



## Planning and Byelaw Strategy

Last Updated: February 2020

Next Scheduled Review Date: April 2024\*

*\* Unless revisions to Government legislation or guidance require modifications of the document ahead of April 2024 in order for the Board's to be legally compliant.*



Cert No. GB11990

### **MEMBER INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARDS**

Broads (2006) IDB, East Suffolk IDB, King's Lynn IDB,

Norfolk Rivers IDB, South Holland IDB



Cert No. GB11991

---

**DEFENDERS OF THE LOWLAND ENVIRONMENT**

## Abbreviations

Abbreviations used in this document are set out below:

<b>BRE</b>	Building Research Establishment
<b>DEFRA</b>	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency
<b>FCERM</b>	Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management
<b>FRA</b>	Flood Risk Assessment
<b>FRMP</b>	Flood Risk Management Plan
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information System
<b>ha</b>	Hectares
<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulations Assessment
<b>IDB</b>	Internal Drainage Board
<b>IDD</b>	Internal Drainage District
<b>LDA</b>	Land Drainage Act 1991
<b>LFRRMS</b>	Local Flood Risk Management Strategy
<b>LGO</b>	Local Government Ombudsman
<b>LLFA</b>	Lead Local Flood Authority
<b>LPA</b>	Local Planning Authority
<b>MAFF</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
<b>NCC</b>	Norfolk County Council
<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>NRA</b>	National Rivers Authority
<b>PPG</b>	Planning Practice Guidance
<b>RoFSW</b>	Risk of Flooding from Surface Water
<b>RMA</b>	Risk Management Authority
<b>SFRA</b>	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
<b>SI</b>	Statutory Instrument
<b>SMO</b>	Standard Maintenance Operations
<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>SuDS</b>	Sustainable Drainage Systems
<b>WCS</b>	Water Cycle Studies
<b>WMA</b>	Water Management Alliance

<b>Section 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 2: Background .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Internal Drainage Boards .....	5
2.2. The Water Management Alliance .....	5
2.3. Further Information .....	5
<b>Section 3: The Planning Process .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1. Introduction.....	6
3.2. Board involvement in the planning process.....	6
3.3. When should the Board be consulted .....	6
3.4. Standing Advice.....	6
3.5. Further Information .....	7
<b>Section 4: Regulation - Overview.....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1. Introduction.....	8
4.2. WMA approach.....	8
4.3. The Requirement for Written Consent .....	9
4.4. Conditions of Consent .....	9
4.5. Right of Appeal .....	10
4.6. Implementation Timescales .....	11
4.7. Other Requirements .....	11
<b>Section 5: Regulation - Policies .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1. Byelaw 3.....	12
5.2. Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4) .....	13
5.3. Byelaw 10.....	15
5.4. Exemptions from the Board's Byelaws.....	17
<b>Section 6: Enforcement .....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1. Introduction.....	18
6.2. WMA Approach .....	18
6.3. Additional Information: .....	20
6.4. Policy.....	20
6.5. Fly Tipping.....	22
<b>Section 7: Watercourse Maintenance .....</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1. Introduction.....	23
7.2. Responsibilities of Riparian Owners .....	23
7.3. Adopted Watercourses .....	23
7.4. IDB Infrastructure and Standard of Protection .....	24
7.5. Adoption and abandonment of watercourses and drainage assets .....	24
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>28</b>

## Section 1: Introduction

This Planning and Byelaw Strategy has been produced by the [Water Management Alliance](#) (“WMA”) group of Internal Drainage Boards, (“IDBs”). It has been compiled to provide:

- Guidance on how the WMA Member Boards will engage with planning applications within their Internal Drainage Districts (“IDDs”) or that have the potential to significantly impact their IDD.
- Guidance to organisations and individuals on the Boards regulatory requirements and processes, including information on the policies against which it will assess and determine applications.

This document is intended for use by IDB Board Members and Officers, the Members and Officers of other Risk Management Authorities (“RMAs”) as well as land managers and developers that are undertaking works and developments within IDB districts or their highland catchments. This is a non-statutory document intended to support the strategies and plans of other RMAs that relate to flood risk, erosion and environmental matters. It does not seek to repeat the work of these documents, instead signposting the reader to relevant external documentation where appropriate.

Each member Board has an adopted Business Plan Policy Statement that sets out the Board’s approach to meeting the national policy aims and objectives. These policy statements should be read in conjunction with this document and are available on the links below:

- [Broads \(2006\) IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [East Suffolk IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [King’s Lynn IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [Norfolk Rivers IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [South Holland IDB Policy Statement](#)

Please note where reference is made to the “Board” within this document this should be taken as meaning any of the Member Boards of the Water Management Alliance.

## Section 2: Background

### 2.1. Internal Drainage Boards

IDBs are local public authorities that manage flood risk and land drainage within areas of special drainage need in England. Each IDB has permissive powers to undertake water management activities within their IDD. The purpose of delivering this work is to reduce flood risk to people and property and to manage water in a way that meets the local needs of business and agriculture, including during times of drought, whilst also dealing with its obligations and commitments to the environment.

IDBs exercise a general power of supervision over all matters relating to water level management within their district. This is undertaken through the use of permissive powers that enable IDBs to regulate works on, or affecting, the watercourses within their area. Advice is also provided by IDBs through the planning system to ensure that planning applications for new development within their districts are supported by appropriate drainage strategies. IDBs conduct their work in accordance with a number of general environmental duties and promote the ecological wellbeing of their districts. They have a specific duty to further the conservation and enhancement of all designated environmental sites within their districts such as Site of Special Scientific Interest (“SSSIs”).

### 2.2. The Water Management Alliance

The Water Management Alliance (“WMA”) is a group of 5 IDBs who share vision, values and standards, and have chosen to jointly administer their affairs in order to reduce costs, strengthen their own organisations and increase influence at both a national and regional level, without losing an unacceptable degree of autonomy. The WMA IDBs operate in the Anglian Region of the United Kingdom and manage the drainage infrastructure and flood risk from watercourses across some 548,000 hectares of East Anglia. This drainage districts of the 5 IDBs comprises parts of the counties of Cambridgeshire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk and Suffolk and intersect with 472 parishes.

Member IDBs in the WMA include the Broads (2006) IDB, East Suffolk IDB, King’s Lynn IDB, Norfolk Rivers IDB and South Holland IDB. The WMA also provides support services to the Pevensey and Cuckmere Water Level Management Board.

### 2.3. Further Information

Please see Appendix 1 of this document for further information relating to the current legislative framework for Internal Drainage Boards.

Please see Appendix 2 of this document for further information relating to the roles and functions of Internal Drainage Boards.

Please see Appendix 3 of this document for further information relating to each WMA Member Internal Drainage Board.

Please see Appendix 4 of this document for further information relating to the vision and mission of the Water Management Alliance, including how these link to National Objectives.

## Section 3: The Planning Process

### 3.1. Introduction

The WMA member Boards cover parts of 20 Local Planning Authority (“LPA”) areas (15 Borough, City or District Council areas, 4 County Council areas and a part of the Broads Authority’s executive area).

Each Board’s Business Plan Policy Statement sets out that the Board will take an active role in the assessment of individual planning applications as well as planning policy documents to prevent inappropriate development and land use to ensure that flood risk is not increased.

### 3.2. Board involvement in the planning process

By engaging with the planning process the WMA Member Boards are seeking to:

- Reduce flood risk to communities within its Internal Drainage District and highland catchment.
- Promote sustainable development in sustainable locations by supporting sound planning decisions that can be implemented by applicants and developers.
- Reduce the potential for conflict between the planning process and the IDB regulatory process.
- Develop an understanding within other authorities and third parties of the flood risk and capacity issues within IDB areas so they can be considered through the planning process.

### 3.3. When should the Board be consulted

Each WMA Member Board will aim to review and comment on applications located wholly or partly within their Internal Drainage District, if the application meets at least one of the following criteria:

- The site is within 9 metres of a Board Adopted watercourse
- Works are, or may be, proposed to alter any ordinary watercourse
- The proposals will, or may, displace water through the alteration of site levels
- The proposals will, or may, result in the introduction of water to an WMA Board’s Internal Drainage District
- The site is in an area known to suffer from poor drainage.

Each WMA Member Board will also aim to review and comment on applications outside of their Internal Drainage District if the proposals will, or may, result in the introduction of water to the District.

### 3.4. Standing Advice

Each WMA Member Board has approved the following standing advice to assist Local Planning Authorities and applicants alike.

*(overleaf)*

### **Standing Advice 1: General savings for Internal Drainage Board regulatory powers**

This standing advice applies where the proposed development site is near to, or within, the Internal Drainage District (“IDD”) of a Member Internal Drainage Board (“IDB”) of the Water Management Alliance. Please see our website ([www.wlma.org.uk](http://www.wlma.org.uk)) for detailed mapping of each Board’s District, including which drains are designated as an adopted watercourse in each District. In order to avoid conflict between the planning process and the relevant Board’s regulatory regime and consenting process please be aware of the following:

- If the site is within a Member IDBs district, that Board’s byelaws apply. The Byelaws for each Board are available on the development pages of our website ([www.wlma.org.uk](http://www.wlma.org.uk)).
- Regardless of whether the site is within a Member Board’s IDD, if the proposals include works to alter a watercourse (including culverting for access) consent is required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. If the site is within an IDD the relevant IDB is the consenting authority for these works. If outside an IDD, the County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority) is the consenting authority.
- If a surface water (or treated foul water) discharge is proposed to a watercourse within an IDD (either directly or indirectly), then the proposed development will require a land drainage consent in line with that Internal Drainage Board’s byelaws (specifically Byelaw 3). Any consent for surface water discharges granted will likely be conditional, pending the payment a surface water development contribution fee, calculated in line with the Board’s charging policy.
- If the proposals include works within 9 metres of a Board Adopted watercourse, consent is required under Byelaw 10.
- If the applicant has proposed to manage surface water by infiltration, this should be supported by infiltration testing in line with BRE 365 and an understanding of the expected groundwater levels.
- For the maintenance of SuDS infrastructure each Board may consider adopting certain assets within their IDD. If the applicant wishes to explore this option they should contact [planning@wlma.org.uk](mailto:planning@wlma.org.uk)

Whilst the consenting process as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board’s Byelaws are separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of these consents. As such we strongly recommend that any required consents are sought prior to determination of the planning application.

### **3.5. Further Information**

Please see Appendix 5 of this document for further information relating to the rationale for, and scope of, IDB involvement with the planning process

Please see Appendix 6 of this document for a list of Local Planning Authorities whose area has coverage by a WMA Member Board

## Section 4: Regulation - Overview

### 4.1. Introduction

The oversight, management and regulation of watercourses in England is delivered across a number of regulatory authorities. Under section 1(2)(a) of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (“LDA”), each Internal Drainage Board (“IDB”) has a duty to exercise a general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within their Internal Drainage District (“IDD”). In pursuance of this role IDBs have permissive powers to regulate (consent and enforce) third party activities effecting watercourses within their district. The purpose of watercourse regulation is to control certain activities that might have an adverse flooding impact and to ensure that riparian owners carry out their responsibilities. As the majority of the watercourse network within IDBs are in private or riparian ownership the role of the IDB as a regulator is key in ensuring positive action is undertaken by third parties.

IDBs can apply byelaws (under Section 66, LDA) relating to the management of watercourses within their district. These cover a wide set of third party activities that could impact the drainage network. Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 IDBs can designate key third party owned structures or features within their district that relate to the management of flood risk.

All areas outside of an IDD are regulated by Lead Local Flood Authorities (“LLFAs”) with District Councils able to exercise permissive works powers and create byelaws. It should be noted that most District Councils have not set byelaws to cover the management of watercourses within their jurisdiction, as such the regulatory and works controls outside of IDB areas are usually less comprehensive.

The Environment Agency (“EA”) has permissive powers for managing watercourses designated as “Main Rivers”. These watercourses are defined on the EA’s Main River map and applications for any works to main rivers should be submitted to the EA.

### 4.2. WMA approach

As part of each Board’s Business Plan Policy Statement the Board have set out their approach to the regulation of third party activities, as shown below:

“The Board will regulate as necessary, using available legislative powers and byelaws, the activity of others to ensure their actions within, alongside, and otherwise impacting its drainage system do not increase flood risk, prevent the efficient working of drainage systems, or adversely impact the environment.”

When regulating ordinary watercourses the Water Management Alliance (“WMA”) member Boards will act in a manner consistent with the policies set out later in this document and as included in the relevant Local and National Flood Risk Management Strategies.



### **4.3. The Requirement for Written Consent**

The LDA and the Board's Byelaws require written consent to be sought prior to undertaking certain types of activities within a Board's Drainage District. To obtain the Board's written consent an application form should be submitted to the relevant Board for consideration. The [application form](#) is available on the relevant Board's webpage.

Applications that are made to the Board will be determined as per the policies set out in this document. Applications that contravene these policies may be refused.

As outlined by each policy (Section 5) some applications may be determined by officers acting under delegated authority, whereas some may only be determined by the Board. Additionally, where the applicant or agent is a member or employee of the Board or is related to a Member or employee, then the application will have to be determined by the Board. The same approach is taken if the applicant or agent is a company where the partner or director of that company is a member of the Board or is related to a Member or employee.

Board meetings are usually only held between 3 and 6 times each year. Due to the need to prepare reports, it will not normally be possible to discuss at the meeting applications received less than 14 days before a meeting. It may therefore be some time after submission of an application when it is discussed by the Board. The applicant will be advised of the date of the relevant meeting as soon as possible.

Applications for consent under the LDA must be decided within two months of the date they are validated by the relevant Board. Please note applications are not deemed valid unless they are accompanied by the appropriate application fee and all information necessary for understanding the nature and impact of the proposed works. Applications for consent under the terms of a Board's Byelaws have no set time limit for determination.

### **4.4. Conditions of Consent**

Consent may be issued subject to conditions as per byelaw 25 of the Board's Byelaws. Conditions can cover technical requirements, legal requirements, environmental matters and the need for financial payments. All conditions specified as part of any consent must be met before the Board's formal consent is deemed valid. In general conditions may include the following:

- The requirement to notify the Board of when works are to be started
- Specific stipulations regarding the nature and extent of the works
- The requirement for environmental mitigation
- The requirement to enter into any legal agreements
- The requirement to pay any financial contributions such as Surface Water Development Contributions ("SWDCs") or Commuted Maintenance Fees ("CMFs")

#### **4.4.1. Environmental Conditions**

IDBs are also designated as a section 28G authority or "Operating Authority" under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This means that before permitting the carrying out of operations likely to damage any of the flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features by reason of which a site of special scientific interest is of special interest, the IDB must consult with Natural England. This consultation period extends for 28 days. As such when a Byelaw

or Land Drainage Act 1991 consent application is received that includes works that may have an impact on the interest features of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), or on a European-designated wildlife site, the Board must consult Natural England on the potential environmental implications of the application. The results of any consultation may be to seek environmental mitigation for the proposed works which may be conditioned, to seek material amendments to the proposals or to require the refusal of the application.

#### **4.4.2. Legal Agreement Conditions**

Approval of certain consents may be given subject to the applicant entering into a Deed of Indemnity. A Deed of Indemnity is an agreement between two or more parties, the purpose of which is to specify the actions and consequences which will result should a particular event or events occur. In drainage matters the agreement essentially attempts to negate or limit the risk which the IDB is exposed to as a consequence of the third-party activities the Board has consented to. The Deed must be completed, signed by all affected parties (including mortgage lenders on the property, if appropriate) and successfully registered against the property at HM Land Registry, before the Board's consent will be valid.

Where a property is not currently registered, the Deed will have to be noted on the property's title documents, and written confirmation to this effect be provided by a solicitor. Most Deeds once registered against a property require the restriction to be continued at the point of sale of the title via the purchasers entering into a Deed of Covenant with a certificate of compliance being issued to HM Land Registry.

Deeds of Indemnity are usually prepared by IDB Officers and are subject to a small administration fee (see the [Boards Development Control Charges and Fees](#) document) along with the fee charged by Land Registry for lodging the document with them (see Land Registry website). Where a Deed is more complex, is time consuming to prepare or involves a solicitor's input, then the administration fee would be increased to reflect the additional costs to the Board.

Where the Board is involved in the commenting on, and approving, works associated with new development adjacent to Board Adopted watercourses the Board will seek to ensure that there are 9 metre wide easement strips kept clear of any development. The Board will usually seek to have the above-mentioned easement strips conveyed to it wherever possible, regardless of whether or not the adjacent drain is owned by the Board. The Board will also normally stipulate that the strips have to be suitably-fenced and gated to all sides, except alongside an open watercourse, and that the transfer is free from encumbrances and completed at no cost to the Board (including the developer paying the Board's legal costs).

#### **4.4.3. Financial Conditions**

Conditions of consent can include the requirement to make financial contributions to the Board as per the [Boards Development Control Charges and Fees Policy Document](#).

#### **4.5. Right of Appeal**

Where you believe that consent has been unreasonably withheld by the Board then under the Land Drainage Act 1991 you have a right of appeal to an independent arbitrator. Ahead of any formal appeal to an arbitrator, when an application is refused by the Board the Board's policy is to afford the applicant a right of reply to the Board. This should take the form of a written statement setting out why the application should be considered favourably, despite being

against Boards policies. The matter will then be taken to the next Board meeting where it will be re-considered.

#### **4.6. Implementation Timescales**

All consents granted by the Board are subject to the approved works being completed within a period of 3 years from the date of the Board's decision. The consent cannot be sold, inherited or otherwise passed on. Any person wishing to undertake work that was previously consented to another party should apply for their own consent to undertake the works in the normal manner.

#### **4.7. Other Requirements**

Please note the IDB consenting process is independent of the need for planning permission and the granting of planning permission does not necessarily imply that consent will be granted by the relevant drainage authority. Furthermore it does not imply that an applicant's proposal will comply with the requirements of any other interested parties, including the Local Planning Authority, Water Company, land owners or occupiers, and it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that they do. If the IDB is made aware of any inconsistencies then IDB officers will inform the applicant and the appropriate authorities.

## Section 5: Regulation - Policies

This section details the policies that the Board applies when seeking to regulate activities within its Internal Drainage District (“IDD”). These policies provide guidance on how applications made to the Board will be determined. It also details if further conditions would be stipulated or separate agreements or payments required.

### 5.1. Byelaw 3

#### Policy 1 – Discharge of Treated Foul Water

Consent is required where the installation of a treatment plant and associated outfall are proposed within the Internal Drainage District that would lead to the discharge of treated foul water into a watercourse (whether privately-maintained or Board Adopted).

On all watercourses where the discharge is to an open drain, the discharge pipe should be installed through a pre-cast concrete outfall unit dug in flush with the drain batter. Suitable erosion protection should be installed below the headwall down to the toe of the watercourse and also dug in flush with the drain batter.

On Board Adopted watercourses consent will only be granted where the following points are complied with:

- All elements of the works except the outfall pipe are at least 9 metres from the edge of the drain.
- Where the discharge is to a piped watercourse, the discharge pipe should be connected into an existing inspection chamber, or a new inspection chamber should be constructed to the Board's specification to accommodate the outfall. In either case, the inspection chamber wall around the incoming pipe is to be repaired to the Board's satisfaction prior to completion of the works.
- The applicant must enter into the Board's standard Deed of Indemnity prior to undertaking the works.

Conditions of consent:

- On all watercourses drain improvement works may be required to be undertaken at the applicants cost to bring the receiving watercourse up to a maintainable standard to enable it to accommodate the proposed flows.
- On Board Adopted watercourses a Commuted Maintenance Fee may be payable if new assets are built within a Boards watercourse to accommodate the proposed discharge e.g. a new inspection chamber.
- On all watercourses, although a development contribution will not normally be payable for treated foul water discharges, the Board reserves the right to require a payment to be made if it feels it is warranted (such as where the amount of the proposed treated water discharge is significant e.g. comparable to surface water run-off rates of discharge).

Applications may be refused if the Board's Officers consider that the receiving watercourse will not be capable of accepting the planned additional flows.

## **Policy 2 – Discharge of Surface Water Run-Off**

Applications for consent to discharge surface water run-off into any watercourse within the Board's Internal Drainage District will be considered against the capacity of the receiving watercourse to accept the proposed surface water flows (rate and volume).

The Board may require the applicant to undertake hydraulic modelling work (at the applicant's cost), or to make amendments to one of the Board's existing models to assess the impact of the proposed discharge. Please note the cost incurred by the applicant in undertaking this work would be in addition to any development contribution due to the Board.

Conditions of consent:

- On all watercourses drain improvement works may be required to be undertaken at the applicants cost to bring the receiving watercourse up to a maintainable standard to enable it to accommodate the proposed flows.
- On Board Adopted watercourses a Commuted Maintenance Fee may be payable if new assets are built within a Boards watercourse to accommodate the proposed discharge e.g. a new inspection chamber.
- Where a development will result in an increase in the rate or volume of surface water in any watercourse one of the conditions imposed would be the payment of a development contribution to the Board. (See the [Boards Development Control Charges and Fees.](#))

It should be noted that it is the Board's preference that any system serving multiple properties is adopted by a statutory authority.

Applications may be refused if the Board's Officers consider that the receiving watercourse will not be capable of accepting the planned additional flows.

### **5.1.1. Byelaw 3 Delegation**

All applications for consent under Byelaw 3 (Treated Foul Water and Surface Water discharges) can be determined by officers under delegation unless the application is to discharge surface water from an impermeable area greater than 5 hectares.

### **5.2. Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4)**

The alterations of Board Adopted as well as riparian/private owned/maintained watercourses are covered by both a statutory provision (Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991) and each WMA Board's Byelaws (Byelaw 4 - Operation of Water Control Structures and Alteration, Improvement or Removal of Structures).

Both these provisions concern the erection of any mill dam, weir or other like obstruction to the flow of any ordinary watercourse or the raising or otherwise altering of any such obstruction. This activity also includes specifically the erection of culverts in ordinary watercourses or the alteration of culverts in a manner that would likely affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse.

Written consent is required from the Board prior to undertaking the activities outlined above and as set out in Byelaw 4 (please note Byelaw 4 also covers the operation of water control structures). Policy 3 below sets out how the Board will determine applications received seeking consent to alter a watercourse.

### **Policy 3 – Alterations of watercourses (including culverting)**

As part of any application to alter a watercourse (including culverting), the applicant has the responsibility to prove that the proposed works would not increase flood risk or negatively impact the efficiency of local drainage. Where it is appropriate to do so, adequate mitigation must be provided for damage caused to the watercourse.

In line with good practice, the Board will only approve an application to alter a watercourse if;

- There is no reasonably practicable alternative.
- The detrimental effects of the works would be so minor that they would not justify a more costly alternative.
- The proposal is for a replacement culvert or bridge.
- Any culverting is for the sole purpose of accessing a field, property, building plot or an estate development and the total length of piping or width of the bridge is the minimum required for the access.
- The total length of Adopted Watercourse to be altered is 18 metres or less.\*

Applications for the installation of weirs, flow control and other structures (not including culverting) as well as the infilling of watercourses will be considered on a case by case basis.

Applications may be refused if the Board's Officers consider that the proposed works will;

- Increase flood risk or negatively impact the efficiency of local drainage
- Cause environmental harm that cannot be mitigated
- Negatively impact the ability of the Board to carry out its operations

If consent is granted by the Board, this may be conditional. Conditions may;

- Specify the technical detail of the works to be constructed
- Require the need for an environmental survey
- Include the requirement for Commuted Maintenance Fee may be payable where the new assets (within a Board-Adopted watercourse) are to be adopted by the Board.

Wherever practical the IDB will seek to have culverted watercourses restored to open channels.

\*Where applications are received to culvert long sections (over 18 metres) of Adopted Watercourse these applications will need to demonstrate an overriding need for the piping (e.g. for health and safety reasons). The application must include a clear appraisal of the environmental impact of the proposal. Applications of this nature will be considered on a case by case basis, including an appraisal of potential impact on the Boards operations (especially for Board-adopted watercourses).

### **5.2.1 Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4) Delegation**

All applications for consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4) can be determined by officers under delegation if they meet the requirements of Policy 3. As such, applications to alter over 18 metres of Adopted Watercourse must be determined by the Board.

### **5.3. Byelaw 10**

Consent is required for all works within 9 metres of the edge of drainage and flood risk management infrastructure. Within each Board's Internal Drainage District this infrastructure is principally Board adopted watercourses and water management assets such as pumping stations, sluices and inlets etc. These are all clearly identified on each Board's mapping available on the Water Management Alliance website.

The 9 metre distance is measured from the edge of the drain (whether open or piped). In the case of an open drain this is 9 metres from an imaginary infinite vertical line running through the drain brink, or landward toe of the embankment if the watercourse is embanked.

The policies set out below outline the approach the Board takes when determining applications for works that qualify for the need for consent including those activities the Board will determine on a case by case basis and those the Board does not find acceptable in any circumstance. A separate policy is also included detailing the approach the Board will take to accommodating services.

#### **Policy 4 – Works within 9 metres of Boards Adopted drainage and flood risk management infrastructure**

The Board will only approve applications for a relaxation of Byelaw 10 (to allow works within 9 metres of Boards adopted drainage and flood risk management infrastructure) if the proposals meet the criteria set out in the Board's table of acceptable works (generally reflecting works that can be easily removed if required).

In addition to the table of accepted works, un-adopted service runs and the planting of hedges and shallow rooted bushes within 9 metres of an adopted watercourse will be considered on a case by case basis.

Permanent works should be sited a minimum of 9 metres from the Board's infrastructure, this is regardless of the position of any previous building or structure. For clarity this includes:

- The construction of a new or replacement building (residential or commercial)
- The construction of a two-storey or ground-floor extension (including conservatories)
- Permanent fencing, the erection of a wall, hedging or tree planting
- The boundary treatments of a new development
- All other permanent above ground structures
- All elements of a structure which may protrude into the 9 metre zone above ground level (such as the blades of a wind turbine or fixed canopy).

*(continued...)*

(continued...)

- Fishing lakes or reservoirs (including surrounding bunds or banks)
- Un-adopted service runs alongside watercourses (electricity cables, telephone wires, gas, water or sewerage pipes or any other services)

Where this is not achievable the matter will be considered by the Board on a case by case basis. These applications will be determined with reference to the impact on the Board's operations (e.g. by assessing current access arrangements).

If consent is granted by the Board, this may be conditional. Whilst dependent on the nature of the proposal, conditions may;

- Specify the technical detail of the works to be constructed
- Require the need for an environmental survey
- Require the applicant to apply for SSSI consent or a Habitats Regulations Assessment ("HRA")
- Require the applicant to enter into the Board's standard Deed of Indemnity
- Require written confirmation from a suitably qualified, independent structural engineer showing that the proposed intended foundation design will ensure the structure does not have an adverse impact on the watercourse, or vice-versa.

Applications may be refused if the Board's officers consider that the proposed works will;

- Negatively impact the ability of the Board to carry out its operations
- Increase the liabilities of the Board

Table showing acceptable works and required distance from brink of watercourse / outside edge of culvert:

Proposed Works	Required distance from brink of water course / outside edge of culvert		
	Watercourse accessible with Machine	Watercourse not accessible with machine	Culverted Watercourse
Demountable Fencing ≤ 1.8 m tall	7 metres	1 metre	1 metre
Moveable Garage	7 metres	3 metres	3 metres
Gravel / Tarmac Chip Driveway	7 metres	1 metre	1 metre

### 5.3.1. Byelaw 10 Delegation

All applications for consent under Byelaw 10 can be determined by officers under delegation if they meet the requirements of Policy 4. As such, only works shown in the table of acceptable works as well as un-adopted service runs and hedging / shallow rooted bushes can be determined by officers under delegation.



#### **5.4. Exemptions from the Board's Byelaws**

Under Byelaw 26 of the Board's Byelaws a number of organisations are identified as being exempt from their requirements. This status is dependent upon certain criteria and specifically whether any works proposed by these organisations makes use of, or interferes with, the Board's infrastructure. The policy below has been drafted to clarify the Board's position on this matter.

##### **Policy 5 – Exemptions to the Board's Byelaws**

Where the body proposing to undertake works within the Internal Drainage District is an organisation defined by Byelaw 26 of the Board's Byelaws an application to register the exemption is required. This registration process is aimed to confirm that the applicant is exempt from the need for consent where they comply with the conditions of the exemption. Where the applicant cannot meet all the conditions of the exemption (as set out in our guidance) they are likely to be interfering with or making use of the Board's infrastructure and therefore must apply for consent from the relevant Board. The purpose of registering the exemptions is to ensure that the Board is made aware of works within its Internal Drainage District to minimise the conflict with its own operations.

# Section 6: Enforcement

## 6.1. Introduction

The WMA member Boards set out in their Business Plan Policy Statements that;

“The Board will take appropriate steps to help riparian owners understand their responsibilities for maintenance, byelaw compliance and environmental regulations.”

As there are many reasons why watercourses are found to be in poor condition the WMA member Boards recognise that such neglect may not be deliberate and therefore will seek to inform and educate riparian and private owners to seek their cooperation in undertaking required works in the first instance. Notwithstanding the desire to work with landowners, if flooding is to be avoided, important but neglected or damaged drainage features need to be brought back to a functional state within a reasonable timescale. As such the policies within this document relating to enforcement seek to guide the use of the Boards enforcement powers if any unreasonable delay in restoring the functionality of a watercourse or structure is likely to result in flooding.

Specifically these powers as set out under Sections 21, 24 and 25 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and in the Board’s Byelaws allow the serving of notices on individuals who have caused contraventions. In issuing a notice the IDB may set out the works required to resolve the contravention to an acceptable standard and the date by which the works should be completed. If the works are not completed by the date set out in the notice, the Board may take action to remedy the effect of the contravention or failure and seek to recover the costs incurred, as well as pursue any necessary prosecution.

## 6.2. WMA Approach

The process of enforcement by WMA member Boards will follow the staged approach set out below, and within Policy 6.

### 6.2.1. Contravention Reported

Once a complaint about an ordinary watercourse is received by the Board, officers will carry out an initial assessment to establish whether a contravention has been undertaken, and whether the Board are the relevant regulatory authority.

To substantiate contraventions reported to the Board we will need to be provided with the location of the contravention and one or more of the following types of evidence:

- Dated photos of the contravention or impact caused by the contravention
- A written report from another Risk Management Authority (such as a LLFA flood investigation)

### **6.2.2. Stage 1:**

The aim of stage 1 is to initiate open correspondence with the relevant landowner, person and/or Risk Management Authority informing them of their responsibilities under the Land Drainage Act 1991. This correspondence will in turn aim to either seek the removal of contraventions which are negatively impacting Flood Risk (or the Board's operations) without the need for formal enforcement action, or to seek the regularisation of contraventions which are not impacting Flood Risk, or the Board's Operations, without the need for formal enforcement action.

The initial assessment will consider the on-site conditions, the impact on the Board's operations, any available historical data and high level indicators of potential flood risk, such as Environment Agency ("EA") flood risk maps as well as flood risk modelling outputs held by the relevant IDB. It will also consider conservation designations and the type of land holdings. This assessment should be completed within 21 days of receipt of the complaint however, it may be necessary to extend the period of assessment for more complex matters, high demand on the service and/or to accommodate environmental circumstances e.g. weather, flood conditions, etc.

Following the initial assessment, the Board's Officers may write a letter to the relevant landowner, person and/or Risk Management Authority responsible for the contravention. This will include the following:

- An explanation of the contravention, its impact and the remedy required in accordance with the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws.
- The timeframe for the work to be undertaken (usually 21 days from the date of the letter).

If a positive response to the IDB letter has not been received within the timescale specified, and on inspection no work has been satisfactorily undertaken, the case may proceed to 'Stage 2'. In deciding whether or not to carry out further investigation the Board will consider whether it is in the public interest to do so. Having regard to the actual and potential impacts of the contravention, the costs of carrying out the works and the likelihood of obtaining sufficient evidence to support enforcement action.

### **6.2.3. Stage 2:**

Where further action is pursued by the Board, officers will seek to resolve the situation by means of negotiation with the person responsible and obtain compliance with a request to satisfactorily undertake the work required. A notice under the relevant section of the Land Drainage Act 1991 or the Boards byelaws will be served. The notice will include the nature of the work to be carried out, the period within which it is to be carried out and any relevant right of appeal to a magistrates' court within 21 days of service of the notice (where applicable). A Notice under the Land Drainage Act 1991 or the Boards byelaws is a legal document formally requiring specific work to be carried out within a set timescale.

A letter will accompany the notice and inform the responsible person that in the event of their failure to satisfactorily undertake the work, the IDB may carry out the work itself and recover from the person responsible the expenses reasonably incurred in doing so which will include recovering the costs of pursuing the case.

Following service of the notice, one of four things will happen:

- The responsible person will carry out the work to the satisfaction of the Board.
- The responsible person may appeal the notice.
- The responsible person will fail to carry out the work to the satisfaction of Board and the Board will seek to recover their expenses; and /or
- The Board will, where appropriate, decide whether to take a prosecution against the responsible person, in addition to carrying out the work and seeking to recover the costs of that work.

If the responsible person complies with the notice and completes the work to the satisfaction of the Board, the Board's officers will write to the responsible person confirming the closure of the case and the end of the action.

### **6.3. Additional Information:**

- In certain circumstances practicalities may not allow for works to be achievable within the usual timeframe specified in the letter. The Board will assess the circumstances of each enforcement case individually and determine whether any works need to be deferred or amended to take into account the impacts of any works on wildlife or habitat. Examples where this may occur include:
  - Seasonal farming practices and Environmental Schemes can restrict access or time schedules to carry out works;
  - The nesting season for some birds occurs between the 1 March and 1 August and works might cause disruption if nests are present;
  - Presence of protected species will influence when it is most appropriate to carry out work.
- In some circumstances the Board may require further information on the contravention. As such officers may arrange to meet the land owner and/or complainant and undertake a site visit to substantiate the Board's regulatory position. This process may also involve the Board consulting with other organisations including other Local Authorities, Highway Authorities, the Environment Agency and Natural England as appropriate and/or require or commission appropriate site surveys and inspections.
- As stated in the enforcement policy the Board may take no action where there is not enough evidence to support enforcement or where there is no or minimal impact. Examples of matters not requiring action may include minimal silting of the watercourse, slight vegetation growth, the accumulation of a small quantity of debris etc.

### **6.4. Policy**

*(overleaf)*

## Policy 6 - Enforcement

Where responsibility for maintenance of ordinary watercourses rests with a land owner, the Board will take appropriate steps to secure their co-operation to ensure maintenance takes place. Where necessary the Board will draw on powers of enforcement to secure this maintenance or the removal of any unauthorised works or obstruction.

The WMA member Boards will take a risk-based and proportionate approach to exercising their regulatory powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and byelaws, taking into account the location and nature of any contravention, nuisance or flooding caused by;

- the failure to repair or maintain watercourses, bridges or drainage works
- un-consented works including works within 9 metres of the edge of drainage and flood risk management infrastructure
- impediments to the proper flow of water

This approach will take into account whether the contraventions have or are likely to increase flood risk and what the consequences of any increase in risk may be. Where works are un-consented the relevant IDB would require the landowner, person and/or Risk Management Authority responsible for the works to prove that the un-consented works would not cause a nuisance or increase flood risk. For the avoidance of doubt the Board will take enforcement action where there is, or has been, a risk to life or serious injury, internal flooding of residential or commercial properties or flooding impacting on critical services.

Where works are un-consented and the relevant landowner, person and/or Risk Management Authority responsible provides no evidence or insufficient evidence to support an assertion that the un-consented works would not cause a nuisance or increase flood risk, there will be a presumption that the un-consented works would cause a nuisance or increase flood risk, unless visible evidence suggests otherwise.

The Board may close an enforcement case file and/or take no action where;

- there is a lack of physical evidence to corroborate the impact of a flood event and/or
- there is no actual or potential risk to properties or infrastructure; and/or
- that the matter complained of is not the cause of the drainage problem; and/or
- the matter is trivial in nature (de minimis)

Where no enforcement action is taken correspondence may inform and advise individuals of their riparian owner responsibilities and of the route for settling disputes with other riparian owners where appropriate including referral to the First-tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) Agricultural Land and Drainage where appropriate.

Where the Board are made aware of breaches to other legislation they will advise the appropriate authorities.

## 6.5. Fly Tipping

The Board do not have enforcement powers with regard to fly tipping as these rest with the relevant Local Authority and the Environment Agency. Despite this the Board believe it is important to clarify the role of the IDB in this area as historically there has been some confusion amongst residents and other public authorities.

Rubbish in Board's watercourses can result from general litter blowing into the watercourse or floating along the drain from upstream or from fly tipping (the illegal dumping of waste). Of the two types, fly tipping generally leads to the most serious problem, especially when large quantities of waste are tipped in one incident and/or location. Rubbish can have the following detrimental effects on watercourses;

- Reduce flow in the watercourse
- Pollution
- Unsightly
- Environmentally damaging

### **Policy 7 – Fly Tipping and rubbish in Board's watercourses and on Board's property**

The Board do not have enforcement powers with regard to fly tipping as these rest with the relevant Local Authority and the Environment Agency. As such, when notified of fly tipping in the IDD the Board would consider the incident as follows:

If the incident is causing a significant obstruction to flow or is presenting an imminent risk of flooding within the Internal District the Board's operatives will remove the waste as per the Board's statutory functions. For this purpose the Board have a waste transfer licence to allow them to move waste. Rubbish can be temporarily stored in the relevant Board's yard, where a waste exemption license is in place, before disposing of in an appropriate manner.

However, if the Board's operatives consider the fly tipping incident to be of a serious nature or to have already resulted in a severe consequence the Board will report it to the appropriate enforcement body, rather than attempting to deal with it itself, in case evidence is inadvertently lost, which could have been used to prosecute offenders.

In all other incidents the waste will be reported to the relevant Local Authority. In the case of a vehicle, the Police will also be informed as soon as possible.

If the waste is causing a pollution incident then the Environment Agency will be informed at the earliest opportunity and the pollution contained.

# Section 7: Watercourse Maintenance

## 7.1. Introduction

Generally watercourses within IDB Internal Drainage Districts (“IDDs”), unless vested in some other authority, are the responsibility of riparian or private owners to maintain, repair and improve as necessary to ensure effective drainage. A ‘riparian owner’ is a person who owns land or property adjacent to a watercourse. A private owner is a person who owns land or property with a watercourse within their title. The definition of watercourse includes streams, ditches (whether dry or not), ponds, culverts, drains, pipes or any other passage through which water may flow.

Purchasers of property are often unaware of their inherited riparian or private duties. These are outlined in the Land and Property Act 1925 (Section 62), which states that “a conveyance of land shall be deemed to include and shall by virtue of this Act operate to convey with the land all buildings, hedges, ditches, fences, ways, waters, watercourses, liberties, easements, rights and advantages whatsoever appertaining or reputed to appertain to the land or any part thereof”.

## 7.2. Responsibilities of Riparian Owners

Riparian owners have the following responsibilities:

- Duty of care towards neighbours upstream and downstream, avoiding any action likely to cause flooding.
- Entitled to protect their properties from flooding and their land from erosion (once the correct permissions have been obtained).
- May be required to maintain the condition of their watercourse to ensure that the proper flow of water is unimpeded.

The government has produced a number of web pages that explain riparian responsibilities and the need for maintenance of watercourses. These are available using the following link: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/owning-a-watercourse>.

## 7.3. Adopted Watercourses

IDBs often carry out their drainage/water level management responsibilities through the designation of ordinary watercourses as ‘Adopted Watercourses’, also frequently known as ‘Main Drains’ or ‘District Drains’. In general Boards only adopt or “en-main” watercourses which are critical to the effective drainage or water level management of a particular area. The simple criteria governing the adoption of watercourses are set out in Policy 8 of this strategy. This designation is usually made on the recommendation of IDB officers to the Board alongside consultation with the riparian landowners affected.

The status of ‘Adopted Watercourse’ is an acknowledgement by the IDB that the watercourse is of arterial importance to the IDD and normally will receive maintenance from the IDB. This maintenance is not necessarily carried out on an annual basis but on a recurrence deemed necessary to meet water level management requirements. The designations are made under permissive powers and there is no obligation for IDBs to fulfil any formal maintenance

requirement and there is no change in the ownership or liability associated with the watercourse.

In general each WMA member Board assesses the flood risk within its IDD by taking into account the following:

- Assets in place taking into consideration their design standard, general condition and economic life
- Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps, Catchment Flood Management Plans, System Asset Management Plans and Shoreline Management Plans
- Local Flood Risk Strategy, as developed by the Local Flood Risk Management Partnership
- Hydrological and hydraulic models covering the Board's catchment area
- Access to adequate revenue funding for maintenance work and capital finance for improvement work
- Other information such as the history of flooding and land use impacts

For some time the EA has classified its main rivers to assist with prioritising work and expenditure, and the WMA Members Boards have seen fit to apply similar appraisals of watercourses under their care. For more information on the prioritisation of watercourses please see each Board's asset prioritisation criteria as included in the policy section of the WMA website.

#### **7.4. IDB Infrastructure and Standard of Protection**

A large proportion of each Board's drainage district is at some risk of flooding (including tidal flooding). Flood risk from ordinary watercourses (that the Board is the relevant Risk Management Authority for), is controlled wherever it is practically and financially viable to do so. However, some variation in the standards of protection will apply.

Assets for which each Board has operating authority responsibility for are also recorded in the Register of Drainage Infrastructure, as shown on each Board's Area webpage. It should be noted that for some IDBs their systems are wholly and completely dependent upon a number of strategic assets controlled by the Environment Agency that pass through or are adjacent to the Drainage District; the nature and extent of which is also shown on our website.

The WMA Boards monitor and review the condition of its watercourses and other assets (such as pumping stations and water level control structures), particularly those designated as high priority, over-spilling from which could affect people and property. Where standards of protection or condition are not at the desired level, improvement works will be sought where they are considered to be practical and financially viable by the Board. Where improvement works meet the criteria set by Defra, financial support will be sought from the Government's Flood and Coastal Resilience Partnership funding.

The Board welcomes any comments from its agricultural ratepayers, special levy paying councils, flood risk management partners and members of the public on the condition of its drainage system, which could lead to any increased flood and coastal erosion risk.

#### **7.5. Adoption and abandonment of watercourses and drainage assets**

Under common law, the responsibility for maintenance of watercourses rests with the riparian owner or land owner. Different owners have different priorities, needs and expectations as to



the standard of drainage required for their land use. As such it is not unusual for drainage issues to occur when the level of maintenance varies between reaches or opposite banks of the same watercourse. The result of such circumstances can be that landowners upstream are impacted by landowners further downstream failing to adequately maintain their respective reach of watercourse.

One of the primary benefits of the management of watercourses by statutory bodies such as Internal Drainage Boards is that critical watercourses are maintained adequately as a connected and related arterial network. To incorporate watercourses into this network it is essential that the Board has and uses its permissive powers to “adopt” watercourses. Another benefit of adoption is that these watercourses are protected to a greater extent by the Board’s byelaws.

From time to time drains are adopted and abandoned by the Board due to changes in circumstance. The criteria listed below have been drawn up to reinforce and assist the decision making process as to which drains should be adopted and which abandoned. It is not intended that the criteria should be used to make radical changes to the existing network of Board Adopted watercourses but instead to provide guidance to the decision making process when in future a riparian owner asks the Board to consider adopting or abandoning a watercourse. It should also be noted that every case will have to be judged on its own merits, as the complexities and peculiarities of individual cases cannot be encompassed within a standard set of criteria.

### **Policy 8 – Adoption of watercourses**

Watercourses which fulfil the following criteria should be considered for adoption:

*A watercourse with more than one riparian owner/occupier, or that caters for more than one owner/occupier within its catchment, which causes persistent drainage problems, or would do if a perceived change in circumstances was to take place, where effective maintenance would prevent these problems from occurring. (“One-off” problems can normally be resolved by issuing the relevant riparian owner a notice under the Land Drainage Act to carry out the required work). If an improvement scheme is required to be undertaken to make it an effective drainage route, then the benefit of this must outweigh the cost. A condition of the adoption would be that the riparian owners, or in the case of development, the developer, finances the improvement to the specification of the Board before the drain is adopted.*

Consideration should also be given, when deciding whether or not to adopt a watercourse, to the implications of retrospectively applying the Board’s Byelaws to the adjacent owners/occupiers, particularly Byelaw 10 affecting development within 9 metres of the drain, and availability of access to the watercourse to carry out maintenance works.

## Policy 9 – Abandonment of watercourses

Watercourses which fulfil the following criteria should be considered for abandonment:

*A watercourse, or upstream section of watercourse, which either has only one riparian owner/occupier and one owner within its catchment, or where there are multiple riparian owner/occupiers or multiple owners within the catchment and all of these owners or occupiers are in full agreement to the abandonment, or a watercourse which is redundant for its original purpose, for example it has been bypassed, and would not cause a drainage problem if it were abandoned by the Board.*

Upon abandonment, the maintenance responsibility for those Board's drains which are not owned by the Board will pass to the riparian owner. It is more difficult to abandon a drain owned by the Board as the Board will still have the responsibility, as owner, to maintain the drain following abandonment, unless the riparian owners are willing to purchase the drain from the Board and take on the maintenance responsibility.

## Policy 10 - Sustainable Drainage Systems ("SuDS") Adoption Policy

### [a] Adoption of SuDS within the Board's Drainage District

The Board will consider the adoption of SuDS within its Drainage District where the SuDS cater for more than one property owner. The decision whether to adopt will be:

- Made on a site-specific basis
- Dependent on the Board having had input to the design from an early stage so that:
  - Adequate access and working space is allowed around the SuDS feature(s) for future maintenance with machinery, including in all landscaping designs.
  - Space is allowed within the site design for deposition of arisings from the SuDS proposed for adoption - where the arisings are vegetation or silts etc - so that these do not have to be removed from site. The area required for this may be additional to the access and working space. It will normally be expected that this deposition space is provided immediately adjacent to the SuDS feature(s).

Generally, the Board will only consider adopting a SuDS feature which;

- Is an extension of, or is adjacent to, an existing Board Adopted watercourse or SuDS feature.
- Is above-ground and can be maintained with equipment commonly used by the Board - such as flails and roding baskets - for example attenuation ponds or linear flood storage areas.

*(continued...)*

(continued...)

- Has a maintenance regime similar to a Board Adopted open watercourse, especially in regard to cutting frequency (SuDS infrastructure that needs maintaining more frequently, for example swales in front of properties or SuDS which are also public open space, may be better-suited to adoption by another authority).

#### [b] Adoption of SuDS within the Board's watershed catchment

The Board may also consider adopting SuDS outside its Drainage District, but within the watershed catchment, if doing so will be of benefit to, and/or help to protect drainage and flood risk in, the Drainage District, provided that the other requirements in this policy are also met.

#### [c] Charges for the Board to adopt SuDS

A one-off, upfront adoption charge will be payable by the developer to the Board as part of the adoption procedure. This charge will be based on the present value of the total maintenance cost associated with the SuDS being adopted over the design life of the development (usually 100 years, unless it can be demonstrated to be less), unless otherwise agreed by the Board. The maintenance costs used to calculate this charge will be set by the Board based on a works programme agreed as part of the consenting and adoption process.

### **Policy 11 – Adoption of Structures within an Adopted Watercourse\***

The Board will seek to adopt the maintenance of proper flow through all **new** consented structures within an adopted watercourse, subject to the applicant paying a Commuted Maintenance Fee calculated in line with the Board's charging policy.

The adoption will mean that the Board will be responsible for de-silting and vegetation clearance on a recurrence deemed necessary to meet water level management requirements. Adoption of a structure does not commute the liability for maintenance of the structure's integrity which shall remain with the relevant landowner(s).

If a riparian landowner does not wish for a new structure to be adopted by the Board, the Board will instead condition that the landowner agree to a standard maintenance regime, the timing of which is to be agreed annually with the Board's Operations Manager.

*\* Policy 11 has currently only been adopted by the South Holland Internal Drainage Board*

# Appendices

<b>Appendix 1: Legislative Framework for IDBs.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Roles and Functions of IDBs .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendix 3: WMA Member Boards.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Vision and Mission of the WMA .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix 5: IDBs and the Planning Process .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Appendix 6: Local Planning Authorities.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## Appendix 1: Legislative Framework for IDBs

The current legislative framework for the management of flood risk and drainage in England is a product of significant amounts of historic and modern legislation. The forebears of the WMA member IDBs were first created under Ministerial Orders or Orders under the Land Drainage Act 1930. This legislation was, in many ways, a successor to the large number of Drainage Acts that had been pursued across the Country in the preceding centuries in low lying areas or areas of special drainage need. A number of the current WMA member Boards are direct beneficiaries of the work and organisations set up under this historic legislation.

In more recent times the [Land Drainage Acts 1991](#) and [1994](#) and the [Environment Act 1995](#) have reshaped the powers available to IDBs as well as their oversight and policy requirements. Specifically the Environment Act 1995 created the [Environment Agency](#) (“EA”) in 1996, subsuming in the process the National Rivers Authority (“NRA”) and its powers of supervision over IDBs.

In 2010, Government incorporated into legislation a number of Sir Michael Pitt’s recommendations from his [review](#) into the significant flooding experienced across England and Wales in 2007. This legislation was the [Flood and Water Management Act 2010](#) and further reshaped the powers and duties of IDBs. Specifically, it acknowledged formally flooding from ordinary watercourses, groundwater and surface run-off as Local Flood Risk. It further recognised those organisations working to manage risk from these sources as Risk Management Authorities (“RMAs”). The Act gave the EA a 'strategic overview' of Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (“FCERM”), created upper tier Local Authorities (County and Unitary Councils) as Lead Local Flood Authorities (“LLFAs”) and placed a duty of co-operation on RMA’s. LLFA’s have a number of statutory duties and powers to help coordinate the management of local flood risk across their area, including the duty to produce local strategies. As such the WMA Boards are covered by four LLFAs: Cambridgeshire County Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Norfolk County Council and Suffolk County Council.

In November 1999 the then Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (“MAFF”) set out its policy approach for IDBs in a document titled High Level Targets for Flood and Coastal Defence Operating Authorities and Elaboration of the EA’s Flood Defence Supervisory Duty. The first target in this document required each operating authority to publish a policy statement setting out their plans for delivering the Government’s policy aim and objectives in their area. This included an assessment of the risk of flooding in their area, and what plans they had to reduce that risk.

In June 2001 MAFF’s role was subsumed into the new [Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs](#) (“DEFRA”). DEFRA’s wide remit includes policy responsibility for flood and coastal management in England. From 1 April 2004 DEFRA brought IDBs under the jurisdiction of the [Local Government Ombudsman](#) (“LGO”) and introduced a model complaints procedure for IDBs to use.

In May 2011 DEFRA and the EA published the [National FCERM Strategy for England](#). This forms the basis of Government’s policy response to the changes in legislation brought about under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. In March 2016 the Environment Agency published their [Flood Risk Management Plan \(“FRMP”\) for the Anglian River Basin District](#) which forms their current policy framework for the management of flooding across the WMA member Board areas. Other key documents that affect the work of IDBs are the Local Flood Risk Management Strategies for [Cambridgeshire](#), [Lincolnshire](#), [Norfolk](#) and [Suffolk](#) as well as the Local Plans developed by each Local Planning Authority (“LPA”) whose district intersects with a member Board’s area.

# Appendix 2: Roles and Functions of IDBs

## 1. IDB functions

As highlighted in the introduction, IDBs were established for predominantly low-lying areas where flood risk management and land drainage measures are necessary on a continually managed basis to sustain developed land uses and agriculture. Many of these measures are delivered through the use of permissive powers and are classed as Flood Risk Management Functions<sup>1</sup> under Section 4 of the [Flood and Water Management Act 2010](#).

To achieve the objectives of each Board's policy statements, as well as to support the delivery of national and local strategies, Water Management Alliance ("WMA") member Boards as Risk Management Authorities ("RMAs") can;

- **Undertake works** (this is the physical and practical management of water levels through the use of pumping stations and water level controls and the sustaining of volumetric capacity and flow rates within the watercourse network through maintenance activities such as desilting).
- **Regulate third party activities** (this is the consenting and enforcement of changes within their district that affect watercourses and their access and maintenance land. These changes could be the erection and alteration of structures or changes in the flow rate and volume).
- **Communicate and engage with other parties and regulatory regimes** (this is the highlighting of IDBs role, functions and requirements);
  - through the planning process to ensure that permissions granted by planning authorities are sustainable and can be implemented;
  - to riparian owners to ensure that they are aware of their responsibilities under common law
  - to other Risk Management Authorities to ensure IDB infrastructure and works are appropriately acknowledged, funded and coordinated to achieve best value.

## 2. Undertaking works

IDBs deliver their practical management of flood risk and water levels through capital works projects and revenue maintenance programmes.

Capital works are infrastructure replacement and improvement schemes that are usually funded through bids to regional and national funding programmes. Bids are submitted and reviewed on an annual basis for inclusion in the Environment Agency's ("EAs") Medium Term Plan ("MTP"). The MTP is a 6 year programme of capital works projects that are aggregated at a regional level. The bids are subject to approval through the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ("DEFRA") and EA administered project appraisal process. The MTP is approved by the relevant Regional Flood and Coastal Committee ("RFCC") that covers the submitting RMAs area. The three RFCCs that cover the WMA member Boards are the Anglian (Eastern), Anglian (Central) and Anglian (Northern) RFCCs. Progress on submission and delivery of funded capital projects is reported to the relevant WMA member Board on a quarterly basis. Further detail of the flood and coastal erosion risk management investment programme 2015 to 2021 can be found using this [link](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> "Flood risk management function" means a function under; Part 1 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, Section 159 or 160 (and a flood defence function within the meaning of section 221) of the Water Resources Act 1991, The Land Drainage Act 1991, Sections 100, 101, 110 or 339 of the Highways Act 1980, The Flood Risk Management Functions Order 2010.

Each WMA member Board delivers a Revenue Maintenance Programme. This is formed of an annual, and in some Board areas, a 5 yearly schedule of works aimed at maintaining the Board's infrastructure. The programme details the type of activity to be undertaken, where it is to be delivered (in some Board areas to the nearest drain reach) and when work is due to be undertaken (approximate to the month). Progress on the delivery of the programme is reported to the relevant Board and reviewed periodically to ensure it is delivering the appropriate standards. The Revenue Maintenance Programme for each Board is available on the WMA website.

District Board revenue programmes are generally funded by drainage rates collected from occupiers of agricultural land within the IDD as well as through special levies raised from District authorities who pay on behalf of occupiers of land within the IDD not used for agriculture (e.g. houses; businesses; shops). These occupiers pay their part of this levy as a proportion of Council Tax or Business Rates which is paid to their Local Authorities. In addition, some Boards also raise highland water contributions from the EA under Section 57 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 for the receipt of water into an IDD from lands at a higher level outside of the IDD.

# Appendix 3: WMA Member Boards

## 1. Broads (2006) IDB

The Broads (2006) IDB was established by [The Broads \(2006\) Internal Drainage Board Order 2006 \(SI 2006 No. 773\)](#). This statutory instrument amalgamated The Lower Yare First IDB (1941-2006), The Lower Yare Fourth IDB (1941-2006) and The Broads IDB (2005-2006) into one Board covering one Internal Drainage District. This consolidation has been preceded by the amalgamation of 6 IDBs into the Broads IDB in 2005 under [The Broads and Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Boards Order 2005 \(SI 2005 No. 429\)](#). The Boards amalgamated at that time were The Happisburgh to Winterton IDB (1935-2005), The Lower Bure, Halvergate Fleet and Acle Marshes IDB (1945-2005), The Muckfleet and South Flegg IDB (1936-2005), The Repps, Martham and Thurne IDB (1942-2005) the pumped catchment of The Middle Bure IDB (1935-2005) and The Smallburgh IDB (1936-2005). As such the Broads (2006) IDB is formed from the sum of 8 historic Boards.

The Board's IDD covers 19,050 hectares. This area is made up of 16,137 hectares of agricultural land including designated wildlife sites and 2,913 hectares of residential, industrial and other property. Within the District there are 4,585 hectares of designated wildlife sites. The total catchment area draining to and including the Board's District totals 45,602 hectares. The Board's infrastructure includes 340 kilometres of Board Adopted watercourses, 37 pumping stations, 62 Water Level Controls and 6 kilometres of raised embankments. Within the Board's IDD the Environment Agency has 137 kilometres of watercourses designated as Main River, 137 kilometres of raised embankments and 18 kilometres of sea and tidal defences for which they are the responsible authority.

The Board's IDD sits within the Broads area and River Yare catchment. It is organised into 59 separate catchments and sub-catchments and includes significant sub-catchments such as those of the River Thurne and River Ant. The drainage district is bounded by the dune system and the sandstone cliffs bordering the North Sea to the north east, and by the River Yare to the south. Predominantly the drainage district forms those lowland areas historically created, improved and maintained and manipulated by pumping regimes. Large areas of farm and marshland have been reclaimed from the sea and therefore a large proportion of the catchments lie below sea level. The water managed within the drainage district ultimately drains into Environment Agency ("EA") managed main rivers before finally meeting the sea as part of the River Yare primary catchment. As such a large proportion of the drainage district is at some risk of flooding (including tidal flooding).

The drainage district includes some of the country's finest grazing marshes and arable land as well as several hugely important local, national and internationally designated wildlife sites. Much of the local economy in the area is derived from agriculture and tourism that is drawn to this internationally acclaimed wildlife haven. The district services a largely rural population with the area having approximately 50,000 people. It drains several large villages such as Hickling, Upton and Sutton, the towns of Acle and Caister as well as small outlying villages and smallholdings. A map of the Board's IDD can be accessed using the following link [https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/84-BIDB\\_drainindex.pdf](https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/84-BIDB_drainindex.pdf)

The Board's IDD intersects with 7 planning authority areas, these are; [Broadland District Council](#), [Great Yarmouth Borough Council](#), [North Norfolk District Council](#), [Norwich City Council](#), [South Norfolk District Council](#), [Norfolk County Council](#) and the [Broads Authority](#). The IDD also intersects with 55 Parish Councils. Other key partners that work within Board's area include The Environment Agency, Natural England and the [Norfolk Wildlife Trust](#).

### 1.1 Previous legislation



## **Broads (2006) Internal Drainage Board [2006-Present] 11 years**

The Broads (2006) IDB was formed under The Broads (2006) Internal Drainage Board Order 2006 (SI 2006 No.773) from an amalgamation of 3 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs). These Boards were;

### **1 Broads IDB [2005-2006] 1 year**

Formed in 2005 under The Broads and Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Boards Order 2005 (Statutory Instrument 2005 No. 429) from an amalgamation of 6 Internal Drainage Boards. These Boards were;

#### **1.1 Repps, Martham and Thurne IDB [1942-2005] 63 years**

Formed in 1942 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Repps, Martham and Thurne Internal Drainage District) Order 1942.

#### **1.2 Happisburgh to Winterton IDB [1935-2005] 70 years**

Formed in 1935 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Happisburgh to Winterton Internal Drainage District) Order 1935 from an amalgamation of 2 drainage authorities. These were;

##### **1.2.1 Hempstead, Happisburgh, Eccles, Palling-next-the-Sea, Lessingham and Ingham Drainage Board [1812-1935] 123 years**

Formed under the Hempstead, Happisburgh, Eccles, Palling-next-the-Sea, Lessingham and Ingham Inclosure and Drainage Act 1812 (52 George III, cap. XVII.)

##### **1.2.2 Winterton and East and West Somerton Drainage Commission [1805-1935] 130 years**

Formed under the Winterton and East and West Somerton Inclosure and Drainage Act 1801 (45 George III, cap. VIII.)

#### **1.3 Lower Bure, Halvergate Fleet and Acle Marshes IDB [1945-2005] 60 years**

Formed in 1945 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Lower Bure, Halvergate Fleet and Acle Marshes) Internal Drainage District Order 1945.

#### **1.4 Muckfleet and South Flegg IDB [1936-2005] 69 years**

Formed in 1936 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Muckfleet and South Flegg Internal Drainage District) Order 1936.

#### **1.5 Middle Bure IDB (Pumped Catchments) [1935-2005] 70 years**

Formed in 1935 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Middle Bure Internal Drainage District) Order 1935.

#### **1.6 Smallburgh IDB (Pumped Catchments) [1936-2005] 69 years**

Formed in 1936 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Smallburgh Internal Drainage District) Order 1936 from an amalgamation of the three drainage authorities listed below. The boundaries of the Smallburgh IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk and Norfolk River Authority, the

Alteration of Boundaries of the Smallburgh Internal Drainage District Order 1972.

- 1.6.1 Potter Heigham Drainage Board [1801-1936]** 135 years  
Formed in 1801 under the Potter Heigham Inclosure and Drainage Act 1801 (41 George III, cap. LXXVI.)
  - 1.6.2 Ludham Drainage Commissioners [1801-1936]** 135 years  
Formed in 1801 under the Ludham Inclosure and Drainage Act 1800 (39 and 40 George III, cap. XXI.)
  - 1.6.3 Hickling Drainage Commissioners [1801-1936]** 135 years  
Formed in 1801 under the Hickling Inclosure and Drainage Act 1801 (41 George III, cap. XXI.)
- 2 Lower Yare First Internal Drainage Board [1941-2006]** 65 years  
Formed in 1941 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Lower Yare First Internal Drainage District) Order 1941 (SR& O 1941 No. 1096).
  - 3 Lower Yare Fourth Internal Drainage Board [1941-2006]** 65 years  
Formed in 1941 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Lower Yare Fourth Internal Drainage District) Order 1941 (SR&O 1941 No. 1099).

## 2. East Suffolk IDB

The East Suffolk IDB was established [by The East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board Order 2008 \(SI 2008 No. 750\)](#). This statutory instrument amalgamated 8 IDBs into 1 Internal Drainage District (“IDD”). The Boards amalgamated were The Alderton, Hollesley and Bawdsey Drainage Board (1922-2008), The River Blyth IDB (1934-2008), The River Deben IDB (2005-2008), The Fromus, Alde and Thorpeness IDB (1936-2008), The River Gipping IDB (1933-2008), The Lower Alde IDB (2000-2008), The Minsmere IDB (1937-2008) and The Upper Alde IDB (1936-2008). The River Deben IDB was itself a recent creation in 2005 under [The River Deben Internal Drainage Board Order 2005 \(SI 2005 No. 2515\)](#). This had merged The River Deben (Upper) IDB (1933-2005) and The River Deben (Lower) IDB (1933-2005) into 1 Board and 1 Internal Drainage District. The Lower Alde IDB was another recent creation from 2000 when the Lower Alde IDB (1941-2000) and the Middle Alde IDB (1941-2000) had been amalgamated under [The Amalgamation of the Lower Alde and Middle Alde Internal Drainage Districts Order 2000 \(SI 2000 No. 1463\)](#). As such the East Suffolk IDB is formed from the sum of 12 historic Boards.

The Board’s IDD covers 13,414 hectares. This area is made up of 11,804 hectares of agricultural land including designated wildlife sites and 2,034 hectares of residential, industrial and other property. Within the District there are 2,034 hectares of designated wildlife sites. The total catchment area draining to and including the Board’s District totals 160,290 hectares. The Board’s infrastructure includes 102 kilometres of Board Adopted watercourses and 10 pumping stations. Within the Board’s IDD the Environment Agency has 321 kilometres of watercourses designated as Main River, 59 kilometres of raised embankments and 88 kilometres of sea and tidal defences for which they are the responsible authority.

The East Suffolk IDB serves the low-lying land within the catchments of the Rivers Blyth, Minsmere/Yox, Thorpeness Hundred, Alde/Ore, Deben and Gipping. The drainage district is organised into 34 catchments and sub-catchments. It services a widely dispersed population

and drains several towns and villages including Stowmarket, Woodbridge, Halesworth, Framlingham, Saxmundham, the outlying areas of Ipswich as well as small outlying villages and smallholdings. The area includes fine arable land and grazing marsh along with several important local, national and internationally designated wildlife sites; most notably the internationally acclaimed Minsmere-Warberswick Heaths and Marshes. The area also falls within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Much of the prosperity of the area is derived from agriculture. It has a thriving local economy and is a hugely popular tourist destination. A map of the Board's IDD can be accessed using the following link [https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/ESIDB\\_Index\\_plan.pdf](https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/ESIDB_Index_plan.pdf)

The Board's IDD intersects with 6 planning authority areas, these are; [Suffolk Coastal District Council](#), [Mid Suffolk District Council](#), [Ipswich Borough Council](#), [Babergh District Council](#), [Waveney District Council](#) and [Suffolk County Council](#). The IDD also intersects 154 Parishes. Other key partners that work within Board's area include The Environment Agency, Natural England, [RSPB](#) and the [Suffolk Wildlife Trust](#).

## 2.1. Previous legislation

### **East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board [2008-Present] 9 years**

The East Suffolk IDB was formed in 2008 under The East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board Order 2008 (SI 2008 No. 750). This order constituted East Suffolk IDB from an amalgamation of 8 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs). These Boards were;

- 1 Alderton, Hollesley and Bawdsey Drainage Board [1922-2008] 86 years**  
Formed in 1922 under the Alderton, Hollesley and Bawdsey Drainage Order 1922 (SR&O 1922 No. 501). The constitution of this IDB was changed in 2013 by The East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board Transfer Order of 1932 (SR&O 1932 No. 861).
- 2 River Blyth IDB [1934-2008] 74 years**  
Formed in 1934 under a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Blyth Internal Drainage District) Order 1934 (SR&O 1934 No. 721).
- 3 River Deben IDB [2005-2008] 3 years**  
Formed in 2005 under the River Deben Internal Drainage Board Order 2005 (SI 2005 No. 2515) from an amalgamation of 2 Internal Drainage Boards. These Boards were;
  - 3.1 River Deben (Upper) IDB [1933-2005] 72 years**  
Formed in 1933 under a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Deben (Upper) Internal Drainage District) Order 1933 (SR&O 1933 No.1142). Its constitution was amended by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Deben (Upper) Internal Drainage Board) Order 1934 (SR&O 1934 No. 1345).
  - 3.2 River Deben (Lower) IDB [1933-2005] 72 years**  
Formed in 1933 under a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Deben (Lower) Internal Drainage District) Order 1933 (SR&O 1933 No. 1136). Its constitution was amended by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Deben (Lower) Internal Drainage Board) Order 1934 (SR&O 1934 No. 1344).

- 4 **Fromus, Alde and Thorpeness IDB [1936-2008]** 72 years  
Formed in 1936 under a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Fromus, Alde and Thorpeness Internal Drainage District) Order 1936 (SR&O 1936 No. 208).
- 5 **River Gipping IDB [1933-2008]** 75 years  
Formed in 1933 under a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Gipping Drainage District) Order 1933 (SR&O 1933 No. 648). The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the River Gipping Drainage District) Order 1936 (SR&O 1936 No. 207) and further altered by a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the River Gipping Drainage District) Order 1945 (SR&O 1945 No. 366).
- 6 **Lower Alde IDB [2000-2008]** 8 years  
Formed in 2000 under The Amalgamation of the Lower Alde and Middle Alde Internal Drainage Districts Order 2000 (SI 2000 No. 1463) from a merger of 2 Internal Drainage Boards. These Boards were;
  - 6.1 **Lower Alde IDB [1941-2000]** 59 years  
Formed in 1941 under a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Lower Alde Internal Drainage District) Order 1941 (SR&O 1941 No. 619).
  - 6.2 **Middle Alde IDB [1941-2000]** 59 years  
Formed in 1941 under a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Middle Alde Internal Drainage District) Order 1941 (SR&O 1941 No. 620).
- 7 **Minsmere IDB [1937-2008]** 71 years  
Formed in 1937 under a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Minsmere Internal Drainage District) Order 1937 (SR&O 1937 No. 41).
- 8 **Upper Alde IDB [1936-2008]** 72 years  
Formed in 1936 under a scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk Rivers (excluding the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Upper Alde Internal Drainage District) Order 1936 (SR&O 1936 No. 209).

### 3. King's Lynn IDB

The King's Lynn IDB was established in 2004 under [The Amalgamation of the West of Ouse, Gaywood, Magdalen, Marshland Smeeth and Fen, and Wingland Internal Drainage Districts Order 2004 \(SI 2004 No. 1657\)](#). This statutory instrument amalgamated 5 IDBs into 1 Internal Drainage District. The Boards amalgamated were The West of Ouse IDB (1944-2004), The Magdalen IDB (1937-2004), The Wingland IDB (1938-2004), The Gaywood IDB (1985-2004) and The Marshland Smeeth and Fen IDB (1937-2004). A further statutory instrument in 2013, [The Reconstitution of Kings Lynn Internal Drainage Board Order 2013 \(SI 2013 No. 3317\)](#) made changes to the Board's constitution regarding the number of elected members, reducing it from 15 to 10.

The Board's IDD covers 35,771 hectares. This area is made up of 31,467 hectares of agricultural land including designated wildlife sites and 4,304 hectares of residential, industrial and other property. Within the District there are 450 hectares of designated wildlife sites. The total catchment area draining to and including the Board's District totals 64,523 hectares. The Board's infrastructure includes 598 kilometres of Board Adopted watercourses, 15 pumping stations, 10 first and second line sluices, 15 Water Level Controls and a number of kilometres of raised embankments. Within the Board's IDD the Environment Agency has 34 kilometres of watercourses designated as Main River, 34 kilometres of raised embankments and 20 kilometres of sea and tidal defences for which they are the responsible authority.

Much of the Board's drainage district is bounded by sea defences and some of the area abuts the Wash SSSI directly, at Heacham and Snettisham. The area runs south from Hunstanton and is bounded to the West by the River Nene and is bisected by the River Ouse at King's Lynn. The IDD is organised into 31 catchments and sub-catchments.

The Board's infrastructure drains a population of approximately 100,000 individuals. It removes water from the easterly uplands, including the villages of Heacham, Ingoldisthorpe, Dersingham, Pott Row and Gayton and large residential and industrial areas of King's Lynn itself. To the west, the large fenland villages of Terrington St Clements, Clenchwarton and West Lynn and serviced by drainage board infrastructure along with many small outlying villages, homesteads and large areas of prime agricultural and arable land. A map of the Board's IDD can be accessed using the following link [https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/128-KLIDB\\_index.pdf](https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/128-KLIDB_index.pdf)

The Board's IDD intersects with 4 planning authority areas, these are; the [Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk](#), [Fenland District Council](#), [Norfolk County Council](#) and [Cambridgeshire County Council](#). The IDD also intersects 42 Parishes. Other key partners that work within Board's area include The Environment Agency, Natural England, and the [Norfolk Wildlife Trust](#).

### 3.1. Previous legislation

#### **King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board [2004-Present] 13 years**

The King's Lynn IDB was formed in 2004 under The Amalgamation of the West of Ouse, Gaywood, Magdalen, Marshland Smeeth and Fen, and Wingland Internal Drainage Districts Order 2004 (SI 2004 No. 1657) from an amalgamation of 5 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs). These Boards were;

- 1 West of Ouse IDB [1944-2004] 60 years**  
Formed in 1944 under the River Great Ouse Catchment Board (West of Ouse Internal Drainage District) Order 1944 (SR&O 1944 No. 638). The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the Anglian Water Authority (Alteration of Boundaries of the West of Ouse Internal Drainage District) Order 1982 (SI 1982 No. 501).
- 2 Magdalen IDB [1937-2004] 67 years**  
Formed in 1937 under the River Great Ouse Catchment Board (Magdalen Internal Drainage District) Order 1937 (SR&O 1937 No. 852). The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the Great Ouse River Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the Magdalen Internal Drainage District) Order 1962 (SI 1962 No. 454).
- 3 Wingland IDB [1938-2004] 66 years**  
Formed in 1938 under the River Nene Catchment Board (Wingland Internal Drainage District) Order 1938 (SR&O 1938 No. 314). The boundaries of this

IDB were altered by a number of Schemes under the following statutory instruments; the Nene River Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the Wingland Internal Drainage District) Order 1953 (SI 1953 No. 374), the Nene River Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the Wingland Internal Drainage District) Order 1956 (SI 1956 No. 455), and the Welland and Nene River Authority (Alteration of Boundaries of the Hundred of Wisbech and the Wingland Internal Drainage Districts) Order 1971 (SI 1971 No. 935).

#### **4 Gaywood IDB [1985-2004] 19 years**

Formed in 1985 under the Anglian Water Authority (Gaywood Internal Drainage District) Order 1985 (SI 1985 No. 505). This Order amalgamated 2 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs). These Boards were;

##### **4.1 Gaywood IDB [1944-1985] 41 years**

Formed in 1944 under the River Great Ouse Catchment Board (Gaywood Internal Drainage District) Order 1944 (SR&O 1944 No. 636). The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a number of schemes under the following statutory instruments; the River Great Ouse Catchment Board (Alteration of the Boundaries of the Gaywood Internal Drainage District) order 1948 (SI 1948 No. 2123) and the Anglian Water Authority (Alteration of Boundaries of the Gaywood Internal Drainage District) Order 1977 (SI 1977 No. 1449).

##### **4.2 Snettisham IDB [1932-1985] 53 years**

Formed in 1932 under the North Norfolk Rivers Catchment Board (Snettisham Internal Drainage District) Order 1932 (SR&O 1932 No. 876). Amended firstly by a scheme confirmed by the North Norfolk Rivers Catchment Board (Snettisham Internal Drainage Board) (Supplementary) Order 1933 (SR&O 1934 No. 30) and secondly by the Scheme confirmed by the Great Ouse River Authority (Snettisham Internal Drainage District) Order 1968 (SI 1968 No. 553). The Snettisham Internal Drainage District was constituted as a drainage area by the Snettisham Drainage Order 1922 (SR&O 1922 No. 1197) and has its boundaries altered firstly by the above Order of 1932 and secondly by the Scheme confirmed by the Great Ouse River Authority (Alteration of Boundaries of the Snettisham Internal Drainage District) Order 1967 (SI 1967 No.531) was continued in being as an Internal Drainage District by Section 6(4) of the Land Drainage Act 1976.

#### **5 Marshland Smeeth and Fen IDB [1937-2004] 67 years**

Formed in 1937 under The River Great Ouse Catchment Board (Marshland Smeeth and Fen Internal Drainage District) Order 1937 (SR&O 1937 No. 853).

The constitution of the King's Lynn IDB was changed in 2013 by The Reconstitution of King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board Order 2013 (SI 2013 No. 3317). This Order made changes to the Board's constitution regarding the number of elected members, reducing it from 15 to 10.

#### 4. Norfolk Rivers IDB

The Norfolk Rivers IDB was established by [The Broads and Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Boards Order 2005 \(SI 2005 No. 429\)](#). This statutory instrument amalgamated 7 IDBs into 1 Internal Drainage District (“IDD”). The Boards amalgamated were The River Wensum IDB (1933-2005), The Upper Bure IDB (1951-2005), The Upper Yare and Tas IDB (1934-2005), The Upper Nar IDB (1944-2005), The North Norfolk IDB (1995-2005) and the gravity catchments of the Middle Bure IDB (1935-2005) and Smallburgh IDB (1936-2005). The North Norfolk IDB was itself a recent creation in 1995 under [The Amalgamation of the Holme Common, River Burn and Stiffkey River Internal Drainage Boards Order 1995 \(SI 1995 No. 1325\)](#). This had merged The River Burn IDB (1921-1995), The Stiffkey River IDB (1922-1995) and The Holme Common IDB (1962-1995) into 1 Board and 1 Internal Drainage District. As such the Norfolk Rivers IDB is formed from the sum of 10 historic Boards.

The Board’s IDD covers 15,023 hectares. This area is made up of 12,853 hectares of agricultural land including designated wildlife sites and 2,170 hectares of residential, industrial and other property. Within the District there are 1,851 hectares of designated wildlife sites. The total catchment area draining to and including the Board’s District totals 239,005 hectares. The Board’s infrastructure includes 405 kilometres of Board Adopted watercourses, 2 first and second line sluices and 6 Water Level Controls. Within the Board’s IDD the Environment Agency has 311 kilometres of watercourses designated as Main River, 100 kilometres of raised embankments and 9 kilometres of sea and tidal defences for which they are the responsible authority.

The Boards district covers a large number of river valleys that all drain by gravity. The majority of these rivers (Wensum, Bure, Tas and Ant) flow east, ultimately discharging to sea via the River Yare; others (Stiffkey) flow north to the sea or west (part of the Nar catchment) towards the River Great Ouse. Man made and improved drainage has developed alongside these rivers, utilising them to mitigate and manage flood risk and drainage. These drains have historically developed for agricultural purposes however have been subject to greater use by industrial, commercial and residential development for the drainage of surface water including the large towns of Fakenham, Aylsham, North Walsham, Dereham and Wymondham, thus serving many thousands of people. This change represents a significant drainage input and challenge to the Board’s Adopted system as it is a gravity system and drainage capacity is limited.

The Norfolk Rivers IDB watercourses typically cover superficial geology of gravel or chalk and therefore have significant environmental potential for both habitat and species. In addition to the built environment mentioned previously, the majority of the drainage district serves fertile agricultural land, much of which is arable or grazing marsh. A map of the Board’s IDD can be accessed using the following link [https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/179-NRIDB\\_Index.pdf](https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/179-NRIDB_Index.pdf)

The Board’s IDD intersects with 7 planning authority areas, these are; [Breckland District Council](#), [Broadland District Council](#), [North Norfolk District Council](#), [Norwich City Council](#), [South Norfolk District Council](#), [Norfolk County Council](#) and the [Broads Authority](#). The IDD also intersects 208 Parishes. Other key partners that work within Board’s area include The Environment Agency, Natural England, and the [Norfolk Wildlife Trust](#).

## 4.1. Previous legislation

### **Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board [2005-Present] 12 years**

The Norfolk River IDB was formed under The Broads and Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Boards Order 2005 (Statutory Instrument 2005 No. 429) which amalgamated of 7 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs). These Boards were;

- 1 River Wensum IDB [1933-2005] 72 years**  
Formed in 1933 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (River Wensum Internal Drainage District) Order 1933.
- 2 Upper Bure IDB [1951-2005] 54 years**  
Formed in 1951 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Upper Bure Internal Drainage District) Order 1951. The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk and Norfolk River Authority, the Alteration of Boundaries of the Upper Bure Internal Drainage District Order 1964.
- 3 Upper Yare and Tas IDB [1934-2005] 71 years**  
Formed in 1934 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Upper Yare and Tas Internal Drainage District) Order 1934. The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the Upper Yare and Tas Internal Drainage District) Order 1939 and by a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk and Norfolk River Board (Alteration of the Upper Yare and Tas Internal Drainage District) Order 1960.
- 4 Upper Nar IDB [1944-2005] 61 years**  
Formed in 1944 under the River Great Ouse Catchment Board (Upper Nar Internal Drainage District) Order 1944.
- 5 North Norfolk IDB [1995-2005] 10 years**  
Formed in 1995 under The Amalgamation of the Holme Common, River Burn and Stiffkey River Internal Drainage Boards Order 1995 (SI 1995 No. 1325) that consolidated 3 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) into 1 Board and 1 Internal Drainage District. These Boards were;
  - 5.1 River Burn IDB [1921-1995] 74 years**  
Formed under an Order of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries dated the 29 December 1921. The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the North Norfolk Rivers Catchment Board (River Burn Drainage District) Order 1934. The constitution of this IDB was changed by a Scheme confirmed by the North Norfolk Rivers Catchment Board (Reconstitution of the River Burn Internal Drainage Board) Order 1952.
  - 5.2 Stiffkey River IDB [1922-1995] 73 years**  
Formed under an Order of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries dated the 28 July 1922. The constitution of this IDB was changed by a Scheme confirmed by the North Norfolk Rivers Catchment Board (Reconstitution of the Stiffkey River Internal Drainage Board) Order 1925. The boundaries of this IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the North Norfolk Rivers Catchment Board (Stiffkey River Drainage District) Order 1933.



**5.3 Holme Common IDB [1962-1995] 33 years**

Formed in 1962 under the East Suffolk and Norfolk River Board (Holme Common Internal Drainage District) Order 1962.

**6 Middle Bure IDB (Gravity Catchments) [1935-2005] 70 years**

Formed in 1935 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Middle Bure Internal Drainage District) Order 1935.

**7 Smallburgh IDB (Gravity Catchments) [1936-2005] 69 years**

Formed in 1936 under the East Norfolk Rivers (including the River Waveney) Catchment Board (Smallburgh Internal Drainage District) Order 1936 from an amalgamation of the three drainage authorities listed below. The boundaries of the Smallburgh IDB were altered by a Scheme confirmed by the East Suffolk and Norfolk River Authority, the Alteration of Boundaries of the Smallburgh Internal Drainage District Order 1972.

**7.1 Potter Heigham Drainage Board [1801-1936] 135 years**

Formed in 1801 under the Potter Heigham Inclosure and Drainage Act 1801 (41 George III, cap. LXXVI.)

**7.2 Ludham Drainage Commissioners [1801-1936] 135 years**

Formed in 1801 under the Ludham Inclosure and Drainage Act 1800 (39 and 40 George III, cap. XXI.)

**7.3 Hickling Drainage Commissioners [1801-1936] 135 years**

Formed in 1801 under the Hickling Inclosure and Drainage Act 1801 (41 George III, cap. XXI.)

## **5. South Holland IDB**

The South Holland IDB was established by [The Anglian Water Authority \(South Holland Internal Drainage District\) Order 1974 \(SI 1974 No. 1209\)](#). This statutory instrument amalgamated 5 IDBs into 1 Internal Drainage District. The Boards amalgamated were The Holland Elloe IDB (1940-1974), The South Holland IDB (1970-1974), The South Holland Embankment Drainage Board (1940-1974), The South Welland IDB (1938-1974) and The Sutton Bridge IDB (1936-1974). Further statutory instruments in 1978, 1993 and 2009 have altered the boundaries of the Board's Internal Drainage District or made changes to its constitution regarding electoral divisions and the number of Board members. These orders included [The Anglian Water Authority \(South Holland Internal Drainage District\) \(Amendment\) Order 1978 \(SI 1978 No. 1589\)](#), [The Reconstitution of the South Holland Internal Drainage Board Order 1993 \(SI 1993 No. 453\)](#), [The National Rivers Authority \(Alteration of Boundaries of the South Holland Internal Drainage District\) Order 1993 \(SI 1993 No. 723\)](#) and [The North Level District Internal Drainage District and the South Holland Internal Drainage District \(Alteration of Boundaries\) Order 2009 \(SI 2009 No. 1170\)](#).

The Board's IDD covers 38,461 hectares. This area is made up of 35,333 hectares of agricultural land including designated wildlife sites and 3,128 hectares of residential, industrial and other property. Within the District there are 41 hectares of designated wildlife sites. The Board is a watershed Board in that there are no other catchment areas draining to the Board's IDD. The Board's infrastructure includes 700 kilometres of Board Adopted watercourses, 17 pumping stations, 21 first and second line sluices and 9 Water Level Controls. Within the Board's IDD there are no watercourses designated as Environment Agency Main River however there are 26 kilometres of Main River adjacent to the Board's district. The EA also

manage 12 kilometres of raised embankments and 42 kilometres of sea and tidal defences within the district for which they are the responsible authority.

The Board's drainage district extends along the seaward toe of the sea defence of the Wash and the district is bounded to the east and west by the Rivers Nene and Welland respectively. South Holland IDB infrastructure takes surface water from the market towns of Long Sutton and Holbeach and the many and various outlying villages and homesteads, draining a catchment that serves an estimated 60,000 individuals. Much of the arable land to the north of the catchment has been reclaimed from the sea and the drainage district as a whole includes some of the most fertile arable land in the country. As such significant areas of the district are below sea level, experience high water tables and are susceptible to groundwater flood risk. The IDD is organised into 19 catchments and sub-catchments. A map of the Board's IDD can be accessed using the following link [https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/210-SHIDB\\_Index.pdf](https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/210-SHIDB_Index.pdf)

The Board's IDD intersects with 3 planning authority areas, these are; [Boston Borough Council](#), [South Holland District Council](#) and [Lincolnshire County Council](#). The IDD also intersects 22 Parishes. Other key partners that work within Board's area include The Environment Agency, Natural England, and the [Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust](#).

## 5.1. Previous legislation

### **South Holland Internal Drainage Board [1974-Present] 43 years**

The South Holland Internal Drainage Board was formed under The Anglian Water Authority (South Holland Internal Drainage District) Order 1974 (SI 1974 No. 1209). This Order constituted the Board in 1974 from an amalgamation of 5 Internal Drainage Boards. These Boards were;

- 1 Holland Elloe IDB [1940-1974] 34 years**  
Formed in 1940 under The River Nene Catchment Board (Holland Elloe Internal Drainage District) Order 1940 (SR&O 1940 No. 1692). The boundaries of this IDB were altered by The Nene River Board (Alteration of Boundaries of the Holland Elloe Internal Drainage District) Order 1955 (SI 1955 No. 1975).
- 2 South Holland IDB [1970-1974] 4 years**  
Formed in 1970 under The Welland and Nene River Authority (South Holland Internal Drainage District) Order 1970 (SI 1970 No. 450).
- 3 South Holland Embankment Drainage Board [1940-1974] 34 years**  
Formed in 1940 under The South Holland Embankment Drainage District Order 1940 (SR&O 1940 No. 470). The boundaries of this Board were altered by the South Holland Embankment Drainage District (Alteration of Boundaries) Order 1950 (SI 1951 No. 246 & 247).
- 4 South Welland IDB [1938-1974] 36 years**  
Formed in 1938 under The River Welland Catchment Board (South Welland Internal Drainage District) Order 1938 (SR&O 1938 No. 320).
- 5 Sutton Bridge IDB [1936-1974] 38 years**  
Formed in 1936 under The River Nene Catchment Board (Sutton Bridge Internal Drainage Board) Order 1936 (SR&O 1936 No. 1090). This IDB was amended by The River Nene Catchment Board (Sutton Bridge Internal Drainage Board) Order 1938 (SR&O 1938 No. 674).

The constitution of the South Holland IDB was changed in 1978 by The Anglian Water Authority (South Holland Internal Drainage District) (Amendment) Order 1978 (SI 1978 No. 1589). This Order altered the Electoral Divisions within the Drainage District and reduced the number of Board members to 23. A further Order was made in 1993 which abolished Electoral Divisions and reduced the number of elected Board members to 10. This Order was The Reconstitution of the South Holland Internal Drainage Board Order 1993 (SI 1993 No. 453). The boundaries of this IDB were altered in 1993 by The National Rivers Authority (Alteration of Boundaries of the South Holland Internal Drainage District) Order 1993 (SI 1994 No. 723). This Order extended the Boards area to include new land including an area known as Mossop's enclosure. In 2009 another amendment was made the Boards Internal Drainage District when the area containing the North Level Main Drain was transferred from South Holland IDB to North Level District IDB. This alteration was under The North Level District Internal Drainage District and the South Holland Internal Drainage District (Alteration of Boundaries) Order 2009 (SI 2009 No. 1170). A further order in 2009, The North Level District Internal Drainage District and the South Holland Internal Drainage District (Alteration of Boundaries) Order 2009 (SI 2009 No. 1170 Correction) made typographical corrections to the spelling of Tydd St Mary in the original Order.

# Appendix 4: Vision and Mission of the WMA

## 1. Vision

The vision of the Water Management Alliance (“WMA”) is to make each Member Board’s Drainage District and watershed catchment area a safer place to live, work, learn, grow and have fun; as a model of sustainable living in a high flood risk area.

## 2. Mission Statement

The WMA member Internal Drainage Boards (“IDBs”) aim to:

- Reduce the risk to people, property, infrastructure and the natural environment by providing and maintaining technically, environmentally and economically sustainable flood and coastal defences within our coastal zones and hydraulic sub catchment areas.
- Become the local delivery partner of choice for all flood and coastal erosion risk management services in our coastal zones and hydraulic sub catchments, by working closely with other Risk Management Authorities (“RMAs”), partners and stakeholders.
- Enable and facilitate land use for residential, commercial, recreational and environmental purposes by guiding and regulating activities that would otherwise increase flood or coastal erosion risk.
- Nurture, enhance and maintain the natural habitats and species which exist in and alongside watercourses and other Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (“FCERM”) infrastructure.

## 3. Links to National Objectives

The Environment Agency (“EA”) has a duty under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a [National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management \(“FCERM”\) Strategy for England](#). The EA is also required to report to the Minister on flood and coastal erosion risk management including the application of the National Strategy. The EA publishes this report annually.

The overall aim of the National FCERM Strategy is **“to ensure the risk of flooding and coastal erosion is properly managed by using the full range of options in a coordinated way”**. Set out in the table below are the key objectives included in the National FCERM Strategy to achieve this aim.

*The Government will work with individuals, communities and organisations to reduce the threat of flooding and coastal erosion by:*

- *understanding the risks of flooding and coastal erosion, working together to put in place long-term plans to manage these risks and making sure that other plans take account of them;*
- *avoiding inappropriate development in areas of flood and coastal erosion risk and being careful to manage land elsewhere to avoid increasing risks;*

- *building, maintaining and improving flood and coastal erosion management infrastructure and systems to reduce the likelihood of harm to people and damage to the economy, environment and society;*
- *increasing public awareness of the risk that remains and engaging with people at risk to encourage them to take action to manage the risks that they face and to make their property more resilient;*
- *improving the detection, forecasting and issue of warnings of flooding, planning for and co-ordinating a rapid response to flood emergencies and promoting faster recovery from flooding.*

The WMA member Board's support the Government's policy aim and objectives for the management of flood and coastal erosion risk and water levels. Each member Board has an adopted Business Plan Policy Statement that sets out the Board's approach to meeting the national policy aims and objectives. These policy statements are available on the links below;

- [Broads \(2006\) IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [East Suffolk IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [King's Lynn IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [Norfolk Rivers IDB Policy Statement](#)
- [South Holland IDB Policy Statement](#)

# Appendix 5: IDBs and the Planning Process

## 1. The Rationale for IDB engagement with the planning process

According to the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2018), strategic policies set by Local Planning Authorities in their Local Plans should take into account advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.

In determining planning applications in accordance with national policy, local policies and relevant guidance, LPAs take into account advice from a number of different sources. These sources include from statutory consultees (such as Lead Local Flood Authorities (“LLFAs”) and the Environment Agency (“EA”)) as well as from other Risk Management Authorities (“RMAs”) on a non-statutory basis such as Internal Drainage Boards (“IDBs”), Anglian Water or the [Canal and River Trust](#).

Between December 2014 and March 2015 Government reviewed and consulted the arrangements for providing advice to planning authorities on drainage and flood risk. As part of their [response](#) to this consultation Government stated they recognised the important role IDBs fulfil in flood risk management and agreed that *“there may be local instances where they should be consulted on new development proposals on a non-statutory basis.”* Government considered at that time that the provision of advice from these bodies would best be established through local arrangements.

## 2. The Scope for IDB engagement with the planning process

The scope of IDB comments on planning applications relates primarily to each Board’s role as a RMA as defined by Section 6 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. In March 2012 Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”). This is a key element of the planning framework used by LPAs and decision-makers, both in drawing up plans and making decisions about planning applications. This framework was revised in July 2018 and the latest version published in February 2019. Section 14 of this document, “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change” (paragraphs 148 to 169) contains key information on how flood risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems (“SuDS”) should be considered as part of new development.

Paragraph 156 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should be supported by a SFRA and should manage flood risk from all sources. It further highlights that in developing these policies LPAs should take into account the advice from other relevant flood risk management bodies such as IDBs. Paragraph 163 of the NPPF includes important references to flood risk and SuDS for LPAs considering planning applications. Amongst many other considerations it highlights that when determining planning applications, LPAs should for all types of development ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere

In addition to Planning Policy, Government has updated Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”) to include a section on Flood risk and coastal change. This includes a number of references to IDBs including Paragraph 006 which states that LPAs should confer with IDBs to identify the scope of their interests. Paragraph 011 also highlights that SFRA’s should be prepared by LPAs in consultation with IDBs alongside other RMAs. Furthermore, the technical nature of

the type of issues that Government believes IDBs could provide advice on is highlighted by Paragraph 086 which advises LPAs to consult IDBs where the proposed drainage system from a new development may directly or indirectly involve the discharge of water into an ordinary watercourse within the board's district.

The link between such technical matters as surface water discharges from new development to the policy considerations of the NPPF relate primarily to the potential consequences of unregulated activities on the IDB network and how they may impact the communities they serve. For example, un-attenuated discharges into IDB watercourses can, in many cases, lead to an increase in flood risk downstream of the development site or, in extreme cases, on the development site itself. Where either scenario may occur then the matter becomes a material planning consideration as it would contravene the NPPF statement under Paragraph 163. To this end Table 1 has been included in this document to summarise when the Board should be consulted by LPAs as the consequence of unregulated activities may contravene planning policy or impact the ability of developers to implement their planning permission, both of which may be material planning considerations.

## Appendix 6: Local Planning Authorities

No.	Local Planning Authority	County	Area of IDD within LPA area (ha)	IDB's within LPA area
1	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Norfolk	33,101 1,102	King's Lynn IDB Norfolk Rivers IDB
2	Breckland District Council	Norfolk	2,651	Norfolk Rivers IDB
3	Broadland District Council	Norfolk	5,565 4,154	Broads (2006) IDB Norfolk Rivers IDB
4	Broads Authority	Norfolk	TBD	Broads (2006) IDB Norfolk Rivers IDB
5	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Norfolk and Suffolk	5,221	Broads (2006) IDB
6	Norfolk County Council	Norfolk	67,129	Broads (2006) IDB, King's Lynn IDB, Norfolk Rivers IDB
7	North Norfolk District Council	Norfolk	7,670 4,394	Broads (2006) IDB Norfolk Rivers IDB
8	Norwich City Council	Norfolk	222	Norfolk Rivers IDB
9	South Norfolk District Council	Norfolk	597 2,452	Broads (2006) IDB Norfolk Rivers IDB
10	Babergh District Council	Suffolk	177	East Suffolk IDB
11	Ipswich Borough Council	Suffolk	59	East Suffolk IDB
12	Mid Suffolk District Council	Suffolk	1,393	East Suffolk IDB
13	East Suffolk Council	Suffolk	TBD	East Suffolk IDB
14	Suffolk County Council	Suffolk	TBD	East Suffolk IDB
15	Boston Borough Council	Lincolnshire	69	South Holland IDB
16	South Holland District Council	Lincolnshire	38,182 2,426	South Holland IDB King's Lynn IDB
17	Lincolnshire County Council	Lincolnshire	40,677	South Holland IDB
18	Fenland District Council	Cambridgeshire	267	King's Lynn IDB
19	Cambridgeshire County Council	Cambridgeshire	267	King's Lynn IDB