


PRELIMINARY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT



DRAIN LONDON

**LONDON
BOROUGH OF
REDBRIDGE**

GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY



London Borough of

Redbridge



Document control sheet **BPP 04 F8**

Client: Greater London Authority
 Project: Drain London Job No: B1577800
 Document Title: Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment for Redbridge

| | Originator | Checked by | Reviewed by | Approved by |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ORIGINAL | NAME M Tadhunter | NAME S Thompsett | NAME R Falconer | NAME S Thompsett |
| DATE 21 March 2011 | SIGNATURE <i>M Tadhunter</i> | SIGNATURE <i>S Thompsett</i> | SIGNATURE <i>R Falconer</i> | SIGNATURE <i>S Thompsett</i> |
| Document Status A.01 | | | | |

| | NAME | NAME | NAME | NAME |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| REVISION | M Tadhunter | S Thompsett | R Falconer | S Thompsett |
| DATE 6th April 2011 | SIGNATURE <i>M Tadhunter</i> | SIGNATURE  | SIGNATURE  | SIGNATURE  |
| Document Status A.02 | | | | |

| | NAME | NAME | NAME | NAME |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| REVISION | | | | |
| DATE | SIGNATURE | SIGNATURE | SIGNATURE | SIGNATURE |
| Document Status | | | | |

| | NAME | NAME | NAME | NAME |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| REVISION | | | | |
| DATE | SIGNATURE | SIGNATURE | SIGNATURE | SIGNATURE |
| Document Status | | | | |

Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited

This document has been prepared by a division, subsidiary or affiliate of *Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited* ("Jacobs") in its professional capacity as consultants in accordance with the terms and conditions of Jacobs' contract with the commissioning party (the "Client"). Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this document. No part of this document may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Jacobs. If you have received this document in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Jacobs.

Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document (a) should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole; (b) do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion; (c) are based upon the information made available to Jacobs at the date of this document and on current UK standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this document. It should be noted and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Jacobs has been made. No liability is accepted by Jacobs for any use of this document, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. Following final delivery of this document to the Client, Jacobs will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this document.

This document has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Jacobs, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of this document. Should the Client wish to release this document to a third party, Jacobs may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that (a) Jacobs' written agreement is obtained prior to such release; and (b) by release of the document to the third party, that third party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against Jacobs and Jacobs, accordingly, assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that third party; and (c) Jacobs accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of Jacobs' interests arising out of the Client's release of this document to the third party.

Quality page

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Title: | Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment for Redbridge |
| Owner: | John Martin, Redbridge |
| Version: | A.02 |
| Status: | Working draft |
| Project Number: | B1577800 |
| File Name: | PFRA REDBRIDGE Final Report A.02.doc |

REVISION HISTORY

| Summary of changes | Completed by | Date of issue | Version |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Updated to include comments from John Martin following WebEx session 28 March 2011 and subsequent emailed comment. | M Tadhunter / S Thompsett | 29 March 2011 | A.01 |
| Updated to include final quality review by Ronnie Falconer and last minute changes to reporting specifications by Drain London | S Thompsett | 6 th April | A.02 |

AUTHORS

| Name | Organisation and role |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Melanie Tadhunter | Jacobs, Project Support |
| Steve Thompsett | Jacobs, Project Manager |
| Alan Surry | Jacobs, Options lead |
| Paul Eccleston | JBA Consulting, Project Manager |

APPROVALS

| Name | Title | Signature | Date |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| Nigel Widgery | Jacobs Project Executive | N Widgery | 31 st Mar'11 |
| Alistair Dale | JBA Project Executive | A Dale | 6 th April'11 |

DISTRIBUTION

| Name | Organisation and role |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| John Martin | London Borough of Redbridge |
| Chris Brandon | Environment Agency |
| Kevin Reid | GLA |

RELATED DOCUMENTS

| Doc ref | Document title | Author | Date of issue | Version |
|---------|----------------|--------|---------------|---------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Executive Summary

This Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) has been produced on behalf of the London Borough of Redbridge by Jacobs and JBA Consulting as part of the Drain London programme.

A PFRA is a high level screening exercise that identifies areas of significant flood risk from all sources, and summarises the probability and harmful consequences of past (historical) and future (potential) flooding.

Lead Local Flood Authorities such as Redbridge have duties under the Flood Risk Regulations to manage local flood risk and are required to undertake a PFRA; the outputs of which consists of this report, the spreadsheet in Annexes 1-3 and the GIS layer of Flood Risk Areas in Annex 5.

In addition to fulfilling the regulatory requirements and establishing an evidence base of historic flood risk information to inform future local strategies, a key objective of this PFRA has been to establish an effective working partnership through ongoing stakeholder communication and engagement to ensure a coordinated and holistic approach to local flood risk management across London.

The PFRA reviews existing data to summarise past flood risk and predict how and where flooding may occur in the future taking into account the effects of climate change and long term developments. Based on that research, this PFRA proposes a minor amendment to the boundary of the Environment Agency's Indicative Flood Risk Area which broadly covers London, to include urbanised areas at Romford Road and Hainault Business Park that are currently excluded.

The PFRA will be approved by the Designated Flood Risk Manager and Redbridge Internal Partnership Group before going to the Environment Agency for final review and submission to the European Commission (as appropriate).

Glossary

| Term | Definition |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Aquifer | A source of groundwater comprising water bearing rock, sand or gravel capable of yielding significant quantities of water. |
| AMP | Asset Management Plan |
| Asset Management Plan | A plan for managing water and sewerage company (WaSC) infrastructure and other assets in order to deliver an agreed standard of service. |
| AStSWF | Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding |
| Catchment Flood Management Plan | A high-level planning strategy through which the Environment Agency works with their key decision makers within a river catchment to identify and agree policies to secure the long-term sustainable management of flood risk. |
| CDA | Critical Drainage Area |
| Critical Drainage Area | A discrete geographic area (usually a hydrological catchment) where multiple and interlinked sources of flood risk (surface water, groundwater, sewer, main river and/or tidal) cause flooding in one or more Local Flood Risk Zones during severe weather thereby affecting people, property or local infrastructure. |
| CFMP | Catchment Flood Management Plan |
| CIRIA | Construction Industry Research and Information Association |
| Civil Contingencies Act | This Act delivers a single framework for civil protection in the UK. As part of the Act, Local Resilience Forums must put into place emergency plans for a range of circumstances including flooding. |
| CLG | Government Department for Communities and Local Government |
| Climate Change | Long term variations in global temperature and weather patterns caused by natural and human actions. |
| Culvert | A channel or pipe that carries water below the level of the ground. |
| Defra | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |
| DEM | Digital Elevation Model |
| DG5 Register | A water-company held register of properties which have experienced sewer flooding due to hydraulic overload, or properties which are 'at risk' of sewer flooding more frequently than once in 20 years. |
| DTM | Digital Terrain Model |
| EA | Environment Agency |
| | |
| FEH | Flood Estimation Handbook, published by Centre for Ecology and Hydrology. |
| Flood defence | Infrastructure used to protect an area against floods as floodwalls and embankments; they are designed to a specific standard of protection (design standard). |
| Flood Risk Area | An area determined as having a significant risk of flooding in accordance with guidance published by Defra and WAG. |
| Flood Risk Regulations | Transposition of the EU Floods Directive into UK law. The EU Floods Directive is a piece of European Community (EC) legislation to specifically address flood risk by prescribing a common framework for its measurement and management. |

| Term | Definition |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Floods and Water Management Act | Part of the UK Government's response to Sir Michael Pitt's Report on the Summer 2007 floods, the aim of which is to clarify the legislative framework for managing surface water flood risk in England. |
| Fluvial Flooding | Flooding resulting from water levels exceeding the bank level of a main river |
| FMfSW | Flood Map for Surface Water |
| FRR | Flood Risk Regulations |
| IDB | Internal Drainage Board |
| Indicative Flood Risk Areas | Areas determined by the Environment Agency as indicatively having a significant flood risk, based on guidance published by Defra and WAG and the use of certain national datasets. These indicative areas are intended to provide a starting point for the determination of Flood Risk Areas by LLFAs. |
| IUD | Integrated Urban Drainage |
| LB | London Borough |
| LDF | Local Development Framework |
| LFRZ | Local Flood Risk Zone |
| Local Flood Risk Zone | Local Flood Risk Zones are defined as discrete areas of flooding that do not exceed the national criteria for a 'Flood Risk Area' but still affect houses, businesses or infrastructure. A LFRZ is defined as the actual spatial extent of predicted flooding in a single location |
| Lead Local Flood Authority | Local Authority responsible for taking the lead on local flood risk management |
| LiDAR | Light Detection and Ranging |
| LLFA | Lead Local Flood Authority |
| Local Resilience Forum | A multi-agency forum, bringing together all the organisations that have a duty to cooperate under the Civil Contingencies Act, and those involved in responding to emergencies. They prepare emergency plans in a co-ordinated manner. |
| LPA | Local Planning Authority |
| LRF | Local Resilience Forum |
| Main River | A watercourse shown as such on the Main River Map, and for which the Environment Agency has responsibilities and powers |
| NRD | National Receptor Dataset – a collection of risk receptors produced by the Environment Agency |
| Ordinary Watercourse | All watercourses that are not designated Main River, and which are the responsibility of Local Authorities or, where they exist, IDBs |
| Partner | A person or organisation with responsibility for the decision or actions that need to be taken. |
| PFRA | Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment |
| Pitt Review | Comprehensive independent review of the 2007 summer floods by Sir Michael Pitt, which provided recommendations to improve flood risk management in England. |
| Pluvial Flooding | Flooding from water flowing over the surface of the ground; often occurs when the soil is saturated and natural drainage channels or artificial drainage systems have insufficient capacity to cope with additional flow. |
| PPS25 | Planning and Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk |
| PA | Policy Area |

| Term | Definition |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Policy Area | One or more Critical Drainage Areas linked together to provide a planning policy tool for the end users. Primarily defined on a hydrological basis, but can also accommodate geological concerns where these significantly influence the implementation of SuDS |
| Resilience Measures | Measures designed to reduce the impact of water that enters property and businesses; could include measures such as raising electrical appliances. |
| Resistance Measures | Measures designed to keep flood water out of properties and businesses; could include flood guards for example. |
| Risk | In flood risk management, risk is defined as a product of the probability or likelihood of a flood occurring, and the consequence of the flood. |
| Risk Management Authority | As defined by the Floods and Water Management Act |
| RMA | Risk Management Authority |
| Sewer flooding | Flooding caused by a blockage or overflowing in a sewer or urban drainage system. |
| SFRA | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment |
| Stakeholder | A person or organisation affected by the problem or solution, or interested in the problem or solution. They can be individuals or organisations, includes the public and communities. |
| SuDS | Sustainable Drainage Systems |
| Sustainable Drainage Systems | Methods of management practices and control structures that are designed to drain surface water in a more sustainable manner than some conventional techniques. |
| Surface water | Rainwater (including snow and other precipitation) which is on the surface of the ground (whether or not it is moving), and has not entered a watercourse, drainage system or public sewer. |
| SWMP | Surface Water Management Plan |
| TfL | Transport for London |
| TWUL | Thames Water Utilities Ltd |
| WaSC | Water and Sewerage Company |

Contents

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | What is a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment? | 1 |
| 1.2 | Background | 1 |
| 1.3 | Objectives | 2 |
| 1.4 | Study Area | 2 |
| 2 | LLFA Responsibilities | 4 |
| 2.1 | Legislative Background | 4 |
| 2.2 | Leadership and Partnership | 5 |
| 2.3 | Stakeholder Engagement | 7 |
| 2.4 | Public Engagement | 8 |
| 2.5 | Other Responsibilities | 8 |
| 3 | Methodology and Data Review | 10 |
| 3.1 | Data Sources | 10 |
| 3.2 | Availability | 10 |
| 3.3 | Limitations | 11 |
| 3.4 | Security, Licensing and Use Restrictions | 11 |
| 3.5 | Quality Assurance | 12 |
| 4 | Past Flood Risk | 14 |
| 4.1 | Summary of Past Floods | 14 |
| 4.2 | Significant Harmful Consequences | 17 |
| 4.3 | Interactions with Other Flooding Sources | 17 |
| 5 | Future Flood Risk | 19 |
| 5.1 | Summary of Future Flood Risk | 19 |
| 5.2 | Locally Agreed Surface Water Information | 21 |
| 5.3 | Impact of Climate Change | 25 |
| 5.4 | Impact of Future Development | 27 |
| 6 | Review of Indicative Flood Risk Areas | 29 |
| 6.1 | Extent of FRA | 29 |
| 6.2 | Review Comments | 31 |
| 7 | Identification of Flood Risk Areas | 33 |
| 7.1 | Amendments to FRA | 33 |
| 7.2 | New FRA | 34 |
| 8 | Next Steps | 35 |
| 8.1 | Scrutiny and Review | 35 |
| 8.2 | Data Collection and Management | 35 |
| 8.3 | Incident Recording | 35 |
| 8.4 | Other FRA Requirements | 36 |

References

37

List of Annexes

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Annex 1</i> | <i>Past Floods</i> |
| <i>Annex 2</i> | <i>Future Floods</i> |
| <i>Annex 3</i> | <i>Flood Risk Areas</i> |
| <i>Annex 4</i> | <i>Review Checklist</i> |
| Annex 5 | GIS Layer of Flood Risk Areas (Not applicable to Redbridge) |
| Annex 6 | Partnership structure |

List of Figures

| | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Figure 1.1 | Four stages of flood risk management activity in Flood Risk Regulations | 2 |
| Figure 1.2 | Map of study area showing Redbridge Borough boundary | 3 |
| Figure 2.1 | Roles and responsibility for local flood risk management delivery | 5 |
| Figure 2.2 | Partnership structure for flood risk management | 6 |
| Figure 2.3 | Three tiers of the Drain London programme and associated stakeholder and partner activity | 7 |
| <i>Figure 4.1</i> | <i>Summary map of past floods (Surface Water incidents)</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Figure 4.2</i> | <i>Summary map of past floods (Main River / Fluvial / Tidal incidents)</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Figure 4.3</i> | <i>Summary map of past floods (Groundwater incidents)</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Figure 4.4</i> | <i>Summary map of past floods (Sewer incidents)</i> | <i>17</i> |
| Figure 4.5 | Interactions between flooding sources in an urban environment | 18 |
| <i>Figure 5.1</i> | <i>Map showing Surface Water Depth (1 in 200 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year)</i> | <i>22</i> |
| <i>Figure 5.2</i> | <i>Map showing Water Flood Hazard Rating (1 in 200 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year)</i> | <i>22</i> |
| Figure 5.3 | Cartoon illustrating the difference between fluvial (top image) and groundwater (bottom image) flood mapping | 24 |
| <i>Figure 5.4</i> | <i>Map showing areas of increased Potential for Elevated Groundwater</i> | <i>24</i> |
| <i>Figure 5.5</i> | <i>Map showing Surface Water Depth (1 in 100 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year plus allowance for climate change)</i> | <i>27</i> |
| <i>Figure 5.6</i> | <i>Map showing Water Flood Hazard Rating (1 in 100 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year plus allowance for climate change)</i> | <i>27</i> |
| Figure 6.1 | Environment Agency map of Indicative Flood Risk Areas (plus inset to show London detail) | 29 |
| Figure 6.2 | Map showing Indicative Flood Risk Areas in London | 30 |
| Figure 6.3 | Areas of Redbridge outside the London Indicative Flood Risk Area | 31 |
| Figure 7.1 | Map of amendments Flood Risk Areas | 33 |

Annexes/Figures highlighted above:

- *Electronic version - See separate files*
- *Paper version - See separate A3 document*

List of Tables

| | | |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 3.1 | Data restrictions by organisation | 12 |
| Table 4.1 | Summary of Past Floods in Redbridge | 16 |
| Table 4.2 | Recorded Past Flooding interactions | 18 |
| Table 5.1 | National assessment of the consequences of surface water flooding | 19 |
| Table 5.2 | National groundwater datasets | 20 |
| Table 5.3 | Predicted consequences of flooding, 0.5% Annual Rainfall Probability | 22 |
| Table 5.4 | Predicted changes in flooding consequences due to climate change | 27 |
| Table 6.1 | Summary review of Indicative Flood Risk Areas | 32 |
| Table 7.1 | Summary of recommended amendments to Flood Risk Areas | 33 |

1 Introduction

1.1 What is a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment?

A Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) is a high level screening exercise. It identifies areas of significant flood risk, and summarises the probability and harmful consequences of past (historical) and future (potential) flooding.

The PFRA involves collecting readily derivable information on past and future floods from a number of existing and available sources. These include the Environment Agency's national datasets (e.g. Flood Map for Surface Water), and existing local products (e.g. Strategic Flood Risk Assessments [SFRAs] and Surface Water Management Plans [SWMPs]).

Information collected and analysed during the PFRA process - no new information is developed - is assembled into the following three outputs:

- Preliminary assessment report (this document);
- Preliminary assessment report spreadsheet detailing past and future floods, and identified Flood Risk Areas (included as **Annexes 1-3** – this spreadsheet is reported to the European Commission);
- GIS layer Flood Risk Area(s) (included as **Annex 5**).

1.2 Background

Lead Local Flood Authorities, including the London Borough of Redbridge, have duties under the Flood Risk Regulations to manage local flood risk. They are required to undertake a PFRA for local sources of flooding, primarily surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses. Although there is no requirement to consider flooding directly from the sea, main rivers and reservoirs, the PFRA does consider interactions between these and local sources.

This PFRA has been undertaken on behalf of Redbridge, by Jacobs and JBA Consulting as part of the Drain London programme.

The Drain London Forum was established in 2007 as a result of the severe flooding experienced in the UK during recent years, together with challenges of climate change, population growth and increasing urbanisation. The Greater London Authority (GLA), on behalf of the Drain London Forum, has employed consultants to deliver the Drain London programme which aims to manage and reduce surface water flood risk in London. The 33 London Boroughs form eight sub-groups; Jacobs and JBA are undertaking PFRAs for 'Group 5' which includes the three London Boroughs of Barking and Dagenham, Havering and Redbridge.

The Flood Risk Regulations set out four stages of activity for managing flood risk within a six year cycle (see **Figure 1.1**); this PFRA addresses the first two stages. Flood Hazard and Flood Risk Maps (which fall under stage 3 of the FRR requirements) are also being produced alongside this PFRA and the SWMP as part of the Drain London programme commission however these will need to be revisited prior to 2013 to take any emerging guidance from the EA into account.




Figure 1.1 Four stages of flood risk management activity in Flood Risk Regulations

1.3 Objectives

The objectives of the PFRA are to:

- Fulfil the requirements of the first two stages of the Flood Risk Regulations in producing PFRA outputs and identifying Flood Risk Areas that warrant further examination through the production of maps and management plans;
- Summarise the methodology adapted for the PFRA, particularly relating to data sources, review, sharing and storage;
- Establish an evidence base of historic flood risk information that will provide a useful reference point for all local flood risk management and help inform and support local strategies;
- Work in partnership with identified organisations involved in assessment of future flood risk, to ensure effective collection and sharing of data through ongoing stakeholder engagement.

1.4 Study Area

The study area for this PFRA is defined by the administrative boundary of the London Borough of Redbridge. As mentioned in section 1.2, Jacobs and JBA have prepared PFRA's for the three London Boroughs in Drain London Group 5 - the geographical extent of the study area for this PFRA for Redbridge is illustrated green in **Figure 1.2**.

Redbridge is an outer London Borough to the north east of Central London. Created in 1965 by the reorganisation of local government for Greater London, Redbridge is a medium sized Borough covering 5,652 hectares, with a population of 267,700 (mid 2009 population estimate).

The River Roding bisects the Borough. Neighbouring local authorities are Waltham Forest to the west, Newham to the south west, Barking and Dagenham to the south east, Havering to the north east, and Essex to the north. Redbridge lies within the Thames River Basin District and is served by the Environment Agency Thames Region.




Figure 1.2 Map of study area showing Redbridge Borough boundary

2 LLFA Responsibilities

2.1 Legislative Background

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA) presents a number of challenges for policy makers and the flood and coastal risk management authorities identified to co-ordinate and deliver local flood risk management (surface water, groundwater and flooding from ordinary watercourses). Lead Local Flood Authorities have been empowered to take the lead on managing local flood risk through new responsibilities for flooding from surface and groundwater.

The FWMA reinforces the need to manage flooding holistically and in a sustainable manner. This has grown from the key principles within Making Space for Water (Defra, 2005) and was further reinforced by the summer 2007 floods and the Pitt Review (Cabinet Office, 2008). It implements several key recommendations of Sir Michael Pitt's Review of the Summer 2007 floods, whilst also protecting water supplies to consumers and protecting community groups from excessive charges for surface water drainage.

The FWMA must also be considered in the context of the EU Floods Directive, which was transposed into law by the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 (FRR) on 10 December 2009. As set out in section 1.2, the FRR require four stages of activity of which the PFRA is one.

- **Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments** (maps and reports for Sea, Main River and Reservoirs flooding as well as 'other' relevant sources) to be completed by Lead Local Flood Authorities and the Environment Agency by the 22 December 2011. **Flood Risk Areas**, at potentially significant risk of flooding, will also be identified. Maps and management plans will be developed on the basis of these flood risk areas.
- **Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps**. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities are required to produce Hazard and Risk maps for Sea, Main River and Reservoir flooding as well as 'other' relevant sources by 22 December 2013.
- **Flood Risk Management Plans**. The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities are required to produce Flood Risk Management Plans for Sea, Main River and Reservoir flooding as well as 'other' relevant sources by 22 December 2015.

Figure 2.1 illustrates how this PFRA fits into the delivery of local flood risk management, and where the responsibilities for this lie.




Figure 2.1 Roles and responsibility for local flood risk management delivery

2.2 Leadership and Partnership

As outlined in **Figure 2.1**, Redbridge, as the designated LLFA, has a responsibility for leading local flood risk management across the Borough.

Much of the local knowledge and expertise necessary for Redbridge to fulfil these duties lies with neighbouring London Boroughs and other partner organisations. Partnership working with these groups and organisations is therefore essential for effective and consistent management of local flood risk throughout Redbridge and for a holistic and coordinated approach across London.

As part of the Drain London programme (detailed in section 1.2), a **collaborative working framework** was established by the Drain London Forum to promote cross-organisational collaboration between Redbridge and all other relevant authorities in flood risk management in order to:

- Set out expectations for key partners and what actions each will take forward;
- Ensure the coordination of future investments for flood risk management in London across the relevant organisations;
- Avoid ad-hoc arrangements for flood incident response; and
- Avoid overlap in routine maintenance of essential flood risk infrastructure.

As well as the neighbouring boroughs of Barking & Dagenham and Havering, Redbridge also have a responsibility to partner with other key stakeholders and risk management authorities, who share the responsibility for decisions and actions. Ideally, the informal relationships established within the context of the Drain London programme should be formalised to ensure clear lines of communication and continued mutual cooperation through the development of a Memorandum of Understanding.

In order to assist with this, Redbridge has identified a number of groups, committees and forums both internally within the Borough and across the different partner organisations, and established a role for **Designated Flood Risk Manager** who acts as the overarching lead responsible for the **Internal and External Partnership Groups** and centralising current work.

The overall partnership structure, and how the Internal and External Partnership Groups fit within the context of existing regional and London-wide flood-related groups, is illustrated in **Figure 2.2** and a brief description of the role of each group is provided in **Annex 6**.




Figure 2.2 Partnership structure for flood risk management

This partnership structure is ‘fluid’ and evolving – as the Borough advances into the role of managing local flood risk in this new way, groups and committees may change in format, membership and frequency to reflect new requirements and ways of working, and partners and stakeholders may change. The partnership approach set out in this PFRA will need to be ratified over time and potentially adjusted as appropriate in the future to accommodate these changes, the most relevant and immediate of which will be the effects of changes to the resilience forum structure under GLA.

2.3 Stakeholder Engagement

As part of the PFRA process Redbridge have engaged stakeholders representing the following organisations and authorities:

* *Stakeholders included as partners in the External Partnership Group.*

- London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (including development planning, engineering services, and emergency planning);
- London Borough of Havering (including development planning, engineering services, and emergency planning);
- Essex County Council * (including highways, emergency planning, engineering services, and heritage and conservation);
- Greater London Authority (also representing the Drain London partnership);
- Environment Agency *
- Thames Water *

Figure 2.3 illustrates the three tier process (set out by the GLA for London Boroughs) for delivering PFRA and SWMPs under the requirements of the Flood Risk Regulations. The development of this PFRA falls under Tier 2.




Figure 2.3 *Three tiers of the Drain London programme and associated stakeholder and partner activity*

In addition to the stakeholder engagement undertaken as outlined above as part of Tier 2 work, further engagement with stakeholders will be required during Tier 3 when local flood risk management plans are formulated for the Flood Risk Areas identified during this PFRA.

Stakeholders who will need to be involved in Tier 3 include:

- Transport for London *
- Highways Agency *
- Network Rail *
- London Fire Brigade *
- British Waterways
- Natural England
- London Underground

- Chamber of Commerce and Retailers
- Association of British Insurers
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Riparian owners
- Developers or regeneration agencies
- Local community and interest groups
- General public (see section 2.4)

2.4 Public Engagement

The engagement of local people is vital. In addition to providing access to valuable local knowledge which can contribute to the PFRA and to local flood risk management more generally across Redbridge, building trust with local people increases the chances of public and stakeholder acceptability of proposals and decisions for managing flood risk.

As stated in section 2.3 and illustrated in **Figure 2.3**, the involvement of the wider public will need to be considered during Tier 3 and beyond, when local flood risk management plans are formulated for the Flood Risk Areas identified during this PFRA.

Through effective Communications and Engagement Plans, Redbridge will ensure that meaningful engagement is undertaken to **inform** people of the risks, causes and probability of flooding; **engage** people and actively seek their views on what can be done to manage flood risk; and provide **feedback** on decisions and how stakeholder and public inputs have influenced the process. The Environment Agency's 'Working with Others' framework provides useful guidance for communicating with and engaging stakeholders and communities.

As the central hub of the partnership structure (see **Figure 2.2**) and overarching lead for local flood risk management within the Borough, the Redbridge Designated Flood Risk Manager is responsible for driving the communication of risk to stakeholders and the public by producing and disseminating literature and undertaking communication and engagement events and activities as appropriate.

Derek Hobday (Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Manager for Redbridge) and Jimmy Maravala (Redbridge Communications and Engagement team lead) will be working together to oversee this element of communicating risk. A communication and engagement programme will be prepared to build on some of the activities currently being undertaken (such as the two-way interviews and surveys that target the most affected residents and aim to raise awareness and gather important local information; and briefing notes that can form the basis of tailored communication materials to suit a range of audiences).

2.5 Other Responsibilities

Lead Local Flood Authorities, as defined under the Flood and Water Management Act, are responsible for a number of important aspects in coordinating the management of local flood risk. Specific requirements are as follows:

- **The investigation of flood incidents** – a duty to investigate and record details of significant flood events within LLFA areas. This includes identifying which organisations have flood risk management functions and what will be done to

the investigate flood incidents, notifying risk management organisations where necessary and publishing the results of any investigations carried out.

- **Asset Register** – a register of structures or features which are considered to have an effect on flood risk, including details on ownership and condition as a minimum must be maintained. The register must be available for inspection by the Secretary of State.
- **Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Approving Body** – under the FWMA, LLFAs are designated the SuDS Approving Body for any new drainage system, and therefore must approve, adopt and maintain any new sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) within their area.
- **Local Flood Risk Management Strategy** – a requirement to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a local strategy for flood risk management in the LLFA area. This local strategy must build upon national and local information and will use consistent risk-based approaches across both local authority areas and catchments.
- **Powers to Undertake Works** – powers to undertake works to manage flood risk from surface runoff and groundwater, consistent with the local flood risk management strategy for the area have been designated under the FWMA.
- **Powers to Designate** – alongside district councils and the Environment Agency, LLFAs now have powers to designate structures and features that affect flooding or coastal erosion. This will safeguard assets that are relied upon for flood or coastal erosion risk management.

3 Methodology and Data Review

3.1 Data Sources

Existing data used to prepare this PFRA was collected in a consistent manner across London by Tier 1 of the Drain London programme. The following authorities and organisations were identified and contacted to share data for the preparation of the PFRA;

- 33 London Boroughs
- British Geological Survey
- British Waterways
- Environment Agency
- Greater London Authority
- Highways Agency
- London Fire Brigade
- London Underground
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- National Health Service
- Transport for London
- Thames Water

Full listings of all of the data requested and received are included in Appendix A of the Surface Water Management Plan. Additionally, the SWMP undertook additional modelling and surface water flood risk mapping for the entire Borough. The results from this modelling constitute the locally agreed surface water information.

Standard Information Request Forms were used to collect data and information from these organisations. The form also facilitated the consistent recording of any issues arising surrounding information sharing and availability.

3.2 Availability

Past flooding

Prior to the Floods and Water Management Act 2010, those local authorities now identified as Lead Local Flood Authorities were not required to collate records of flooding within their boundaries.

Records are held on returns from a questionnaire sent to properties in the vicinity of the flooding along the Roding, and incidents on Seven Kings Water in 2000. Returns give an indication of extent and severity of flooding, whether flooded internally, flooded through air bricks or had flooded gardens. Other incidents and locations are known to the Borough and have been mapped for the SWMP and PFRA, but are not currently held in a central register of flooding incidents.

Future flooding

National information on future flood risk was provided by the Environment Agency and was centrally collected for all London Boroughs through the Drain London project. This data is also made freely available to LLFAs via the EA's Datashare website (<http://www.geostore.com/environment-agency/>)

Consequences

The National Receptor Database (NRD) has been developed by the EA to assist the assessment of the consequences of flooding. It contains point receptors (e.g. houses, commercial premises), polygons (e.g. SSSIs) and linear features (e.g. roads and railways). The National Receptors Database (NRD) version 1.0 was used for the counts of properties and other receptors in the preparation of this PFRA. Receptor information was prepared for all London Boroughs in December 2010 in order to undertake property counts required for the SWMP. Version 1.1 of the NRD has subsequently been issued and contains modifications and corrections since version 1.0. However, in order to avoid repetition of work, and ensure consistency between the SWMP and the PFRA, it was decided to complete the PFRA using NRD version 1.0.

3.3 Limitations

Data recording

Detailed information on historic flooding incidents is maintained by the Borough including GIS records for some incidents. However there is not currently a single register for recording flood incidents.

Data sharing

There are no significant known data sets required to produce this PFRA which have not been made available to the Borough by partner organisations, although limitations in the available data and restrictions on their use are noted above and in section 3.4.

Records of Consequences of Flooding

The GIS records for the Roding and Seven Kings Water record whether flooding was internal, through airbricks or to gardens (external only). There is limited confidence in the accuracy of this data that was collected through a questionnaire sent to residents. Beyond this there is limited data held on the actual consequences of historic flooding.

3.4 Security, Licensing and Use Restrictions

The security of data is a key consideration when it comes to collecting, collating and storing sensitive data.

Data licensing and usage restrictions were negotiated through Drain London Tier 1. As a general rule, a check should be made prior to any use of the supplied data for purposes other than preparation of the SWMP or PFRA. Where partner organisations have supplied data with restrictions on usage, these are saved with the data.

Data licenses are made out to the Greater London Authority, and hence a revised license may be required prior to use by LLFAs for work not under the umbrella of Drain London and/or the GLA. [Table 3.1](#) summarises the restrictions on the use of this data.

| Organisation | Restrictions on data use |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| British Geological Survey | Usage limited to work undertaken on behalf of GLA. Specific conditions relating to use of DIGMap |
| British Waterways | Canal network is only for use by Tier 2 Consultants for the SWMPs as part of Drain London programme. |
| Environment Agency | Data was supplied with the restriction “access only for: GLA, Local Authorities and their consultants for Geo-Portal. Only for surface water management plans, strategic flood risk assessments or preliminary flood risk assessments”. |
| Greater London Authority | GLA owned dataset. Only to be used for Drain London programme and in accordance with OS Contractor License issued by GLA. |
| Highways Agency | Data provided to GLA for use under Drain London programme. Users must abide to the Memorandum Of Understanding. |
| London Fire Brigade | Only to be viewed by the Council and Tier 2 consultants |
| London Underground | Subject to LU conditions |
| Natural England | Standard Natural England terms of use apply (http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/copyright) |
| Network Rail | Only to be viewed by the Council and Tier 2 consultants |
| National Health Service | None stated |
| Transport for London | None stated |
| Thames Water | All data subject to conditions. Sewer flooding incidents (DG5 register) were supplied collated by 4 figure postcode area in order to prevent identification of individual properties at risk. |

Table 3.1 Data restrictions by organisation

3.5 Quality Assurance

3.5.1 INSPIRE Directive

The INSPIRE Directive (2007/2/EC) is implemented in the UK by the INSPIRE Regulations 2009. Its main aim is to improve the quality, consistency and accessibility of spatial data sets and services for environmental data to ensure they can be shared and integrated seamlessly into applications with minimal manual intervention. Further information can be found in guidance produced by the Association for Geographic Information (2009).

The general principles of INSPIRE are:

1. Data should be collected only once and kept where it can be maintained most effectively.
2. It should be possible to combine seamless spatial information from different sources across Europe and share it with many users and applications.
3. It should be possible for information collected at one level/scale to be shared with all levels/scales; detailed for thorough investigations, general for strategic purposes.

4. Geographic information needed for good governance at all levels should be readily and transparently available.
5. It should be easy to find what geographic information is available, how it can be used to meet a particular need, and under which conditions it can be acquired and used.

Following the PFRA Guidance, this report has been prepared in accordance with the INSPIRE Directive. Specifically:

- The data produced for the SWMP, which is used to provide the locally agreed surface water information referenced in section 5, has INSPIRE compliant MetaData¹ associated with each layer of spatial data and with pieces of non-spatial data including reports.
- The data provided by flood risk management partners was collected once for the whole of London as part of the Drain London programme, and was supplied with MetaData detailing the source and format of each data set collated.

Subsequently review of data quality was conducted using the scoring system recommended in the Defra SWMP Guidance (2010), and this is recorded in Appendix A of the SWMP report.

¹ **MetaData** is data that serves to provide context or additional information about other data. For example, MetaData could include information about the subject, author, size, collection method or accuracy of a data file or document.

4 Past Flood Risk

4.1 Summary of Past Floods

This section presents a summary of past flooding events in the Borough. Events from all sources are considered. In order for events to be included within **Annex 1** (the records of past floods and their significant consequences), they must be shown to have had “significant harmful consequences” (see section 4.2 for definition). Additionally, past floods of a kind that are not likely to occur now should not be included in Annex 1, for example where flood defences or drainage have been improved since the flood occurred.

| Flood Event (refs in brackets indicate sources) | Source / Cause | Significant Consequences? | Likely to recur? | Included in Annex 1? |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Ching 1947: Minor flooding from the Ching along the Borough’s western boundary with Waltham Forest. (1), (2). Some evidence (3) that this flood also involved the Roding “at one time, indeed, the flood- waters from the Thames, the Come, the Lea and the Roding had nearly joined up, to throw a moat of floods all round that half of London lying north of the river...the Roding was flooding Ilford. Parts of Wanstead and Woodford were under water; it was the same story farther out, at Watford, for instance, and Ware, Hertford and Bishop’s Stortford.” However no flood extents are recorded for this by the EA. | Main River - channel capacity exceeded | Unknown | Yes | No |
| Roding (various): The MAFP (7) states that: “On the 5th April 1967 Mr Patrick Jenkins MP stood up in the House of Commons and spoke about flooding in Brackley Square Woodford Green. Whilst it has not been possible to assess whether this was caused by fluvial or surface water flooding the situation was serious enough for the matter to be raised in the House and for a Minister to respond. According to the Hansard report Brackley Square was developed between 1935 and 1939. The builder’s application in 1935 was turned down by the Council but was allowed on appeal by the Minister of Health. In response to this the Council passed a byelaw establishing a datum line, requiring houses and access roads to be built 5 to 6 feet above the natural ground level within the area. Forty years ago there was a dispute as to the cause of the flooding of Brackley Square gardens and therefore whose responsibility it was. The dispute was whether it was a land drainage or sewerage problem. “ | Main river / surface water / sewerage | Unknown (not related to a specific incident) | Yes | No |
| Roding 1968: Flood extents to immediate north of Borough in the Buckhurst Hill area. | Main River - channel | No | Yes | No |

| Flood Event (refs in brackets indicate sources) | Source / Cause | Significant Consequences? | Likely to recur? | Included in Annex 1? |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| None recorded within Redbridge itself (1), (2). | capacity exceeded | | | |
| Roding 1974: River out of bank for the entire reach through the Borough, including flooding to properties in Woodford, Woodford Bridge and Cranbrook. (1), (2). No information obtained on the consequences of this flooding. | Main River - channel capacity exceeded | Unknown | Yes | No |
| Roding 1987: Extensive flooding recorded north of A12 including flooding to properties in Woodford and Woodford Bridge. (1), (2). No information obtained on the consequences of this flooding. | Main River - channel capacity exceeded | Unknown | Yes | No |
| Roding 1993: Flooding to Ray Park and Ashton Playing Fields (1), (2). | Main River - channel capacity exceeded | No | Yes | No |
| Roding 2000: The floods in October 2000 were extensive along Chigwell Road and adjacent side roads between Charlie Brown's roundabout and the M11 bridge, Roding Lane South and Wanstead Park Road. This flooding was caused by a combination of reasons including overtopping of the riverbank, river water surcharging from the river through gullies and surface water that could not drain into the Roding and coming up through gullies and manholes. In total, in the vicinity of 250 properties are believed to have flooded. In the case of Brackley Square, flooding to Gardens was up to 2m deep and included flooding to garages. (1), (2), (5), (6), (7). | Main River - channel capacity exceeded / surface water / sewerage | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Roding 2001: Flood extents to immediate north of Borough in the Buckhurst Hill area. None recorded within Redbridge itself (1), (2). | Main River - channel capacity exceeded | No | Yes | No |
| Seven Kings Water 2000: Flooding to properties in Westwood Recreation Ground, Spencer Rd and Chester Rd. In total, in the vicinity of 20 properties are believed to have flooded. Flooding due to accidental removal of a section of bunding within the recreation ground, which has subsequently been repaired. | Ordinary watercourse – failure of defences | No | No | No |
| Other surface water flooding incidents: The Borough holds records of other incidents of surface water flooding in the following locations: Peregrine Road, Valentines Park, South Park, Junction Empress Avenue and High Road, St Romans Crescent, Rose Tree Mews / Chigwell Rd, Hermon Hill, Cocked Hat Plantation and the A12. None are considered to have been of a magnitude to have had “significant harmful consequences” and as such are not reported within Annex 1 (see explanation in section 4.1). | Surface water (including pluvial, sewerage, highway drainage exceedance) | No | Varies by location | No |
| Thames Water has provided information extracted from their DG5 register of | Sewer | No | Yes | No |

| Flood Event (refs in brackets indicate sources) | Source / Cause | Significant Consequences? | Likely to recur? | Included in Annex 1? |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <p>properties at risk of sewer flooding. This a statutory register that Thames Water are required to maintain and submit to OfWAT. The information is supplied as numbers of properties on the DG5 register considered to be at risk of flooding from sewers within each Postcode Sector, for example "RM5 2." Postcode sectors typically contain several thousand properties, and therefore the data provided in this manner only gives an approximate indication of areas at risk of sewer flooding. Additionally, many Postcode sectors overlap LLFA boundaries. RM5 2, for example, spans Redbridge, Barking and Dagenham and Havering. It is not therefore possible to identify in which Borough the 53 at-risk properties in this Postcode sector are located.</p> <p>In total, the postcode sectors wholly or partially within Redbridge have 371 properties on the DG5 register. (8)</p> <p>Note that the DG5 register does not include properties considered to be at risk in a 1 in >20 year (less than 5% Annual Event Probability) event.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Historic Flood Map (2) Flood Event Outlines (3) British Hydrological Society Chronology of British Hydrological Events (4) Redbridge Level 1&2 SFRA (5) Communications with Redbridge staff (6) Redbridge GIS records of flooded properties (7) Redbridge Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) (8) Thames Water DG5 register of properties at risk of sewer flooding | | | | |

Table 4.1 Summary of Past Floods in Redbridge

The following additional sources of information on past flooding have been consulted and have identified no flooding with the Borough:

- **British Waterways** map of BW canals in London, and note "Anecdotal Flood Records 20100622.doc" prepared for Drain London. There are no British Waterways canals within the Borough.
- **London Fire Brigade** incidents (flooddata.csv). A total of 1078 incidents associated with flooding or person in water were provided for the Borough. The incidents are widely spread across the Borough, and the source of flooding is not attributed (and may for example include flooding due to burst water mains or even domestic plumbing). For this reason it was decided that this data set could not be used to identify past floods of significant consequence.
- **Greater London Council** (GLC historic storm reports.xls) - report on 19 storm events from 1956 to 1980 across London. Includes observed rainfall and river flows/levels, and commentary on flooding consequences. There is no reference to watercourses or flooding within the Borough.

- **Highways Agency** (Flooding_hotspots_Area_5.shp) GIS layer showing locations of flooding hotspots on the Motorway and Trunk network. No roads within the Borough are identified as being at risk by the Highways Agency.

Figure 4.1 Summary map of past floods (Surface Water incidents)

Figure 4.2 Summary map of past floods (Main River / Fluvial / Tidal incidents)

Figure 4.3 Summary map of past floods (Groundwater incidents)

Figure 4.4 Summary map of past floods (Sewer incidents)

4.2 Significant Harmful Consequences

In order for a flood to be included within **Annex 1**, it must be shown to have had significant harmful consequences – i.e. those that impact on human health, the economy, the environment, cultural heritage or any combination of these.


There is no national definition of significant harmful consequences as local receptors respond in different ways. Guidance has been issued by the Environment Agency (2011b) and Greater London Authority (2011) which has been followed for this PFRA. This guidance can be summarised as:

- There is only a need to include information in Annex 1 if there is reliable information on past floods and there were significant harmful consequences.
- Floods reported in Annex 1 should be of a level of consequence sufficient to justify reporting to the European Commission. This would normally imply that they were memorable or otherwise registered on a national scale even if occurring over a relatively small area.

Based on the evidence available, the fluvial and surface water flooding along the Roding in 2000 is considered to have had significant harmful consequences. This was a major event for the Borough; in the vicinity of 250 properties are believed to have flooded. Responsibility for managing the event and subsequent preventative actions was shared by the Borough, the Environment Agency and Thames Water.

4.3 Interactions with Other Flooding Sources

Flooding, particularly when it occurs in an urban context, can frequently be attributed to a number of sources. The interaction between these sources historically made it very difficult to specify a particular source. **Figure 4.5** provides a pictorial representation of potential flooding sources in an urban context.



Source: JBA Consulting (2006)

Figure 4.5 Interactions between flooding sources in an urban environment

Within the Borough, the following historic flooding interactions have been observed in the flood records;

- Surface water / Sewer – Roding valley
- Surface water / Fluvial – River Roding, Seven Kings Water

A full summary of flooding interactions is shown in Table 4.2.

| Redbridge Flooding Interactions | | LLFA Responsibility to Lead | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| | | Surface Water (including ordinary water courses) | Groundwater |
| Primary Responsibility of other party | Sewer | Yes | Not recorded |
| | Fluvial (Main river) | Yes | Not recorded |
| | Tidal | Not recorded | Not recorded |

Table 4.2 Recorded Past Flooding interactions

5 Future Flood Risk

5.1 Summary of Future Flood Risk

Whilst analysis of past flooding provides valuable information on the nature and extent of flooding that has occurred in the Borough in the past, it does not necessarily inform us about how and where flooding may occur in the future. Predictions of future flood risk are produced using combinations of hydrological and hydraulic modelling and analysis of past hydrological records to make future predictions.

5.1.1 Surface water future flood risk

The Environment Agency has two national datasets showing surface water flooding available to LLFAs:

- Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding (AStSWF);
- Flood Map for Surface Water (FMfSW).

These datasets, along with the National Receptors Database v1.0 were used nationally to select the 10 Indicative Flood Risk Areas in England.

The surface water maps are not designed to assess the risks from other sources of flooding. However, as these datasets use a 2D representation of the ground, they route surface runoff into channels and depressions. As flooding is dependent on topography and depressions, flooding from ordinary watercourses and groundwater may occur in the same places as flooding from surface runoff.

A national-scale assessment of properties at risk of surface water flooding within the Borough was provided by the Environment Agency, as shown in **Table 5.1**.

| Mapping Source | Count for Redbridge | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Flood Map for Surface Water (FMfSW) - 1 in 200 rainfall - Flooding greater than 0.1m depth | NRD v1.0 - all properties | 32,100 |
| | NRD v1.0 - residential properties | 29,000 |
| | difference (non-residential) | 3,100 |
| Flood Map for Surface Water (FMfSW) - 1 in 200 rainfall - Flooding greater than 0.3m depth | NRD v1.0 - all properties | 9,100 |
| | NRD v1.0 - residential properties | 8,200 |
| | difference (non-residential) | 900 |
| Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding (AStSWF) - Less | NRD v1.0 - all properties | 27,700 |
| | NRD v1.0 - residential properties | 24,700 |
| | difference (non-residential) | 3,000 |
| Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding (AStSWF) - Intermediate | NRD v1.0 - all properties | 9,200 |
| | NRD v1.0 - residential properties | 8,100 |
| | difference (non-residential) | 1,100 |

Source: LLFA_Property_Counts_Rounded_for_PFRA.xls supplied by the Environment Agency with Indicative Flood Risk Areas to Local Authorities. Note that values are rounded to nearest 100 properties.

Table 5.1 National assessment of the consequences of surface water flooding

An analysis of the receptors assessed to be at risk from the AStSWF and FMfSW was not undertaken, because the locally agreed surface water information on future

flooding is considered to be the best available source of this information (see section 5.2.1).

5.1.2 Groundwater future flood risk

There are four national datasets providing information on groundwater flooding (see **Table 5.2**). Each has limitations, which may include: cost, resolution, coverage (for example, England only), classifications (it may or may not be linked to an estimated flood probability) and hydrogeological coverage (for example, only chalk; or only consolidated aquifers).

As identified earlier, the mechanisms of overland flow and ponding in topographic depressions have an obvious relationship with surface water flooding. Above ground locations identified at risk of surface water flooding, that lie within an area susceptible to groundwater flooding, may also be susceptible to groundwater flooding. The consequences of future flooding from groundwater (in the areas susceptible to groundwater flooding) are therefore not additional to those counted and recorded for the future surface water flooding maps.

| Source | Availability | Description |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Groundwater Flood Susceptibility Map | British Geological Society – a licence fee may be payable. England & Wales. | This shows areas split into bands of susceptibility where groundwater flooding could arise from consolidated aquifers or permeable superficial deposits. The dataset does not attempt to assign a probability to flooding. |
| Groundwater Emergence Maps | Defra – free of charge to LLFAs for use in PFRAs. Covers England only. | This shows areas where groundwater levels in consolidated aquifers might be within 2m of the ground surface in a winter hydrologically similar to the very wet winter of 2000/01 verified against flood records from that winter. The dataset does not attempt to assign a probability to the flooding. |
| Groundwater Flood Map | JBA consulting – a licence fee may be payable. England & Wales. | This shows flood risk envelopes for a range of probabilities for groundwater flooding from chalk aquifers and permeable superficial deposits. |
| Areas Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding | Environment Agency. Available from Datashare . Free of charge for use in PFRAs. England & Wales. | This is a very broad scale map showing groundwater flood areas on a 1km ² grid. This dataset is a simplified version of the top two susceptibility bands of the Groundwater Flood Susceptibility Map and is being provided to give a broader feel for the wider areas which might be at risk from groundwater flooding. It covers consolidated aquifers and permeable superficial deposits and shows the proportion of each 1km grid square susceptible to flooding. The dataset covers a large area of land, and only isolated locations within the overall susceptible area are actually likely to suffer the consequences of groundwater flooding. |

Table 5.2 National groundwater datasets

These four layers have been used to create new locally agreed information on future groundwater flooding (see section 5.2.2).

5.2 Locally Agreed Surface Water Information

Locally agreed information on future flood risk is information produced to inform a local study, such as an SFRA, SWMP or Drainage Action Plans (DAP). Two sources of locally agreed information on future flood risk have been developed for the SWMPs for all London Boroughs under the Drain London programme co-ordinated by the GLA:

5.2.1 Surface Water Flood Risk Mapping

Surface water flood risk modelling and mapping has been prepared for the entire Borough in support of the SWMP. Full details of the methodology used to produce the surface water flood risk mapping are provided in the SWMP report (London Borough of Redbridge, 2011), but in summary:

- Modelling was carried out in InfoWorks CS following a direct rainfall approach. A variable mesh was used to apply greater detail to the 2D model in urban areas.
- Net (effective) rainfall was variable according to land surface and to the capacity of the sewerage system, set by Thames Water at 6.5mm/hour. Where the capacity of the sewerage system is lower than this, it would be expected that sewer flooding would occur on a relatively regular basis and would be brought to the attention of Thames Water and/or the Borough.
- The 3.33% (1 in 30 year), 1.33% (1 in 75 year), 1% (1 in 100 year), 1% (1 in 100 year) allowing for climate change (at 30% increase in rainfall) and 0.5% (1 in 200 year) annual probability design rainfall events were calculated using the FEH CD-Rom and run through the models.
- Key 1D structures (in particular culverts inflowing from urban areas) were included where sufficient information was available. The sewerage system was not explicitly modelled.
- Main Rivers were assumed to be bank-full.

Model outputs include maps of extent, depth, speed, direction and probability of flooding. This locally produced information closely matches the extents of the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Surface Water (FMfSW) in most areas, but the modelling approach taken for the SWMP was more locally detailed than the national FMfSW, and therefore is presented here as the primary source of local surface water information on future flooding.

Outputs are shown in Figures 5.1 and 5.2 for the 0.5% annual rainfall probability. The PFRA Guidance states that *“for the purposes of the PFRA process the rainfall event with a 1 in 200 chance of occurring in any year scenario is the most appropriate as this is equivalent to the chance of flooding on the ground in the order of a 1 in 100 chance in any given year”*. **Figure 5.1** shows surface water depth for a 1 in 200 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year, and **Figure 5.2** shows the “Hazard to People” rating and direction of flow for the same event.

Within Redbridge, the river valleys of the Roding, Cranbrook and Seven Kinks Water are indicated as important surface water flow pathways. West of the Roding (Woodford Wells, Woodford Green) the relatively steep topography has several well-defined flow pathways leading to the Roding. Modelling indicates that these overland pathways can be obstructed by the railway embankment running north-south. In the flatter parts of the Borough (Ilford, Cranbrook, Seven Kings), flow pathways are generally less well defined, with ponding modelling many of the roads, though generally not to a depth where large numbers of properties would be

internally flooded. Overall, it is important to note that surface water flood risk is not confined to specific areas of the borough – all parts of the borough have some risk of surface water flooding.

Table 5.3 summarises the numbers of properties at risk in each borough, following the Drain London classification of receptors (consequences). Properties where the average flood depth across the building footprint exceeds 0.03m are assessed to be flooded².

| Borough | Property Type | Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification | Total No. of units flooded |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Redbridge | Infrastructure | Essential Infrastructure | 25 |
| | | Highly Vulnerable | 31 |
| | | More Vulnerable | 47 |
| | Households | Non-deprived (not basements) | 10000 |
| | | Non-deprived (basements only) | 231 |
| | | Deprived (not basements) | 1048 |
| | | Deprived (basements only) | 32 |
| | Commercial | Units (not basements) | 1561 |
| | | Units (basements only) | 68 |
| | TOTAL | | |

Table 5.3 Predicted consequences of flooding, 0.5% Annual Rainfall Probability

Figure 5.1 Map showing Surface Water Depth (1 in 200 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year)

Figure 5.2 Map showing Water Flood Hazard Rating (1 in 200 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year)

5.2.2 Increased Potential for Elevated Groundwater Mapping

Background

Large areas within the Greater London area are underlain by permeable substrate and thereby have the potential to store groundwater. Under some circumstances groundwater levels can rise and cause flooding problems in subsurface structures or at the ground surface. The mapping technique described below aims to identify only those areas in which there is the greatest potential for this to happen and in which there is the highest possible confidence in the assessment.

The four data sources listed in **Table 5.1** have been utilised to produce the increased Potential for Elevated Groundwater (iPEG) map. To produce the iPEG map for consolidated aquifers, an area was defined as having increased potential for elevated groundwater levels if at least two of the three mapping techniques listed in **Table 5.1** produced a corresponding area. For the permeable superficial deposits, only Band 1 Very High of the BGS was used as this was judged to best represent the hazard.

The techniques used to generate the iPEG map produced some small areas of increased potential and some dry islands within increased potential areas. These

² This depth threshold was set as the property footprints had already been raised by 0.1m in the model. It was not possible to assume that buildings with a lower depth were “flooded” because all buildings (and all other surfaces) in the model are wetted by rainfall during the model simulation.

have not been cleaned in order to best represent the original data. Further information on the iPEG mapping is available in Appendix D of the SWMP.

How to Use and Interpret the Map

The increased Potential for Elevated Groundwater map shows those areas within the Borough where there is an increased potential for groundwater to rise sufficiently to interact with the ground surface or be within 2 m of the ground surface.

Groundwater may become elevated by a number of means:

- Above average rainfall for a number of months in Chalk outcrop areas;
- Shorter period of above average rainfall in permeable superficial deposits;
- Permeable superficial deposits in hydraulic continuity with high water levels in the river;
- Interruption of groundwater flow paths; and
- Cessation of groundwater abstraction causing groundwater rebound.

With the exception of groundwater rebound which is not covered, the iPEG map will identify those areas most prone to the mechanisms described above. The map shows those areas considered to have the greatest potential for elevated groundwater. Additional areas within the London Boroughs have permeable geology and therefore could also produce elevated groundwater levels. However, to produce a realistic map, only where there is the highest degree of confidence in the assessment are the areas delineated. This ensures resources are focused on the most susceptible areas. In all areas underlain by permeable substrate, groundwater should still be considered in planning developments.

Within the areas delineated, the local rise of groundwater will be heavily controlled by local geological features and artificial influences (e.g. structures or conduits) which cannot currently be represented. This localised nature of groundwater flooding compared with, say, fluvial flooding suggests that interpretation of the map should similarly be different. The map shows the area within which groundwater has the potential to emerge but it is unlikely to emerge uniformly or in sufficient volume to fill the topography to the implied level. Instead, groundwater emerging at the surface may simply runoff to pond in lower areas. The localised nature of groundwater flooding and the different interpretation of the maps required are illustrated in the cartoon in **Figure 5.3**.




Figure 5.3 *Cartoon illustrating the difference between fluvial (top image) and groundwater (bottom image) flood mapping*

For this reason, within iPEG areas, locations shown to be at risk of surface water flooding are also likely to be most at risk of runoff/ponding caused by groundwater flooding. Therefore the iPEG map should not be used as a “flood outline” within which properties at risk can be counted. Rather it is provided, in conjunction with the surface water mapping, to identify those areas where groundwater may emerge and if so what would be the major flow pathways that water would take.

Results

The iPEG mapping is presented in **Figure 5.4**. This indicates that significant areas of the Borough have a potential for elevated groundwater due to the presence of permeable, superficial deposits. The river valleys of the Roding, upper Cran Brook and upper Seven Kings Water are included, as is most of Ilford east of the town centre. Again it must be reiterated that these are not potential flood outlines and therefore this mapping should not be used to count receptors “at-risk”.

Figure 5.4 Map showing areas of increased Potential for Elevated Groundwater

5.3 Impact of Climate Change

5.3.1 The Evidence

There is clear scientific evidence that global climate change is happening now. It cannot be ignored.

Over the past century around the UK we have seen sea level rise and more of our winter rain falling in intense wet spells. Seasonal rainfall is highly variable. It seems to have decreased in summer and increased in winter, although winter amounts changed little in the last 50 years. Some of the changes might reflect natural variation; however the broad trends are in line with projections from climate models.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) levels in the atmosphere are likely to cause higher winter rainfall in future. Past GHG emissions mean some climate change is inevitable in the next 20-30 years. Lower emissions could reduce the amount of climate change further into the future, but changes are still projected at least as far ahead as the 2080s.

We have enough confidence in large scale climate models to say that we must plan for change. There is more uncertainty at a local scale but model results can still help us plan to adapt. For example we understand rain storms may become more intense, even if we can't be sure about exactly where or when. By the 2080s, the latest UK climate projections (UKCP09) are that there could be around three times as many days in winter with heavy rainfall (defined as more than 25mm in a day). It is plausible that the amount of rain in extreme storms (with a 1 in 5 annual chance, or rarer) could increase locally by 40%.

5.3.2 Key Projections for Thames River Basin District

If emissions follow a medium future scenario, UKCP09 projected changes by the 2050s relative to the recent past are:

- Winter precipitation increases of around 15% (very likely to be between 2% and 32%);
- Precipitation on the wettest day in winter up by around 15% (very unlikely to be more than 31%);
- Relative sea level at Sheerness very likely to be up between 10cm and 40cm from 1990 levels (not including extra potential rises from polar ice sheet loss);
- Peak river flows in a typical catchment likely to increase between 8% and 18%.

5.3.3 Implications for Flood Risk

Climate changes can affect local flood risk in several ways. Impacts will depend on local conditions and vulnerability.

Wetter winters and more of this rain falling in wet spells may increase river flooding in both rural and heavily urbanised catchments. More intense rainfall causes more surface runoff, increasing localised flooding and erosion. In turn, this may increase pressure on drains, sewers and water quality. Storm intensity in summer could increase even in drier summers, so we need to be prepared for the unexpected.

Rising sea or river levels may increase local flood risk inland or away from major rivers because of interactions with drains, sewers and smaller watercourses.

There is a risk of flooding from groundwater-bearing chalk and limestone aquifers across the district. Recharge may increase in wetter winters, or decrease in drier summers.

Where appropriate, we need local studies to understand climate impacts in detail, including effects from other factors like land use. Sustainable development and drainage will help us adapt to climate change and manage the risk of damaging floods in future.

5.3.4 Adapting to Change

Past emission means some climate change is inevitable. It is essential we respond by planning ahead. We can prepare by understanding our current and future vulnerability to flooding, developing plans for increased resilience and building the capacity to adapt. Regular review and adherence to these plans is key to achieving long-term, sustainable benefits.

Although the broad climate change picture is clear, we have to make local decisions against deeper uncertainty. We will therefore consider a range of measures and retain flexibility to adapt. This approach, embodied within flood risk appraisal guidance, will help to ensure that we do not increase our vulnerability to flooding.

5.3.5 Local information

The Locally Agreed Surface Water Information described in section 5.2.1 included simulations of the 1% annual rainfall probability for present day and with an additional 30% rainfall to allow for climate change. This uplift is in line with recommendations in PPS25 (based on research by Defra) and was applied as a standard uplift across London by the Drain London programme. A comparison of the results enables an estimation of the potential for increased flood risk due to climate change.

The results for Redbridge show no significant new areas of flood risk due to the increased rainfall as a result of climate change, but the flow pathways and accumulation areas at risk in the present day 1% annual rainfall probability are extended, in many areas leading to flooding of additional receptors and deeper flooding at those receptors also already considered to be impacted in this event.

An assessment of the change in consequences of flooding due to climate change was carried out. The Drain London methodology for identifying whether a property is flooded is to select properties where average depth (within the building footprint) is greater than 0.03m. Results are presented in **Table 5.4**. Overall they indicate a 20% increase in the number of properties flooded due to climate change.

| Property Type | Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification | Total No. of units flooded (1 in 100) | Total No. of units flooded (1 in 100CC) | Percentage change |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Infrastructure | Essential Infrastructure | 25 | 25 | 0% |
| | Highly Vulnerable | 26 | 34 | 31% |
| | More Vulnerable | 40 | 48 | 20% |
| Households | Non-deprived (not basements) | 8669 | 10457 | 21% |
| | Non-deprived (basements only) | 200 | 241 | 21% |
| | Deprived (not basements) | 916 | 1090 | 19% |
| | Deprived (basements only) | 26 | 35 | 35% |
| Commercial | Units (not basements) | 1389 | 1604 | 15% |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| | Units (basements only) | 63 | 70 | 11% |
| TOTAL | | 11354 | 13604 | 20% |

Table 5.4 Predicted changes in flooding consequences due to climate change

There is no locally agreed information on changes to the risk of groundwater flooding due to climate change.

Figure 5.5 Map showing Surface Water Depth (1 in 100 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year plus allowance for climate change)

Figure 5.6 Map showing Water Flood Hazard Rating (1 in 100 chance of rainfall event occurring in any given year plus allowance for climate change)

5.4 Impact of Future Development

5.4.1 Long term developments

It is possible that long term developments might affect the occurrence and significance of flooding. However current planning policy aims to prevent new development from increasing flood risk.

In England, Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) on development and flood risk aims to "ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas at highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible, reducing flood risk overall."

Adherence to Government policy ensures that new development does not increase local flood risk. However, in exceptional circumstances the Local Planning Authority may accept that flood risk can be increased contrary to Government policy, usually because of the wider benefits of a new or proposed major development. Any exceptions would not be expected to increase risk to levels which are "significant" (in terms of the Government's criteria), but should be recorded here so that they can be reviewed in the future.

5.4.2 Local future development

The Core Strategy for Redbridge identifies the following future long term development opportunities in the Borough:

- **Thames Gateway:** the London Plan gives priority (among other areas) to the regeneration of north east London, especially the Thames Gateway. It recognises that the levels of growth in this area will depend upon substantial new and improved infrastructure to stimulate and facilitate investment and that special attention should be paid to long term flood risk.
- **Iford Town Centre:** the London Plan identifies Iford as an Opportunity Area and the Borough's primary area of growth and development opportunity, with the potential for additional housing for 11,000 to 13,000 people. An Iford Town Centre Action Plan has been produced.

- **Strategic Industrial Locations:** Southend Road Business Area and Hainault Business Park have been identified for residential and commercial development as Redbridge's Strategic Industrial Locations.
- **London 2012 Olympics:** the Olympics are anticipated to have significant implications for the pace of regeneration within Redbridge.

Due to the scale of these developments, their impact on flood risk is potentially significant and will therefore need to be managed strategically (rather than on a site-by-site basis).

6 Review of Indicative Flood Risk Areas

6.1 Extent of FRA

The Environment Agency has identified London as one of ten Indicative Flood Risk Areas in England. The methodology applied to select these areas is described in Defra (2010). The Indicative Flood Risk Areas are illustrated in **Figure 6.1** and in more detail in **Figure 6.2**.




Figure 6.1 Environment Agency map of Indicative Flood Risk Areas (plus inset to show London detail)




Figure 6.2 Map showing Indicative Flood Risk Areas in London

Not all parts of the Borough lie within the Indicative Flood Risk Area for London as defined by the Environment Agency. This is due to the screening and clustering method employed, which was carried out nationally by 1km squares. Where these squares are on the edge of a settlement and therefore do not contain many receptors, they did not meet the Flood Risk Thresholds used for the national assessment (number of people > 200 or critical services > 1 or number of non-residential properties > 20). These are reviewed in [Figure 6.3](#), and where appropriate, recommendations made for amendments to the Indicative Flood Risk Area boundary.




Figure 6.3 Areas of Redbridge outside the London Indicative Flood Risk Area

6.2 Review Comments

Table 6.1 summarises the issues identified in reviewing the extent of Indicative Flood Risk Areas for Redbridge.

| Reasons for Change | | Explanation |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Geography | Minor Change to Boundary | Extension to Romford Road boundary to include Romford Road and Hainault Business Park. |
| | Indicative Flood Risk Area Split | Not required as entire borough covered by one flood risk area. |
| | Indicative Flood Risk Area Combined | |
| Past/ Historic Flooding | Indicative Flood Risk Area Expanded | Not required as entire borough covered by one flood risk area. |
| | New Indicative Flood Risk Area | Not required as entire borough covered by one flood risk area. |
| Future Flooding | Indicative Flood Risk Area Expanded | In line with extending the boundary out to Romford Road the presence of Hainault Business Park which is currently outside the indicative flood risk area, reinforces the need for extending the IFRA to cover this piece of critical infrastructure. The locally agreed information on future surface water flooding shows a large ponding area to the north east |
| | New Indicative Flood Risk Area | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | of Hainault Business Park. |
| | Indicative Flood Risk Area Reduced in Size | Not required as entire borough covered by one flood risk area. |
| | Indicative Flood Risk Area Deleted | |

Table 6.1 Summary review of Indicative Flood Risk Areas

7 Identification of Flood Risk Areas

7.1 Amendments to FRA

As identified in **Table 6.1**, it is recommended that one amendment is made to the Greater London Indicative Flood Risk Area to include the following areas within Redbridge:

- Romford Road and Hainault Business Park

Table 7.1 summarises these recommended changes.

| Location | Reason for change | Explanation |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Romford Road / Hainault Business Park | Geography - Minor Change in Boundary | Extend to Romford Road to provide complete coverage of settlement. |

Table 7.1 Summary of recommended amendments to Flood Risk Areas

Amendments to IFRAs must be provided as a polygon consisting of amalgamated Ordnance Survey 1km National Grid squares. Following this method a single amendment area to the London IFRA within Redbridge has been identified. This is shown below in **Figure 7.1**, and a GIS layer is provided in **Annex 5**.




Figure 7.1 Map of amendments Flood Risk Areas

As discussed in section 5.2.1, the flood extents of the locally agreed surface water information for future flood risk are broadly similar to the national FMfSW and

AStSWF maps and therefore do not justify any reductions in size of the Greater London Indicative Flood Risk Area within the Borough.

7.2 New FRA

With the proposed amendments, the entire urbanised area of the Borough will be contained within the Greater London Indicative Flood Risk Area. Therefore no new FRAs are identified.

8**Next Steps****8.1 Scrutiny and Review**

The PFRA review process is an important check that the requirements of the Flood Risk Regulations have been met, and ensures that the right areas (i.e. those with the most significant flood risks) are identified for attention in the next stages.

8.1.1 LLFA review

The purpose of this review is to ensure that the PFRA is fit for purpose in meeting the requirements of the Regulations.

As a change to water management policy, the Designated Flood Risk Manager will take the PFRA to Cabinet for approval.

8.1.2 Environment Agency review

The EA has a duty under the Regulations to review, collate and publish the PFRA to ensure it meets the minimum requirements of the European Commission and to ensure the selection of Flood Risk Areas is appropriate. The local Area review informs the national review which checks that any changes are justified and consistent nationally.

The Review Checklist included as **Annex 4** is used by all LLFAs and EA review teams to ensure a consistent review process is applied.

8.2 Data Collection and Management

Data will be collected in a centralised database, coordinated by the local flood risk lead in the Borough. This will establish a common baseline for flood data and information, in line with Environment Agency requirements. It is anticipated that by setting up a Borough wide 'one-stop-shop' for flood data and information it will enable efficient information consolidation and data sharing. This will be linked to the asset register required under the FWMA.

Existing data will be consolidated and linked to the new data management system, where it is in a suitable format or stored centrally in order to improve access. Historic data within Redbridge is currently fragmented and significant value could be gained through collating existing information.

As a LLFA, Redbridge have a duty to maintain a register of structures or features which are considered to have an effect on flood risk, including details on ownership and condition as a minimum. This register must be available for inspection by the Secretary of State.

8.3 Incident Recording

The Drain London Forum has issued to all Boroughs a standard specification for Flood Incident data reporting, in Excel spreadsheet format. The purpose of this spreadsheet is to provide a template for recording flood incident information in a consistent manner throughout Greater London.

As part of their new responsibilities as Lead Local Flood Authorities, each London Borough is required to monitor flooding within its area and investigate the causes. This Flood Incident Record template aims to provide a key tool in this process by providing a consistent means for recording incident information for future investigation. The fields provided are based upon the Environment Agency standards for flood event data collection, with some minor additions to retain extra related information where it is available.

This spreadsheet can be used as a stand-alone record or can be modified for use on any proprietary GIS platform.

In addition to setting up consistent systems, the Borough will need to define the processes by which a flood incident is reported and investigated.

8.4 Other FRA Requirements

The Flood Risk Regulations require three main types of assessments, maps and plans to be undertaken by LLFAs and approved by the Environment Agency between 2011 and 2015. These are outlined as follows;

- **Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments (this document)** - Completed by Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) and agreed by the Environment Agency by the 22nd December 2011. Flood Risk, Hazard Maps and Local Flood Risk Management Plans will be developed on the basis of identified flood risk areas. Under the Flood and Water Management Act, Surface Water Management Plans are required where there is a risk identified (a SWMP for Redbridge is being produced in parallel with this PFRA).
- **Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps** - The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities are required to produce Hazard and Risk maps for Sea, Main River and Reservoir flooding as well as 'other' relevant sources by 22nd December 2013. Draft maps will be developed as part of the Drain London Programme for all 33 London Boroughs during 2011. Some minor changes/enhancements to these products may be required once formal guidance is published by the Environment Agency.
- **Local Flood Risk Management Plans** - The Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities are required to produce Local Flood Risk Management Plans for Sea, Main River and Reservoir flooding as well as 'other' relevant sources by 22nd December 2015.

References

Association for Geographic Information (2009). *The INSPIRE Directive – A Brief Overview*. Accessed online: http://www.agi.org.uk/storage/inspire/inspire_intro.pdf.

Brown, S.J., Beswick, M., Buonomo, E., Clark, R., Fereday, D., Hollis, D., Jones, R.G., Kennett, E.J., Perry, M., Prior, J. and Scaife, A.A. (2008). Met Office Submission to the Pitt Review - Executive Summary, The extreme rainfall of Summer 2007 and future extreme rainfall in a changing climate. 08/01/2008

Defra (2010). Selecting and reviewing Flood Risk Areas for local sources of flooding: Guidance to Lead Local Flood Authorities. Accessed online: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/flooding/documents/research/flood-risk-method.pdf>.

Defra (2006). Flood and Coastal Defence Appraisal Guidance, FCDPAG3 Economic Appraisal, Supplementary Note to Operating Authorities – Climate Change Impacts. October 2006. <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/flooding/documents/policy/guidance/fcdpag/fcd3climate.pdf>

Environment Agency (2010). Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA): Final Guidance. December 2010. Accessed online: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/125459.aspx>.

Greater London Authority (2011). Drain London Tier 2 Guidance Note: Significant Harmful Consequences of Past Flooding.

JBA Consulting (2006) Flooding from other sources (HA4a) Final Report. Environment Agency.

London Borough of Redbridge (2009) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 and Level 2 Report.

London Borough of Redbridge (2011) Surface Water Management Plan

Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Avery, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.) (2007). Summary for Policymakers. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. 9. Available for download from <http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/ar4-wg1.htm>

Annexes

Annex 1: Past Floods

Annex 1 contains a record of past floods and their significant consequences. Please refer to Annex 1 of the Preliminary Assessment Spreadsheet attached with this report.

Annex 2: Future Floods

Annex 2 contains a record of future flood risk within Redbridge, including details of potential consequences of flooding to key receptors within the Borough. Please refer to Annex 2 of the Preliminary Assessment Spreadsheet attached with this report.

Annex 3: Flood Risk Areas

Annex 3 contains information and details about the identified Flood Risk Areas within Redbridge. Please refer to Annex 3 of the Preliminary Assessment Spreadsheet attached with this report.


Annex 4: Review Checklist

Annex 4 contains the Review Checklist as provided by the Environment Agency to act as a checklist for reviewing PFRA submissions. Please refer to the Review Checklist spreadsheet attached with this report.

Annex 5: GIS layer of Flood Risk Areas

Annex 5 contains a GIS layer of Flood Risk Areas; please refer to the GIS layer attached with this report.

Annex 6: Partnership Structure



This partnership structure is ‘fluid’ and evolving – as the Borough advances into the role of managing local flood risk in this new way, groups and committees may change in format, membership and frequency to reflect new requirements and ways of working, and partners and stakeholders may change. The partnership approach set out in this PFRA will need to be ratified over time and potentially adjusted as appropriate in the future to accommodate these changes, the most relevant and immediate of which will be the effects of changes to the resilience forum laws under GLA.

Designated Flood Risk Manager

The Redbridge Designated Flood Risk Manager acts as the central local level hub of the partnership structure; the role was set up to consolidate the existing flood related groups, meetings and committees across the Borough (e.g. the Redbridge Water Management Group) and partner organisations.

Redbridge are keen to avoid sub-groups and their inevitable duplications and gaps that can weaken the process and lead to ineffective partnership, therefore the Designated Flood Risk Manager is responsible for both the Internal and External Partnership Groups (explained below).

The Designated Flood Risk Manager will chair quarterly meetings of the Internal and External Partnership Groups to agree responsibilities, assign actions and monitor progress relating to local flood risk management. As the overarching lead within the Borough, these two groups are responsible for driving the communication of risk to stakeholders and the public by producing and disseminating literature and

undertaking communication and engagement events and activities as appropriate. Derek Hobday (Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Manager for Redbridge) and Jimmy Maravala (Redbridge Communications and Engagement team lead) will be working together to oversee this element of communicating risk. A communication and engagement programme will be prepared to build on some of the activities currently being undertaken (such as the two-way interviews and surveys that target the most affected residents and aim to raise awareness and gather important local information; and briefing notes that can form the basis of tailored communication materials to suit a range of audiences). The Redbridge Emergency Planning Meetings (which take the role of the Redbridge Borough Resilience Forum) and the Redbridge Water Management Group will feed outputs and knowledge into the Designated Flood Risk Manager.

Internal Partnership Group – includes representatives from Streetcare (e.g. highways and drainage), Development and Building Control (e.g. emergency and spatial planning), Parks, Regeneration, Culture and Leisure, Insurance and Communications. The Internal Partnership Group meets as often as required in addition to the regular quarterly meetings including the External Partnership Group chaired by the Designated Flood Risk Manager. Members of the External Partnership Group (the Environment Agency and Thames Water in particular) are invited to join Internal Group meetings as appropriate, and separate one-to-one meetings with members of the External Group (e.g. riparian owners) may be undertaken by individuals from the Internal Group as appropriate. The Internal Group reports to the Redbridge Highways and Cleansing Senior Management Team which in turn reports to the Cabinet.

External Partnership Group – includes representatives from stakeholder and partner organisations including the Environment Agency, Thames Water, Network Rail, Essex and Suffolk County Councils, Anglian Water, London Transport, Highways Agency, London Fire Brigade and Transport for London. The External Partnership Group meet quarterly under the Redbridge Designated Flood Risk Manager and occasionally additionally attend Internal Group meetings, or separate individual meetings, as requested by Redbridge.

North East Area Flood Group

Led by John Martin (from Redbridge) this group acts as the overarching regional level hub of the partnership structure, combining outputs from Redbridge's Internal and External Partnership Groups and the equivalent local level groups within Havering and Barking & Dagenham. For Emergency Planning purposes the North East Boroughs of Waltham Forest and Newham are also involved. The Group addresses cross boundary issues for the three neighbouring Boroughs and identifies opportunities for working together. Meetings are attended by representatives from Havering, Redbridge, Barking & Dagenham, and are planned to coincide with meetings of the Thames Regional Flood Defence Committee so that appropriate members can be briefed beforehand.

Thames Regional Flood Defence Committee

Regional Flood Defence Committees (RFDCs), of which there are 11 in England, carry out most of the Environment Agency's flood risk management functions under the Water Resources Act 1991, and deal with all land drainage matters and flood defence activities in their areas. The Thames RFDC consists of 23 members, 12 of which are nominated by local authorities in the Thames region, seven members and the Chairman appointed by Defra, and three by the Environment Agency. Councils within the region provide some funding for improvement and maintenance work

through levies, usually to allow local projects to go ahead when they do not meet national funding priorities.

Redbridge Emergency Planning Meetings

All London Boroughs have Borough Resilience Forums to co-ordinate and implement resilience activities on a local level, however they are not all known as such. In Redbridge, the 'Borough Resilience Forum' takes the form of Emergency Planning Meetings. Held six times a year, the meetings are attended by a range of departments including Emergency Planning, Parks, Customer Services, IT, Transport, Environmental Health, Legal, Housing and Community Care. Priorities for emergency planning at a Borough level are fed down from the North East London Local Resilience Forum in the form of a Community Risk Register.

North East London Local Resilience Forum

The North East London Resilience Forum is one of the six London Local Resilience Forums (LRFs) and brings together the London Boroughs of Barking & Dagenham, Havering, Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest. The Forum, which meets quarterly, is responsible for overseeing the local implementation of the policy set by the London Regional Resilience Forum. Tasked with identifying, assessing and managing local risks that could cause an emergency (of which flooding is one), the North East London Resilience Forum informs emergency planning teams within individual Boroughs of emergency planning priorities through Community Risk Registers. As well as local authorities, membership of the North East London Resilience Forum includes representatives from emergency services, government agencies, health, utilities, voluntary organisations, businesses and the military.

London Resilience Partnership

The London Resilience Partnership (the partnership between the Government, the Mayor and all of London's key responding agencies) consists of the London Regional Resilience Forum (of which the London Risk Advisory Group is a sub-group) and the London Resilience Team.

London Regional Resilience Forum - the London Regional Resilience Forum reports to the Government and is composed of senior officials representing the main emergency organisations and key sectors within the partnership. The Forum, which is supported by a number of Panels to allow focus on specific sectors (e.g. business, utilities, voluntary sector, blue lights), is responsible for defining the strategic direction for the London Resilience Partnership.

London Risk Advisory Group – a sub-group of the London Regional Resilience Forum, the London Risk Advisory Group (previously run by London Fire Brigade) is led by Hamish Cameron (London Resilience Manager of the London Resilience Team at the GLA). The Group contains representatives from each of the six Local Resilience Forums, and key resilience and emergency planning organisations and agencies, and is responsible for assessing a range of risks across London (of which flooding is one of the most important) to inform planning priorities. Alan Clark (of Havering) is the representative for the North East London Boroughs.

London Resilience Team - the London Resilience Team was created following the events of 11 September 2001 which suggested that Government and local responders needed to plan for events on a previously unimaginable scale (hence the Team's early focus on terrorism). The Team supports the London Regional Resilience Forum and is responsible for overseeing the work of the London Resilience Partnership. The team operates with a permanent core of civil servants who are supported by specialists seconded from partner organisations. Members

include the Metropolitan Police Service, British Transport Police, City of London Police, London Fire Brigade, London Ambulance Service, National Health Service, Greater London Authority, Transport for London, London Underground, London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) and London Councils.

Drain London Forum

The Drain London programme was set up to help LLFAs meet their responsibilities for managing local flood risk under the Flood Risk Regulations; part of this was done through the Drain London Forum which provided Boroughs with guidance on asset registers, helped to form multi-agency partnerships, and shared good practice, knowledge and expertise. When the Drain London programme finishes, the Boroughs are required to address remaining flood risk problems and continue the partnership working established through the Drain London process; for this reason the Drain London Forum is ongoing and will continue to serve the purpose outlined above.

Redbridge Water Management Group (potentially to be subsumed into the Redbridge Internal Partnership Group under the Designated Flood Risk Manager)

The Redbridge Water Management Group is made up of officers from Planning, Engineering and Emergency Planning, and more recently representatives from the Environment Agency, who discuss a range of issues around the affects of water on planning, day to day drainage and emergency planning. The group, which meets 3 or 4 times a year depending on issues at the time, is led by a Drainage Engineer representing the head of Highways and Engineering Services. In light of recent LLFA responsibilities under FRR requirements, this group now operates as part of the Internal Partnership Group.