



**FCERM Strategy 2050 Water Based Decision Making Working Group**  
**Summary notes**  
**Meeting – 11 July 2018**  
**Birmingham Rep and Library**  
**10:30 – 15:30**

**Ideas for change**

The following table lists all the ideas at the meeting and those that had others had identified through the engagement process before the meeting. Those in bold and italicised were selected by break out groups for more development and in depth discussions. The categories used to group the ideas were identified by the note taker for ease of presentation – these were not discussed at the meeting.

<b>Non-FCERM decision-makers</b>
<b>Ideas identified before the meeting</b>
Water is first consideration and assured and supported by a regional water group. Water is a statutory fundamental consideration and in all planning decisions (water/land/place etc) and is assured so people are held to account. Plus there is a regional 'water' group to advise.
By 2050, managing water as a whole has helped us to grow food and survive in a world of extreme floods and droughts
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<i>Engaging organisations whose priority is not water</i>
<b>All</b> decisions relating to the water environment taken by statutory bodies take account of all impacts on the water environment, including, but not limited to: flooding, water quality, ecology of both the blue and green, water supply, infrastructure need
Facilitate better overall/integrated decisions by stakeholders outside of FCERM – linked to private gain v public good in terms of decisions to develop on flood plain
How do we get agri-community to engage more?
Key decision-makers are developers and commercial and industrial investors. They need to be more involved in FCERM decisions
Persuade society that water is as important as NHS, security, transport etc. It has to be valued by everyone

Entice people we often find difficult to engage but often talk about needing to be involved e.g. insurance, water companies, developers
Ensuring we get all the right individuals in the room when making water based decisions e.g. insurance, developers, water companies, infrastructure. We will learn how best to engage with these organisations, recognising water management may never be a priority for some.
How do we maintain water as a priority when the weather is 'mundane' – not necessarily too wet/dry?
By 2050, water (including flooding) is so embedded in national and local decision making that we have stopped needing these discussions.

<b>Alignment/simplification of strategies, funding and decision-making scales</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
Consistent coherent boundaries for decision making and single point of contact/oversight. Consistent nationwide
Simplify flood risk planning – fewer plans but more focused that have real impact on development and infrastructure design and build
Coincident boundaries for decision-making – too many different political and strategic geographical units
We have too many plans in FCERM. We should simplify them so we have a catchment and coastal cell
Clarity responsibilities - who is responsible for what?
Simple, sensible and meaningful connections between scales of decision making, delivery and management - from local to national
Better connection between local and national e.g. catchment partnerships better linking to national level
<b>Integration across areas and break down silos</b>
<b>Ideas identified before the meeting</b>
Regional overview with integrated (all infrastructure) authority managing catchments as a whole with democratic accountability and community ownership (input)
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b><i>Integrated decision making between flood risk, development, water cycle, natural capital, energy and transport infrastructure etc.</i></b>
Use the 25 YEP to break down silos. We have a national FCERM strategy because legislation requires it – how do we extend the influence to cover Natural Flood Management (NFM) catchment based approaches etc.
National plan for FCERM – (25 YEP useful in breaking down silos) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support land management</li> <li>• Natural Flood Management (NFM)</li> </ul> Catchment based approaches
The 25 year plan has the potential to break down silos so that flood risk is seen as part of a wider environmental approach for sustainable development
Collaborative approach to flood risk and water management – change led by the organisation best placed to do so. To bring benefits for flood risk, environment, economy etc.
Partnership working evolves into integrated working: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catchment committees</li> <li>• Leadership</li> <li>• Integration at Government department level</li> </ul>

Joined up/integrated thinking, working, delivering, funding, planning across (and within) infrastructure sectors.
<b>Integrate water quality and flood risk issues</b>
<b>Ideas identified before the meeting</b>
Working with nature to complement the infrastructure we need. Global scarcity becomes a driver of the value of water and hence drives how we see it
Holistic approach to manage water and raise the profile of the problem -> 'we have a water management problem, not just flood risk'
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b><i>By 2050 the FCERM family will think of itself as a water management family including water resources and water environment</i></b>
Integrate water quality and flood risk strategies/ management
Improve link between water resources and flood risk management – future housing estates to have reservoirs to store water for drought and provide flood storage
All forms of flood risk (and water related infrastructure/habitats) are considered equally with a sound evidence base for decision-making
Surface water flood risk (SWFR) remains the poorer relation. Do we need a stronger strategic overview of SWFR? In London, given high standard of tidal protection, surface water flood risk is the most significant risk. It's hard to fund retrofit solutions under the current funding model.
Need to join up flood risk management with water cycle management in decision making. More role for EA in WRMPs?
<b>Importance of place and place-making</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b><i>Multi-functional places with water at their heart</i></b>
The history of places and of water in places is included/considered at the outset of all decisions (Development, CaBA (Catchment Based Approach) management, Natural Flood Management (NFM), flood defence, SuDS, drainage, resilience)
Barriers to authorities developing place-based plans include lack of money to invest in intangible benefits.
We focus on planning, not the plan
Urban regeneration funds protection of/increased resilience of existing at risk communities
Water at the centre of delivering multifunctional places
Develop water stories to show what good looks like e.g. for water and cities, water and infrastructure, water and energy, and flows and droughts
Work both ways – water integrated in others as well as FRM in for delivering multiple function.
<b>Better integrate water/flood risk into spatial planning to support regeneration, growth and FCERM</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b><i>Achieving resilient/sustainable growth at sub/city regional level</i></b>

<b><i>An increasingly strategic approach to spatial planning across the catchment with water at the heart. By 2050, the spatial planning system is used to identify locations across catchment that need to serve multiple objectives</i></b>
<b><i>How can we be pro-active about water and flood management decisions (into growth, development and infrastructure plans)?</i></b>
In spatial planning, developers are required to provide betterment in relation to on/off site risk [- where evidenced this is required?] and resilience
Spatial Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 2050, the spaces required for flood risk management are understood and protected/enhanced/restored</li> <li>• Short term- evidence for all sources of flood risk and pathways</li> <li>• Land management</li> </ul>
Re-adjust balance between private gain (using planning permission to build on flood plains) and public good (preventing flooding as a consequence)
Planning needs to be more directive – principles and guidance aren't enough
LLFAs need to be embedded in or alongside planning teams
By 2050, the flood family will be (at the heart of) influences for development decisions
Increased strategic integration for flood risk infrastructure from pre-planning stage – consider Government early funding – similar to the creation of Milton Keynes 40 years ago
Responsibility for flood risk and resilience in planning – local plans and planning applications – is clear and development is appropriate. Who is responsible for incident management?
Better pre-planning guidance/advice between LPAs, developers and other RMAs e.g. PADs
Water is the first consideration when anyone plans anything. Flood infrastructure is more highly valued than housing -> development and flood risk management sit side by side. Take account of environment opportunities too.
In 2050, our towns and cities have adopted policies that encourage development away from flood risk areas and re-development of areas at risk over time. Land is utilised to minimise run-off and provide ecosystem services.
Better plan enforcement/policing, to ensure local plans incorporate FCRM planning, compliance with minimum standards etc. gives FCRM plans for bite.
<b>Catchment management, natural capital and natural flood management (NFM)</b>
Ideas identified before the meeting
Managing water as a whole – rural/urban catchments (coast) are resilient to climate change
Agricultural support has shifted to public payment for public goods, leading to more mixed and market responsive industry, where common standards for environmental condition are high and farmers are positively engaged and encouraged to target inputs, restore woodlands and wetlands, and set aside flood storage areas, leading to catchment management flooding.

<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<i>Develop mechanisms for engaging rural communities: land management: payment by results – minimum standards to meet – farming for wildlife/environment, payment for ecosystem services</i>
Single integrated catchment based plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with natural processes</li> <li>• Landscape vision</li> <li>• Community vision</li> </ul>
Integrate local decisions into one CaBA (Catchment Based Approach) framework
Partnership approach to catchment management – multi-stakeholder approach
By 2050, an integrated flood risk, water management, and development plan at a catchment scale, owned by a catchment scale, Natural Capital/Planning committee with a requirement to take account for all development and infrastructure plans.
Apply a natural capital approach to the development of this strategy.
Natural Flood Risk Management can assist but is not <b>THE</b> solution!
Catchment based approach
Make 'OM4s' more inclusive and require comprehensive reporting of <b>all</b> environmental benefits
<b>Proactive approaches to adaptation</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
No more knee-jerk response/short-term responses esp. refunding. 'proactive not reactive'. e.g. 'adaptive windows' (Larissa Naylor) not boxing in and limiting future options for adaptation.
To consider the impacts of our changing climate to ensure we future proof the strategy and associated action plan
Plan for event driven change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural processes result in sudden change</li> </ul> Use these as opportunities to move forward rather than reinstate previous situation
Stop short-term, knee jerk response to funding – 'we've got to build these badly thought out defences like this by XX because otherwise there will be no funding'
Funding for long term maintenance of flood risk infrastructure
<b>Accepting risk and the need for future community relocation in some places</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<i>By 2050 we will have resilient coastal communities that accept they are still at risk but still live there</i>
Accept that some communities will have to be moved where coastal defences are not sustainable because of cost

Water-based decisions where no funding for coastal defence (e.g. raising/repairing)
<b>Community resilience</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b><i>Property level resilience measures become part of basket of measures considered and regulatory requirement of new buildings</i></b>
<b><i>Commit to building mental resilience in at risk communities</i></b>
Kitemark for development E.g. “building with nature” by Glos Wildlife Trust
National campaign from Government (not EA/LLFA) to trigger a change in culture towards property-based resilience and preparedness
All new development must be flood resilient
‘Mental resilience’ is recognised as a key feature of preparedness and response and resource is committed to develop such mental resilience
Building regulations – deliver resilient homes (current extent limited)
Build in water resilience and responsibility to all stages of the planning and development cycle
A regulatory requirement to build property level resilience and preparedness for water and flooding as a component of climate resilience building and retro-fit (existing builds)
<b>Language and communication</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b><i>A water literate society so that everybody is equipped to make the right decisions about the water agenda</i></b>
<b><i>By 2050, we will have a clearer incident response, so that communities and businesses are aware of who is responsible and their responsibilities and applied at the appropriate scale.</i></b>
<b><i>We will be using smart technology to manage water holistically (and technology to inform decision makers/public to communicate flood/coastal risk</i></b>
We will change our language so that FCE risk is better communicated and understood by non FCERM professionals and decision makers
Flooding and water resources throughout curriculum – to promote cultural shift in understanding and expectations and literacy
Flood risk needs to be better understood generally
We change our language so that decision-makers who are not FCERM experts can better understand FCERM issues to inform their decision-making
We have a technological solution that people understand what others are planning to do to manage their risk, not via a plan, but through smart technology

Communities are aware of flood risk and what they can do to address local flood risk – it isn't always negative, destroying, protection-based
Management of political and media expectations on the risks, processes and potential solutions
Need better information for communities about localised flood risk to support existing knowledge on coastal and fluvial flood risk
Engaging with people needs to set the boundaries so that they understand how much influence they have at the start
Integrated water management (sustainability) is a core theme of education/curriculum at all levels of education
A full, detailed flood history available for every location in the UK based on empirical data from gauged, historical and sedimentary evidence being used to reliably and precisely identify flood risk and return periods for planning future development and accessible by public for personal decisions
<b>Evidence-based approach</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<i>Comprehensive evidence-based decision-making bringing in our understanding of the historic environment and how flood risk has been managed over time and with what effects</i>
We separate out evidence around risk or coastal change from what we then do about it
Value and include local knowledge in evidence base/decision and plan making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use local facilitators</li> <li>• Utilise catchment partnerships</li> </ul>
<b>Costs and funding</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<i>Multiple objectives achieved through multiple sources</i>
The full, real costs of flooding are understood – to and by industry, LPAs, RMA, infrastructure providers – area based evidence
Flexibility in funding sources to allow multiple benefits to be achieved as well as people acknowledge agriculture, infrastructure etc.
Funding for FCERM will be more flexible to allow water to be managed holistically by stakeholders who are best placed to deliver functions that benefit flood risk, environment, economy etc.
Make reporting of multiple benefits comprehensive and required
<b>Asset resilience</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<i>Completing the asset management cycle -&gt; towards ISO 55000 for all water management infrastructure</i>



### Key issues highlighted through the discussion

- National Infrastructure Assessment and recommendations to achieve varying standards across the country – some opposing views, important consideration for the strategy (particularly Ambition and Protection working groups)
- Related to this, linkage of Strategy with other national plans and strategies, particularly the 25 Year Environment Plan
- Role of FCERM in mitigating and adapting to climate change
- Spatial planning of key importance in FCERM

### Guiding principles

The suggested guiding principles for the delivery of the strategy were presented to the group

- We put people at the heart of what we do
- We create great places for people and for wildlife
- We continually improve our understanding of risk and solutions
- We trust one another to deliver
- We manage all sources of flooding and coastal change
- We value flexible solutions that adapt to changing risk
- We are carbon-neutral and climate resilient
- We actively grow and support the range of skills we need
- We seek innovative finance solutions to fund resilience

Working together to manage flooding and coastal change

Comments received on these were as follows:

- What do we mean by 'we'? Should it be 'Between us, we . . .'
- First one is very 'EA speak'
- Unlikely to be carbon neutral in our lifetimes. Needs realism – 'we are likely to be . . . or we aim to be . . .'
- 'Flood family' – how can we represent this in a broader water environment family?
- 'Wildlife' should be the 'environment'
- Isn't the overall aim to minimise (or reduce) harm?
- Pleased to see links to knowledge
- No explicit reference to the economy (part of sustainability)
- Use the term 'mitigate' – perception of trying to work towards solving the problem
- Concept of multi-functional – FRM community to ensure resilience, and multi-benefits
- Nothing about reaching out and working with others
- Learn from others' expertise – flood risk/water management oath everyone signs up to
- Finance – why innovative? Just finance
- Exclusive by just talking about 'flood family'
  - How do communities feel part of this?
  - Other industries?

- Talk about all sources of flood risk e.g. sewer flooding
- Impacts on wider society e.g. not being able to work
- Include the term 'community'
- 'Effective' includes being 'efficient'

### Enablers

Minimal discussion

### Summary of evidence gaps/requirements

- International case studies of multifunctional places e.g. Copenhagen
- Commission a review of how the historic environment informs flood risk understanding (lessons, learner, where worked etc.) Historic England keen to progress this but don't have the resource to procure a study during the strategy development timeline.
- Need more evidence on role of spatial planning contributing to and reducing flood risk.
- National Infrastructure Assessment

### Agreed actions:

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>
Draft and circulate detailed meeting note within 2 weeks of the meeting	JBA/EA
Continue to refine ideas for change and submit any additional thoughts by end July	Attendees
Talk to networks about ideas for change and send back by email by end July	Attendees
Provide information on evidence gaps to JBA/EA	Attendees
Next meeting (WebEx) to consider new ideas and refine existing – 13 August	All

### Implications for other working groups

Overlapping ideas:

- Alignment of strategies and funding, integration across areas and water/flood risk, catchment management, better integration with spatial planning – roles and responsibilities working group
- Costs and funding – protection and funding working group
- Community resilience, language and communications – communities and businesses working group

### Items to raise with Ambition Group

- Focus on integration with spatial planning and reinforced importance of working and aligning with stakeholders/agendas/plans and strategies outside FCERM – also important for Advisory Group
- National Infrastructure Assessment and views on recommendations

### Suggested Action points (i.e. those that may feed into the Strategy)

Nothing specific outside of the suggested ideas

### Questions asked (to feed into FAQs)

How have stakeholders outside of the FCERM industry ('usual suspects') been involved

### Legislative/policy points raised to share with Defra

Proposals to amend partnership funding policy

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Monday 13 August - WebEx**