

**Local Flood Risk Management Strategy  
for Hertfordshire**

**Strategic Environmental Assessment  
Environmental Report -  
Annex D: Consultation Responses**

**Prepared June 2012**



**Produced by Place Services on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council**

The information contained in this document can be made available in alternative formats: large print, braille, audio tape or on disk. We can also translate this document into other languages.

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	Consultations .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Consultation Responses .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Draft Scoping Report.....	2
2.2	Issues and Option Consultation of the LFRMS and SEA .....	5
2.3	Consultation on the Draft LFRMS and SEA Environmental Report .....	7

This page has been left blank intentionally

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Background**

In July 2011 Hertfordshire County Council commissioned Essex County Council's Strategic Environmental Assessment Team, now part of Place Services, to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the proposed Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (hereafter referred to as LFRMS) for Hertfordshire. Place Services continues to act as consultants for this work; therefore the content of the Strategic Environmental Assessment should not be interpreted or otherwise represented as the formal view of Essex County Council.

This document is Annex D to the Environmental Report of the draft LFRMS. It sets out the responses received during previous consultations in the SEA process and our responses.

## **1.2 Consultations**

This document is a compilation of all the responses received during the consultation on the draft Scoping Report, and all the responses regarding the Issues and Options Consultation of the LFRMS and accompanying SEA Working Note.

## 2 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### 2.1 Draft Scoping Report

A draft copy of the Scoping Report was published for a 5-week consultation period, in accordance with the SEA Directive during the later part of 2011. The consultation sought the views of the three statutory consultation bodies with environmental responsibilities (the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage) on the scope and level of detail. The draft report was also published on the Hertfordshire County Council website over the consultation period to enable wider consultation.

All three statutory consultees responded. No additional responses were received. Table 1 outlines the consultation responses received and the action taken in response to these.

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND ACTION TAKEN**

<b>Consultee Name: English Heritage</b>	
<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>Response &amp; Action Taken</b>
We note that in section 1.20 (Landscapes) [sic] of the main document, historic landscapes are not included in the definitions. Historic landscape issues are also absent from section 1.15 [sic]. I would suggest that historic landscapes themselves should be included in section 1.15 [sic], along with the other assets.	Noted - Section 4.7 Cultural Heritage in the main Scoping Report now makes reference to historic landscapes. Further information is supplied in Annex B: Baseline Information
Section 1.15 [sic] we welcome the section on archaeological finds in the HER. We would also like to suggest that a reference is made here to the fact that many historic assets are undesignated and that they should be given equal consideration to designated assets.	The following sentence has been inserted into Section 4.7 Cultural Heritage – “It must also be recognised that many historic assets are undesignated and that they should be given equal consideration to designated assets”.
In Table 5, objective 7 would be better worded as, 'To maintain and/or enhance the character of townscapes and historic landscapes, cultural heritage and designated and undesignated heritage assets within Hertfordshire.'	The original text for Objective 7 has been replaced with that suggested.
In section 8 of the baseline Annex, we welcome the acknowledgement of the importance of unknown heritage assets, but would like historic landscapes to be included in this section. Furthermore, in this section and in section 1.15 [sic] of the main document, we would like to see the term 'heritage asset' being used in favour of 'historic landscape'. Historic landscape tends to confer a	A description of 'historic landscapes' and the 'Historic Landscape Characterisation' project now forms Section 8.1 of Annex B: Baseline Information.  The term 'historic landscape'

more specific meeting, e.g historic grazing marshes, or salt-working areas.	has been replaced by 'heritage asset' in Section 4.7 Cultural Heritage in the main Scoping Report
<b>Consultee Name: Environment Agency</b>	
<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>Response &amp; Action Taken</b>
<p>The Environment Agency suggested the following documents be added to the list of Plans and Programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wheathampsted Modelling Study, 2008</li> <li>- Hertford pre-feasibility study, 2009</li> <li>- Lower Lee Flood Risk Management Strategy (update)</li> <li>- Catchment Flood Management Plan Policy Units – covering the Upper, Middle and Lower Lee, and the Stort.</li> <li>- On-going Surface Management Plans for Watford and St Albans</li> <li>- Mining Waste Directive</li> <li>- Environmental Permitting Regulations</li> <li>- Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3)</li> </ul>	<p>Established good practice is to recognise that no list of plans and programmes can be exhaustive. Nonetheless the Mining Waste Directive 2006, Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 and Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) have been added to Annex A: Plans and Programmes and the list of plans and programmes provided in the Scoping Report. Given the absence of a spatial component to the high level strategic Local Flood Risk Management Issues and Options document, it is not considered appropriate to add additional local level documents to the Plans and Programmes Annex at this stage.</p>
<p>Table 5: The strategic environmental Assessment Objectives. Point 6 – We believe that this should have a social indicator. Green spaces have been shown to improve peoples general health and mental state of mind.</p>	<p>Agreed. Table 5 has been amended to reflect that Objective 6 has a social component. Additional modifications have also been made to Table 6 to also reflect this.</p>
<p>Agree that SEA objectives cover all areas of interest without repeating each other.</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>
<p>The baseline information with Chapter 1.9 [sic], and tables 3 and 4, is predominantly related to fluvial flood risk, although we recognise that this is the source of the flood risk with the greatest amount of information held about it. You may wish to consider incorporating some of the surface water data from your Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment: for example the number of properties at risk per borough</p>	<p>Table 3 and Table 4 have been updated to include headlines relating to surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding. The number of properties at risk of flooding in Hertfordshire, by borough, was included as Section 2.5 of Annex B: Baseline Information.</p>

River Stout should be River Stort (p16)	Corrected.
Reservoirs are not abstraction sources. Reservoirs are part of a water company infrastructure. Reservoirs will be supplied with water from river and/or groundwater sources.	Passage in the Scoping Report and Annex B read "Water resources are extracted from major rivers, reservoirs and a large number of groundwater sources". No reference was made to abstraction sources in the referred passage. No changes made.
Hertfordshire falls within 3 main CAMS areas i) Upper Lee CAMS, ii) Colne CAMS and iii) Upper and Bedford Ouse rather than 2 stated in the document (p17).	Section 4.2 in the main Scoping Report and Sections 3.4 and 3.7 in Annex B: Baseline Information corrected to state there are two River Basin Districts covering Hertfordshire. A 'River Catchment and County Boundaries' map supplied by the Environment Agency shows there are five catchment areas within Hertfordshire, namely Cam and Ely Ouse, London, Upper Lee, Colne and Upper and Bedford Ouse. This map has been inserted into Annex B: Baseline Information as Figure 10.
Update rainfall data and other water resource statistics can be obtained from our website. We produce monthly water situation reports which can be found at <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/127606.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/127606.aspx</a>	Noted. The passage in question was highlighting the reason behind groundwater levels in Hertfordshire being higher than average in 2010. The presence of monthly water situation reports is noted but is considered to be outside of the scope of what is intended to be a high-level long term strategic document.
No link has been made between how increased water efficiency will contribute towards less water needing to be abstracted and/or treated at STW before being discharged back into our rivers and stream.	This link has been made in Section 4.2, Table 3 and Table 4 of the main Scoping Report and Section 3.6 and 3.7 of Annex B: Baseline Information.
Flood events do not significantly effect GW flow /	Reference removed.



transport of contaminants. (p17)	
The backfilling of sites like gravel works with inert material / waste can lead to a decrease in ground permeability and a possible increase in flood risk. (p26)	Accepted. This statement has been inserted into Section 4.8.1
<b>Consultee Name: Natural England</b>	
<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>Response &amp; Action Taken</b>
Q1 – Are there any additional relevant plans and policies beyond those covered that you think are relevant to this assessment? A1 – Natural England is not currently aware of any.	No action necessary.
Q2 – Do you think that the SEA objectives are appropriate? A – Yes.	No action necessary.
Q3 – Do the objectives cover all the areas of interest without repeating each other? A 3– Yes.	No action necessary.
Q4 – Do you or your organisation have information that you feel would add to the assessment of the objectives or increase the robustness of the baseline data? A – No.	No action necessary.

## 2.2 Issues and Option Consultation of the LFRMS and SEA

Consultation on the Issues and Options LFRMS and the accompanying SEA working note ran from 17 October to 2 December 2011. Documents were made available on Hertfordshire County Council's website for public consultation during this period.

There were 25 representations made following the consultation, of which only a few refer to the SEA. The comments were filed under the specific questions posed and do not identify the consultee. Those comments relating to SEA have been reviewed and compiled into Table 2 below along with our responses.

**TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND ACTION TAKEN**

<b>Question 2 - Understanding flood risk</b>	
<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>Response &amp; Action Taken</b>
Although most of the watercourses within the Park in Hertfordshire are designated 'Main Rivers' and fall under the remit of the Environment Agency, there is still a need to understand the interactions between the Main Rivers and the ordinary watercourses, surface water and ground water in order to manage local flood risk. For	Noted

<p>example surface water drainage can be impacted if there is a rise in the level of the 'Main River' reducing its capacity to cope with increased surface water. The Lee Valley is a complicated and interconnected hydrological system; measures introduced to reduce or manage flood risk for one aspect of the system could impact (negatively or positively) on other aspects. The assessment of 'Climatic Factors' in the SEA (page 19) includes the following "it can be stated that wetter winters, and an increase in precipitation falling during wet spells, may increase river flooding in both rural and heavily urbanised catchments."</p>	
<p>The issue and options presented under '3.3.2 Understanding Flood Risk' and '3.3.3 Collection of Flooding Data' should include an analysis of the interactions between local flood sources and the Main Rivers.</p> <p>Also of relevance to the Regional Park and the Park Authority as a land manager and leisure operator is the need to understand the management of flood risk in terms of its impact on matters such as biodiversity, water resources, cultural heritage, the economy (in relation to the leisure industry), landscape, health and quality of life. The SEA Scoping report provides a useful overview of these matters and the Authority would wish to see these taken forward into the next stage of the LFRMS.</p>	Noted
<b>Question 8 - Sustainability</b>	
<b>Comments Received</b>	<b>Response &amp; Action Taken</b>
<p>There are wide ranging sustainability issues that should be taken into consideration in light of the approach suggested above and these should link back to the Sustainability Objectives set out in the SEA scoping report (or whatever the finalised objectives are). However, in the context of 'effective flood risk management' one area of sustainability that should form part of any LFRMS or flood reduction scheme should be climate change (both mitigation and adaptation). Adaptation appears to be fairly well covered in the consultation document. However, as set out in the consultation document, there is a dynamic relationship between climate change and flood risk therefore to effectively manage flood risk. Therefore, any response should also look to mitigate the cause of climate change which in the long term may result in a lower flood risk within the County.</p>	Noted

## **2.3 Consultation on the Draft LFRMS and SEA Environmental Report**

Consultation on the draft LRFMS will run from Monday 18 June to Friday 7 September 2012. Comments received during this consultation period regarding the Environmental Report and the draft LFRMS will help inform the next stage of the SEA process.