



Winteringham Ings to South Ferriby Flood Alleviation Scheme

Statement of Community Involvement

Version C01, November 2018



We are the Environment Agency. We protect and improve the environment and make it a better place for people and wildlife.

We operate at the place where environmental change has its greatest impact on people's lives. We reduce the risks to people and properties from flooding; make sure there is enough water for people and wildlife; protect and improve air, land and water quality and apply the environmental standards within which industry can operate.

Acting to reduce climate change and helping people and wildlife adapt to its consequences are at the heart of all that we do.

We cannot do this alone. We work closely with a wide range of partners including government, business, local authorities, other agencies, civil society groups and the communities we serve.

Quality Assurance

Project name	Humber South Bank Appraisals Package: Winteringham Ings to South Ferriby Flood Alleviation Scheme
Project 1B1S reference	IMAN002289-CH2-00-300-RP-PL-0003
Date	20/11/18
Version number	C01
Author	Ramona Kayindu, Martin White

Approvals

Name	Signature	Title	Date	Version
Martin White	MJW	Divisional Director	20/11/18	P01
Tim Hammond	TH	Divisional Director	20/11/18	P01
Jamie Ferguson		Project Manager	21/11/18	C01

Executive summary

The purpose of this report is to demonstrate the extensive consultation and engagement that has taken place since 2015. It demonstrates that all affected parts of the community have been listened to in preparing the Scheme for planning.

Contents

Winteringham Ings to South Ferriby Flood Alleviation Scheme	i
Statement of Community Involvement	i
Executive summary	iii
Contents	iv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 The Scheme	1
1.3 Need for the Proposed Scheme	1
1.4 Purpose of this Statement of Community Involvement	1
2 Pre-Application Consultation	2
2.1 Background	2
2.2 Who we have consulted	2
2.3 Methods of Engagement	3
2.4 Schedule of Engagement	4
3 Analysis of Feedback from Community Event	9
3.1 Community Event	9
3.2 Feedback from Question 1	9
3.3 Feedback from Question 2	10
3.4 Feedback from Question 3	11
4 Response to Feedback	12
References	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is submitted as part of the planning application for a Flood Alleviation Scheme between Winteringham Ings and South Ferriby.

1.2 The Scheme

The Scheme is for the erection of a new flood defence alignment on the south bank of the Humber Estuary between Winteringham Ings and South Ferriby in North Lincolnshire. This is to provide an improved level of flood protection for residential properties, agricultural land, farms and the CEMEX cement plant from tidal flooding.

1.3 Need for the Proposed Scheme

The need for the Scheme is because the existing flood defence alignment is forecast to breach in the future due to coastal erosion. In 2013, following a tidal surge, 129 properties were inundated along with the Cemex cement plant, A1077 highway, poultry farms, utilities and over 1,000 ha of agricultural land were also flooded.

The implementation of the Scheme will improve flood protection for residential 150 properties as well as Cemex.

1.4 Purpose of this Statement of Community Involvement

The requirement for a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is set out in Part 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The aim of this SCI is to set out how the public, stakeholders and other interested parties have been involved in the preparation of this planning application.

This SCI has been prepared in line with North Lincolnshire Council's (NLC) SCI which was adopted in July 2010. This is where the council encourages developers to undertake community involvement for planning applications where NLC considers they are likely to have a significant impact on the local community.

2 Pre-Application Consultation

2.1 Background

The North Lincolnshire Council SCI states this document is required for planning applications for non-residential development if the total site area is in excess of 5 ha. As the Scheme is approximately 39 hectares within a rural area it meets this threshold.

Figure 1: Extract from North Lincolnshire Council Statement of Community Involvement

Table 3: Two Tier Thresholds for Significant Applications for Community Involvement		
	Scunthorpe & Bottesford Urban Area	Rural areas of North Lincolnshire
Residential Development	50 dwellings, or 1.5 hectares	10 dwellings, or 0.5 hectares
Non-residential development	5 hectares, or 10,000 sq. metres gross floor space	1 hectare, or 1,000 sq. metres gross floor space

2.2 Who we have consulted

Prior to consultation, the Environment Agency identified all the stakeholders who would need to be consulted and the type of consultation which would be undertaken. There were three levels of consultees:

- Partners (1),
- Involve (2) and
- Inform (3).

Below is a complete list of all external stakeholders who have been consulted in the preparation of this planning application.

Table 1: List of Key Stakeholders

Consultee Level	Stakeholder
1	Landowners
1	Cemex, Environmental Manager
1	North Lincolnshire Council Officers
1	Natural England
1	Andrew Percy MP
1	Cllr Ron Allcock
2	RFCC
2	Local residents – South Ferriby/ Winteringham
2	Humber LEP

Consultee Level	Stakeholder
2	South Ferriby Parish Council
2	Winteringham Parish Council
2	Council Leader South Ferriby Ward Councillors
2	Tenants
2	Historic England
2	MMO
2	RSPB
2	Winteringham Ward Councillors
2	Lincs Wildlife Trust
2	Humber Nature Partnership
3	Humber LRF
3	The Hope & Anchor pub
3	Users of A1077
3	Ancholme Drainage Group
3	South Ferriby Primary School
3	Ramblers
3	NFU
3	ABP
3	Ancholme Heritage Trust
3	Ancholme Rivers Trust
3	Winteringham Sailing Club
3	Birdwatchers
3	South Ferriby Marina Ltd
3	Network Rail
3	National Grid
3	Media

2.3 Methods of Engagement

The following engagement methods have been used and will continue to be used throughout the application and construction process:

Table 2: Methods of Engagement

Consultee Level	Method of Consultation
1	Letters / face-to-face meetings / Email or phone updates / partner workshop
2	Stakeholder meetings / newsletters / email or phone updates / community events
3	Newsletter / email updates / community events / Press releases

2.4 Schedule of Engagement

The table below provides a full list of when consultation has taken place and with whom.

Table 3: Schedule of Engagement Undertaken.

Action	Activity	When	Who	Completed?
Pre-planning preparation – Summer / Autumn 2018				
Contact affected Landowners	Address environmental mitigation measures	Nov 2018	NL/PG	Ongoing
Meet IDB	Liaison regarding building over Fulseas Drain.	30 th October 2018	Project Team	Yes
South Ferriby Parish Council	Community event to advise on scheme, programme and impacts	October 2018	KK	Yes
Meet NLC	Highways and Traffic	18 th October 2018	Project team	Yes
Visit community and affected parties near Hope and Anchor	Pre-planning engagement including alignment detail.	12 th October 2018	KK/PG	Yes
Meet NLC	Flood Risk Assessment	4 th September 2018	Project Team	Yes
Meeting to address Heritage Impacts	Historic England and NLC to address heritage impacts.	6 th August 2018	Project Team	Yes
Meet NLC	Highways and Traffic meeting	30 th July 2018	Project Team	Yes
Community Engagement	Drop in session to share revised	10 th July 2018	Project Team	Yes

Action	Activity	When	Who	Completed?
Event	alignment with community			
Meet NLC	Project update to address change in alignment	6 th July 2018	NL/KK	Yes
Meet IDB	Address impacts of revised alignment on IDB assets.	5 th July 2018	NL / KK	Yes
Visit Community / affected parties /Landowners	Series of meeting with individual owners and tenants to explain reason for change in alignment.	3&4 th July 2018	NL/KK/PG	Yes
Contact Community / affected parties	Arrange access for Environmental surveys	April – Sept 2018	Project team	Yes
Outline Business Case - January 2018				
RFCC	Update RFCC	14 July 2017		Yes
Update Andrew Percy MP	Update post General Election	July 2017	MD/ Project Team	Yes
Organise a community event	Inform community of preferred option	July 2017	Project Team	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	Humber newsletter – community event outcome	May 2017	Project Team	Yes
Organise discussions with landowners	Follow up face to face meetings – discuss likely preferred option in more detail	July 2017	KK/AG	Yes
RFCC	Update RFCC	28 April 2017	KK	Yes
Liaison group meeting	Project liaison group meeting – update on project	April 2017	KK	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	Humber newsletter – community event outcome	February 2017	Project team to feed into Humber comms	Yes
Organise a	Bring community	February	Project	Yes

Action	Activity	When	Who	Completed?
community event	up-to-speed about scheme, range of options	2017	team	
Send update to landowners	Provide project update and inform about community event	February 2017	KK/AG	Yes
RFCC	Update RFCC	20 Jan 2017	KK	Yes
Liaison group meeting	Project liaison group meeting – update on project	Jan 2017	KK	Yes
Update Andrew Percy MP	Humber MPs meeting	December 2016	PW	Yes
Organise face to face meetings with landowners	Discussions with landowners re potential habitat creations	Nov/Dec 2016	KK/AG	Yes
Liaison group meeting	Project liaison group meeting – update on project	November 2016?	KK	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	Humber newsletter – bird counts/surveys/site invests	November 2016	GW / Humber comms	Yes
Schedule one-one follow up partner meetings	Partner meetings – understand their objectives	Oct/Nov 2016	KK	Yes
Organise partner workshop	Partner workshop – intro to project and long list	End October 2016	KK	Yes
RFCC	Update RFCC	21 October 2016	KK	Yes
Follow up with parish council and landowners	Inform of surveys successful completion	October 2016	KK	Yes
Environmental surveys – September 2016				
Contact landowners where possible	Inform of Environmental Surveys	Early September	Kamen Kalchev	Yes
Send out letters parish councils	Inform of Environmental Surveys	Early September	Kamen Kalchev	Yes

Action	Activity	When	Who	Completed?
Send newsletter out to contacts	Humber newsletter	July 2016	Gemma Ward	Yes
Liaison group meeting	Project liaison group meeting – update on project	July 2016	Kamen Kalchev	Yes
RFCC	Humber information paper updates on scheme	15 July 2016	Gemma Ward	Yes
Meeting with Humber MPs	Update Andrew Percy on project latest	27 April 2016	Mike Dugher/ Phillip Winn	Yes
Liaison group meeting	Project liaison group meeting – update on project	April 2016	Kamen Kalchev	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	Humber newsletter	March 2016	Gemma Ward	Yes
Update community	Parish council communication	Dec 2015	-	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	Humber newsletter	Dec 2015	Gemma Ward	Yes
Liaison group meeting	Project liaison group meeting – update on project	Nov 2015	Mark Adams/ Kamen Kalchev	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	South Humber bank newsletter	Sept 2015	Gemma Ward	Yes
Surveys happening onsite – inform landowners/parish council	Ecological/mammal surveys	July/August	Mark Adams/ Gemma Ward	Yes
Feedback/update to members	RFCC meeting	31 July 2015	Gemma Ward	Yes
Send out update to parish councils/MP/Cllrs	Draft update	28 July 2015	Gemma Ward/ Mark Adams	Yes
Check outcome	Phil Younge telecon with Andrew Percy MP	13 July 2015	Gemma Ward	Yes
Update on funding - MP/Cllr Liz Redfern/Parish Council	South Ferriby update meeting	10 July 2015	Mark Adams	Yes

Action	Activity	When	Who	Completed?
Discuss contributions and project next steps	CEMEX/NLC meeting	3 July 2015	Mark Adams	Yes
Send newsletter out to contacts	South Humber bank newsletter	June 2015	Gemma Ward	Yes

3 Analysis of Feedback from Community Event

3.1 Community Event

A third local community event was held on 10th July 2018 where our Environment Agency representatives were in attendance. Feedback forms were distributed and filled in by members of the public. Thirty three responses were received.

The feedback form contained three sections, each with a question or statement requesting respondents to express their opinions and queries about the scheme. The questions/statements were as follows:

1. In light of the new erosion information, what are your thoughts on the proposal to build a new flood defence?
2. Please use space below to share any comments you would like the project team to consider.
3. Anything else you would like to know/see about the scheme at future community events?

3.2 Feedback from Question 1

In the feedback forms, there was an inconsistent response rate to sections 2 and 3. As such, section 1 was the only section that was filled in by all respondents while a total of twenty five responded to section 2 and nineteen responded to section 3. Fifteen respondents replied to all three sections whilst the remainder only replied to 1 or 2 sections.

In section 1, respondents were asked to express their opinion on the scheme in relation to the information they were given at the community event. The majority of the responses were positive and supportive of the scheme, but some concerns were raised, some of which were combined with the positive feedback. The most recurrent concerns were as follows:

- Funding and/or commencement of works (eight out of thirty three).
- Proximity of the new defence to properties (three out of thirty three).
- If it will work in practice (six out of thirty three).
- If work on the existing bank can be undertaken instead (two out of thirty three).

A few of the respondents expressed more specific and detailed concerns than the above. Some of these concerns also included suggestions and were as follows:

- Concern that the erosion near the Village Hall will eventually breach if left as is.
- If, in the event of funds being insufficient, the Scheme will be cut back or partly completed.
- Concern that the new defences leave a large part of the northern village open to erosion – suggestion that a substantial wall reinforced with stone is

built to slow the southern movement of the river, reduce speed of erosion and protect the northern village.

- Request to be able to walk along the existing bank until it disappears.
- Proposed traffic signage locations.

3.3 Feedback from Question 2

Considering the nature of the statement in section 2, respondents were given a chance to provide feedback on what the project team should take into consideration. Here, 25 respondents took the opportunity to raise concerns and queries. The most recurrent ones were as follows:

- For the new bank to be as straight as possible (two out of twenty five).
- To consider impact on home insurance (four out of twenty five).
- Unprotected properties, namely the pub, houses and the electricity substation on St Andrew Road (two out of twenty five).
- For works to commence as soon as possible (three out of twenty five)
- Regular updates (two out of twenty five).
- To minimise nuisance from construction and the new defence (two out of twenty five).

Outside the more generic responses above, more respondents gave detailed and specific answers compared to section 1, some of which were combined with the aforementioned generic comments. These were as follows:

- Request that the EA considers using on site material to create new habitat for birds and to consider the drainage on the south side of the new bank.
- Request that the EA considers that in the event of the existing bank becoming unsafe the right of way access reverts to the new bank top.
- Request that communication around the potential erosion to areas close to residential property be kept to a minimum as it will heighten nervousness and anxiety.
- Concern that the new scheme would cause a decrease in the value of their house and whether any compensation would be given.
- For the existing bank to be maintained as long as possible.
- Request that it is made sure the access is closed when barriers are installed.
- Question of source of funding and whose responsibility it will be to close barriers at Sluice when necessary.
- Whether local labour will be used rather than contractors.
- Concern that if the bank is left in its present state with additional earth bank then erosion will continue and thus both erosion and flooding need to be addressed.
- Request that a proper warning ensues in the likelihood of flooding.

- Recognition that the path near the pub appears to be a problem but the bank should come first.
- Request that dredging on a regular basis is tried, to go with the barriers.
- Request that the project team considers easy access to the Humber bank across the field on the permitted foot path.

3.4 Feedback from Question 3

Section 3 provided respondents the opportunity to request any further information they'd like to receive in future community events. 19 responded to this section and the most recurrent requests were as follows:

- Detailed schedule of works (three out of nineteen)
- Any updates (eight out of nineteen)
- No further comments (two out of nineteen)

The above gives a total of thirteen generic comments out of nineteen which were all standalone comments. As such, the remaining 6 respondents gave specific requests and comments which were as follows:

- Question whether the area between the road and the new defences will be left 'wild' or redeveloped into a useable park/leisure space.
- Preference of no more community events and for the job to get started ASAP.
- Disappointed over lack of information and to have never been approached with a questionnaire in past 5 years.
- Question whether there will be any road disruption.
- Under the impression that the government had already made funds available.
- Question about how residents will be notified when the barriers are in place.

4 Response to Feedback

The table below summarises:

1. The key issues that have been raised both through the public consultation event and through other stakeholder engagement; and
2. How our project team have sought to address any concerns in putting forward the Scheme for planning.

Table 3: Response to Feedback from Community Even Number 3, July 2018

Key Issue	Response
Can't you just stop the erosion and keep the bank where it is?	We have looked at this option. We estimate it will cost more than £25 million to slow down the effects of erosion, in addition to the cost of Option 4, circa £10million. In total this makes £35 million, which could not be justified by the economic benefits.
Is the Scheme Funded?	The funding for the project will not be confirmed until the Full Business case has been approved. This is expected to take place early in 2019.
When will work begin and how long will it take before it is operational?	It is expected that the works will commence in the Spring of 2019 and be complete by the Spring of 2021.
When will the existing defences breach?	Current modelling predicts this could happen within three years but it is difficult to forecast this.
Why was significance of the erosion risk not identified sooner?	Foreshore erosion and foreshore gain are natural processes. The impact of natural processes in the Humber was considered in the Outline Business Case prepared in autumn 2017, and there was provision for set-back of a new bank east of the IDB pumping station. An increased rate of erosion in the winter of 2018 required consideration of a more sustainable bank alignment.
How has the alignment been decided?	The alignment has been decided through balancing a number of factors including predicted erosion rates, discussions with landowners, engineering and environmental constraints, ensuring maximum flood protection and funding considerations.
When will the road be closed and how often?	The road will be closed once a year to allow for a practice for a real flood event. This is necessary as the demountable defences must be installed correctly. Beyond that, the road will only be closed if flood warnings indicate an exceptional tide. The outline procedures for closing the road and the circumstances for when it will be closed are contained in the Operational Traffic Management Plan (document refence IMAN002289-CH2-00-300-RP-PL-0002).

Key Issue	Response
	<p>Unfortunately, it is not possible to avoid closing the A1077 during construction and the worse case is this could be closed for a total of 30 weeks, in tranches of 12 weeks, 11 week and 7 weeks. This is whilst works around the Ferriby Sluice and the East Drain are completed. During this time the full diversion will be in place.</p>
<p>What will happen to the existing footpath and will a footpath be provided on the new embankment.</p>	<p>Access to the existing permissive footpath will be maintained until such time that this path is unsafe for public access.</p> <p>A new public footpath has been considered but the new embankment is nearer to residential properties and passes through some private gardens. A new footpath is not proposed as it would be detrimental to the amenity of these properties.</p>
<p>Why does the new defence go around the pond? Can the pond be filled in?</p>	<p>Geotechnical Investigations have been carried out which determined that going across the pond would be technically difficult.</p>
<p>How will construction impacts be managed?</p>	<p>Our contractor will implement a Construction Environmental Action Plan (CEMP) throughout construction works to minimise noise, dust and other disruption. The contractor will keep local residents informed, for example through updates at the parish council meetings, public notices and leaflet drops.</p> <p>Temporary traffic management measures, including potential road closures, will be required to enable construction works, particularly around the Ferriby Sluice.</p> <p>Temporary footpath diversions will also be required to protect safety during construction.</p>
<p>What about the wider environment?</p>	<p>The Scheme includes enhancement to the wider environment, in particular through a landscape and ecology plan.</p>

**Would you like to find out more about us,
or about your environment?**

Then call us on

03708 506 506 (Mon-Fri 8-6)

Calls to 03 numbers cost the same as calls to standard geographic numbers
(i.e. numbers beginning with 01 or 02).

email

enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk

or visit our website

www.environment-agency.gov.uk

incident hotline 0800 80 70 60 (24hrs)

floodline 0845 988 1188



Environment first: Are you viewing this on screen? Please consider the environment and only print if absolutely necessary. If you are reading a paper copy, please don't forget to reuse and recycle if possible.