

## Annex A

Do you have any comments on the actions for the whole catchment or would like to suggest any additional actions (P19)?	
--	--

<b>Policy Unit One</b>	<b>Swainby,Broughton and Greenhow,Fylingdales, Dales</b>
Do you agree with the chosen policy as the preferred option for these areas (p22)?	
Agree/Disagree	If you disagree please comment
2.Do you have any comments on the actions or would you like to suggest additional actions?	
<b>Policy Unit Two</b>	<b>Birdsall(Derwent District), Stockton &amp; Bossall (Ryedale South West), Ampleforth, Rillington</b>
Do you agree with the chosen policy as the preferred option for these areas (p23)?	
Agree/Disagree	If you disagree please comment
2.Do you have any comments on the actions or would you like to suggest additional actions?	

<b>Policy Unit Three</b>	<b>Sherburn, Amotherby, Thornton Dale, Wolds Weighton, Linhead, Scalby, Derwent (Derwent Valley), Ayton (Derwent Valley)</b>
Do you agree with the chosen policy as the preferred option for these areas (p24)?	
Agree/Disagree	If you disagree please comment
2.Do you have any comments on the actions or would you like to suggest additional actions?	

<b>Policy Unit Four</b>	<b>Hovingham, Kirkbymoorside, Kirby Misperton (Cropton &amp; Sinnington), Wheldrake, North Duffield, Pocklington, Howdenshire, Howden</b>
Do you agree with the chosen policy as the preferred option for these areas (p26)?	
Agree/Disagree	If you disagree please comment
2.Do you have any comments on the actions or would you like to suggest additional actions?	

<b>Policy Unit Five</b>	<b>East &amp; West Norton, Malton, Helmsley, East &amp; West Pickering</b>
Do you agree with the chosen policy as the preferred option for these areas (p28)?	
Agree/Disagree	If you disagree please comment
2.Do you have any comments on the actions or would you like to suggest additional actions?	

<b>Policy Unit Six</b>	<b>Hemingbrough, Cayton, Hertford, Seamer, Sheriff Hutton, Derwent (Dunnington)</b>
Do you agree with the chosen policy as the preferred option for these areas (p29)?	
Agree/Disagree	If you disagree please comment
2.Do you have any comments on the actions or would you like to suggest additional actions?	

13. Do you have any further comments, questions or feedback on any part of the document?	
--	--

**Comments**

It is disturbing that defences for Pickering are listed in the plan only as a “medium term” option which is utterly unacceptable.

Medium term is classed as a project being carried out in 5 to 25 years timescale – it needs to be moved to a Short-term classification.

Evidence in support of fast tracking the scheme in Pickering:

Seventy homes and businesses flooded this year  
Six floods in the town in eight years  
£3.5 million damage this summer alone  
Cost of defences, £6.7million  
Further floods inevitable without defences

It is alarming that the agency has failed to carry out any accurate census of the properties flooded and in advice to Ministers constantly underestimates the number.

Just as bad, the inaccurate figures on which it is working are used to determine the points score on which decisions on schemes are currently based.

As was pointed out last night, there is a lack of adequate rural proofing in the agency assessments which results in Ryedale losing out to heavily populated urban areas. *(Policy Unit 5)*

### **General goals**

It does make sense to plant more trees and look at creation of flood meadows, as well as "gripping" on the moors, to reduce the speed of run off into the river system.

The measures are increasingly crucial to help combat climate change and more intense bursts of rain which are already worsening the risk of repeated flooding. *(Policy Unit 4)*

These concerns have to be addressed in terms of helping to "future proof" existing defences at Malton, Norton and Old Malton,

It is also welcome that the plan indicates that these defences will be kept under review with the potential to improve them as necessary.

That review needs to also include Mill Beck pumping station which has worked well so far but offers a one in 10 year level of protection instead of one in 50 or 75. *(Policy Unit 5)*

It is unlikely that consensus can ever be achieved over the competing views - even in the face of the evidence – between protecting land and allowing it to flood to help save homes.

What can and should be agreed is that in the event of land being sacrificed to flood plain and water meadows, the farmers must be properly compensated.

In the event that the Environment Agency moves to abandon defences protecting agricultural land it must also take into account the extent of the sacrifice being made.

It needs to demonstrate that the measures will result in lowered flood risk for homes and businesses.

It should not be acceptable to allow agricultural land to flood unless there is a positive benefit in protecting people, property and/or roads.

The agency should also take into account the potential extent of the loss of productive land in any decision to allow existing defences to fail. (*Policy Unit 1, 2, 3 and 6*)

### **Siltation**

The plan admits that siltation is a cause of damage to the River Derwent Special Area Of Conservation. That recognition deserves to be commended.

The shift is unlikely to remove the agency's objections to wholesale dredging on grounds of cost but it does show the ecological argument against the measure is bogus,

The authority can legitimately argue for sequential dredging in key areas as part of a package protecting people and habitat.