary School.”*

HEATONS AND REDDISH

- *“Councillors expressed concern at the problems created by people using patterned concrete on their driveways without the installation of appropriate soak aways. This resulted in water flowing onto the Highway with resultant flooding and pooling of water.*
- *Drainage capacity was a major problem in many parts of the borough with systems being unable to cope with heavy rainfall.”*

STEPPING HILL

- *“Flooding had not traditionally been a particular problem within the wards covered by the Area Committee. It was acknowledged that while not a particular problem in Stockport, there were significantly higher risks elsewhere within Greater Manchester.*
- *It was queried whether or not the A6MARR works had taken account of the measures in the Strategy. In response it was stated that extensive mitigation measures had already been factored into the planning for the Road.*
- *Concerns were raised about the impact of the Belway Homes development on Lisburn Lane on drainage of the former Dialstone Centre site. There had been flooding on Worthing Close. It was stated that this would be reported back to appropriate departments in the Council.”*

CHEADLE

- *“The local management role given to Stockport Council for the delivery of coordinated local flood risk management did not make it liable for incidents of flooding.*
- *If an incident of flooding occurred, the Council had a duty to investigate it and put a report on its website.*
- *As well as the main rivers in the borough, Chorlton Brook was also classified as a main river for the purposes of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. The Area Committee also requested confirmation of whether or Micker Brook was a main river for the purposes of the strategy.*
- *The problems of increased house insurance for those people who lived in an area where there was a high risk of flooding was raised.*

- *There were a number of areas in the Cheadle Hulme North Ward where there was frequently flooding-related problems, including in the vicinity of Station Road and Albert Road; in the vicinity of Queens Road; in the vicinity of Grange Avenue; near to the rear of the Cross Keys public house; to the rear of Councillor Lane and near to Demmings Road.*
- *As well as the proximity to residential development, incidents of flooding needed to be assessed with regard to continuing to provide services to elderly people.*
- *In terms of responding to the consultation on the strategy, residents were encouraged to complete the form on the website, write to the Chief Executive of the Council or pass on information and comments to councillors at their Ward surgeries.*
- *There was strong interest in the area for the creation of a community resilience group with regard to flood risk management.”*

MARPLE

3.4.2 No LFRMS feedback is included in the minutes of this meeting.

CENTRAL STOCKPORT

- *“How the strategy would deal with the run off of water along Brinksway, Chestergate and Wood Street, Stockport.*
- *The Area Committee debated a report which had been circulated separately to Members regarding the incident of flooding at Dorset Avenue, Stockport on 8 February 2016.*
- *That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Area Committee regarding the reporting mechanism for incidents such as occurred at Dorset Avenue and how the Council ensures that the riparian owner carries out its legal duties following the production of a report by the Council into an incident of flooding.”*

BRAMHALL AND CHEADLE HULME SOUTH

- *“An identified problem was that there was a lack of knowledge around the location of culverts and drains in the Borough. This would be remedied through the undertaking of surveys on a district by district basis; however this would be a lengthy process.*
- *The Council had a responsibility to log details of incidents of flooding and publish regular reports. Such incidents would need to be reported to the Council.*
- *There needed to be an increased in awareness around the problems caused by the blocking of streams, the creation of additional culverts and the introduction of additional hardstanding without sufficient drainage.”*

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1.1 This report has demonstrated that a consultation has been undertaken by Stockport Council to inform those who may be affected by flooding and/or hold an interest in the Draft LFRMS (and supporting documents) and capture their comments.
- 4.1.2 The consultation was primarily publicised by way of a letter distributed by email or post to stakeholders, with a supporting consultation web page set up via www.stockport.gov.uk/consultation. Furthermore an article about the consultation was included on the www.marketingstockport.co.uk news pages and in the associated newsletter, and reference to the consultation was made on Twitter via the Stockport Council business account.
- 4.1.3 The Draft LFRMS was also presented at Open Forums at Stockport Council's Area Committees.
- 4.1.4 A total of 11 responses were received via email and/or online survey, as summarised by this report, including from the below stakeholders:
- Virgin Media;
 - Historic England;
 - Natural England;
 - Stockport Council Civil Resilience;
 - Environment Agency;
 - Friends of Tangshutt Fields;
 - Stockport UNISON; and
 - Marple Civic Society.
- 4.1.5 Comments were also captured at the Area Committee Open Forums, as included in this report.
- 4.1.6 The consultation responses received will be considered in the initial finalisation of the LFRMS. Once finalised, the LFRMS will be a 'live' document that will be reviewed periodically as the measures and actions detailed therein are developed and implemented. Stockport Council will continue to work to ensure that information is communicated to those with an interest in the LFRMS with regards to its development.