

**STORM DAMAGE UPDATE**

**EXECUTIVE MEMBER:** Councillor Peter Kane  
**LEAD OFFICER:** Janice Carrol  
**REPORT AUTHOR:** Jackie O'Reilly

**WHAT BENEFITS WILL THESE PROPOSALS BRING TO COPELAND RESIDENTS?**

This report identifies options for remedial action arising from weather related infrastructure damage caused during the December 2013 to February 2014 period. Subject to repair work being concluded this report results in flood and coastal defences continuing to protect property.

**WHY HAS THIS REPORT COME TO THE EXECUTIVE?**

To formalise the release of funding to effect storm repairs and to agree support and accountable body arrangements for work which would otherwise not be undertaken by this Council?

**RECOMMENDATIONS: That**

- a) a maximum of £150,000 be released from the Coastal Management Reserve to undertake repairs and associated work in relation to the Council's assets, as follows:
  - In 2013/14 the net amount (residual) required once all eligible Bellwin expenditure has been claimed; and
  - In 2014/15 the remainder of the maximum £150k, required to fund relevant works
- b) That Officers supports partners in relation to Whitehaven Harbour, Seamill Lane, and the Whitehaven Cattle Arches to develop flood and coastal defence repairs on the proviso there is no financial contribution from the Council and
- c) That, where necessary to secure external funding, the Council act as accountable body in relation to the three projects identified in b)
- d) That officers submit a Bellwin application for the maximum possible expenditure permissible under the scheme and report back to Executive when the outcome is known. Funding received through the Bellwin scheme to be returned to the Coastal Management Reserve; and

e) That officers review the Council's sandbagging policy and bring proposals back to Executive.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report builds on the update given to Executive on 13 February in relation to weather related damage incurred over the early December to early February 2014 period. The briefing note prepared for the 13 February is appended to this report, which seeks to develop and formalise the issues and opportunities presented last month.
- 1.2 Subsequent analysis by the Environment Agency has shown the weather conditions over the two month period are unlikely to be experienced more than once in a lifetime. In particular the event of the 3<sup>rd</sup> January is only likely to have a repeat period of 50 to 75 years. During this time the Council's Environmental Health, Building Control, Property, Street Cleaning, Refuse Collection and Parks teams were heavily involved at all hours of the day and night responding to sand bagging requests, assessing structural damage to the Council's and other buildings, investigating individual problem areas and clearing fallen trees and other debris. Members will be aware from national media coverage that local authorities sand bagging policies have been subject to scrutiny. For information appended to this report as Appendix C is the summary document available to residents from the Cumbria Constabulary website of sandbagging policies across the County.
- 1.3 This report can be best broken down into 4 main elements. Being; a) the immediate impacts of the weather and potential cost recovery b) Fresh water incidents and the Council's obligations c) Coastal incidents and remedial actions and d) Partnership initiatives.
- a) The immediate impacts of the weather and potential cost recovery.  
The Government have opened the "Bellwin" scheme for those authorities who suffered flooding from 5 December to 18 February. Officers have registered the Council's intention to consider making a claim under the scheme which will cover the Council's costs above £18,208 (ie above 0.2% of the annual budget). Normally Bellwin payments are made at 85% of actual expenditure. However on this occasion the Government has stated it will be paid at 100%. Appendix B identifies types of qualifying expenditure and examples that would not qualify. Since the Council's teams delivered several thousand sandbags using over 75 tonnes of sand in addition to the other flooding related activity summarised in 1.2 officers are confident the Bellwin threshold has been exceeded and this means any expenditure incurred by the Council in excess of the threshold on storm related infrastructure repairs should be recoverable. Executive should be

aware that the Bellwin scheme will only refund costs where those costs are incurred within 2 months of the event. Work has progressed since the decision of Executive on 13 February to effect repairs with North Shore complete, South Shore closed to traffic, St Bees in progress at the time of writing as is Seascale. Having commenced work at St Bees it became apparent the storm damage has been more severe than was obvious when Executive were briefed in February. The consequence is the volume of concrete needed to fill voids created in the promenade and scour apron is significantly higher than anticipated resulting in an increased cost of approximately £45k. As noted this additional cost should not fall on the Council as it should be eligible for the Bellwin claim. However the release of funding from reserves provides a cushion to allow the works to progress. Executive on 13 February agreed to release up to £125,000, however with the severity of the damage at St Bees being worse than originally thought, reserves of up to £150,000 is now requested.

b) Fresh water incidents and the Council's obligations.

To confirm, Executive was advised on the 13<sup>th</sup> the majority of the fresh water incidents occurring in Copeland are the responsibility of Cumbria County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority to investigate. As detailed in Appendix A this Council may have riparian responsibility for surface water run-off at Whinlatter Road, subject to confirmation of land ownership and possibly for a water leak which may be contributing to high water levels at Gable Road, both in Whitehaven. If this is the case estimated costs are £13,000 in total for both sites.

c) Coastal incidents and remedial actions.

Coastal damage has been more severe and widespread than freshwater flooding incidents on this occasion. Council owned assets at Parton, Whitehaven (North and South Shores), St Bees and Seascale suffering from the high tides and storm conditions. The agreed approach to each of these is as follows.

Parton, the estimated cost of repairing storm damage to the coast defenses is £27k excluding any access costs involved in crossing Network Rail property. Early indications are Network Rail is open to a joint approach to work at Parton as they were already programming activity in the village. This is fortunate because the complications of working with Network Rail means that the Council would not be able to effect repairs within the 2 month time period required to support a Bellwin claim. Should this be confirmed they will be asked to be the lead for the necessary works coordinating this Council's repairs alongside their own work, obviating the need to negotiate, and pay for, access arrangements.

In relation to Whitehaven the costs of making good damage to North Shore promenade and rock armour is estimated at £12,000 with there being no significant issues in relation to getting the work completed. As mentioned in

February to Police had asked for access to South Shore to be closed to vehicular traffic. Repairs have now been concluded.

At St Bees a sink hole had developed in the northern end of the promenade close to the previously planned Rottington Beck consolidation work, the contract for which had been let prior to this more recent incident. Subsequent to the February Executive briefing detailed examination shows the storm damage is more severe than originally thought. It is now necessary to repair the sink hole ahead of the Rottington Beck project plus carry out additional remedial work to the scour apron at a revised estimate of £60,000.

The gabion baskets fronting Seascale foreshore have suffered in the storms and remedial work in the order of £35,000 is needed to repair and replace these with rock armour. The Parish Council have indicated they would be willing to accept the coast defense structure as part of the Community Asset Transfer of the foreshore area already underway if the defenses are repaired, making the investment in the repairs particularly worthwhile in the longer term.

#### d) Partnership initiatives

Although the Council has no direct responsibility, the potential to secure government/third party funding for other infrastructure as coastal defence authority means that other areas may benefit from the Council's, non-financial, support. St Bees parish council have confirmed they would wish to work with this council to develop a scheme for the Seamill Lane defences at St Bees. Therefore it is recommended that Executive confirm the indicative bid for Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) as part of the 2014 bidding process. In relation to Whitehaven Harbour a FDGiA award of £325k has been awarded with this Council's support. To secure the grant the Council has agreed to act as accountable body passporting the funding on to the Whitehaven Harbour commissioners in order to allow repairs to be made to the harbour walls and this has been agreed by the Chief Executive as an urgent action. As the situation caused by the storms required immediate action to secure this external funding Council is being asked to confirm the accountable body activity in retrospect. The accountable body status in Seamill Lane and Whitehaven Harbour is predicated on condition that no long term liability is created for the Council by way of ownership or otherwise of new coastal defence assets. In addition to these two coastal initiatives, Mirehouse Residents Group have approached the Council to ask if it would support them, by way of being accountable body, for a project to help alleviate surface water ponding at Wasdale Close cattle arch and between Whinlatter Road and Uldale Road under the railway line. With an

estimated total cost of circa £16,000 it is recommended the Council does support this local initiative in return for an accountable body fee of 15%.

### **3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**

3.1 There are a number of variants possible to the proposals above. These include, not supporting the partnership initiatives and not repairing damage to the Council's own assets. However, to maximise the benefits or external funding and to help prevent future flooding and coastal damage no alternative options are recommended.

### **5. STATUTORY OFFICER COMMENTS**

5.1 The Monitoring Officer's comments are: No legal issues arise directly from the report. Overall the Council has power to undertake the works either as coast protection authority, as a district council carrying out flood risk management works or as landowner. However legal issues do arise in respect of each project in terms of liability, accountable body arrangements, land ownership, etc and the Deputy Monitoring Officer is consulted and advises on those matters as appropriate.

5.2 The Section 151 Officer's comments are:

The Council is seeking external income to cover the costs arising from the recent flooding and storm damage. This includes the application to the Belwin scheme. It is hoped that this application will recover the majority of the costs incurred, but should that not be the case the coastal management reserve which has been earmarked for this purpose will be used for up to £150K. There are sufficient funds in the coastal management reserve to cover this.

5.3 EIA Comments: None

5.4 Policy Framework: None

5.5 Other consultee comments, if any:

### **6. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS**

6.1 Funding up to a maximum of £150,000 from the Coastal Management Reserve.

**7. HOW WILL THE PROPOSALS BE PROJECT MANAGED AND HOW ARE THE RISKS GOING TO BE MANAGED?**

7.1 Projects will be managed by the Council Land Drainage and Coastal Defence Officer.

**List of Appendices**

Appendix A – Briefing Paper of February 13

Appendix B – Bellwin Eligibility

Appendix C – Sandbagging policies

**List of Background Documents: None**

## **Appendix A**

### **Fresh Water Incidents**

#### **Distington**

Swallow Hill and Hayescastle Road area suffered primarily from watercourses and culverts overflowing along with some surface water flooding. Primary responsibility for investigation the problems is the Lead Local Flood Authority - Cumbria County Council.

No formal issues for CBC

#### **Parton**

The only reported property flooding was from an ordinary watercourse affecting one house and surface water is thought to have entered the school. Primary responsibility for investigation the problem is Lead Local Flood Authority.

No formal issues for CBC.

#### **Whitehaven Centre**

Sunny Hill area and town bus station area suffered from surface water flooding. Surface run off from Harras Moor and overtopping of a culvert appear to be primary causes. Primary responsibility for investigation the problems is the Lead Local Flood Authority.

No issues for Copeland.

Cellar flooding in market place due to failure of UU pumping station at West Strand. Issue complicated by the potential for groundwater levels being elevated by impounded water in harbour.

No formal issues for CBC

#### **Mirehouse**

Reports are that at least 2 properties on Whinlatter Road flooded from surface water/ditch in field behind via an adopted bridleway on Copeland land. Potential solution is to get surface water into culvert under bridleway. If Copeland responsibility this would require Flood Defence Consent from Cumbria County Council and bridleway closure. Primary responsibility for investigation the problem is the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Potential CBC Issue – Estimated cost if so £10,000

At least 3 properties on Derwentwater Road reported to have been flooded by surface water entering through constructional gap between houses. No obvious source of water. Primary responsibility for investigation the problem is the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Possible, but unlikely, origin from CBC land behind higher up streets.

Fire brigade managed to prevent property flooding on Gable Road, twice. Main source is from highway and green beside. Primary responsibility for investigation the problem is the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Run off and water leak from CBC land may contribute. If so estimated cost to determine source of leak and make good £3k

### Woodhouse

One property on Woodhouse has flooded. Initially believed to be groundwater, but possibly also surface water. Primary responsibility for investigation the problem is the Lead Local Flood Authority.

May be planning enforcement issue for CBC.

### Orgill

Several properties in Orgill suffered flooding from Skirting Beck and surface water. Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority are the primary agencies to investigate and work has been continuing since 2012 to address this.

Potential riparian and unadopted surface water sewer issues for CBC, but no evidence to date that these have been contributory factors.

### Sandwith

This is primarily a surface water issue from field run off and is a major issue at Sandwith. I understand Lead Local Flood Authority are publishing a report of Sandwith flooding, but there is no timescale on this at present.

No issues for CBC

## Moresby Parks

Station House and a property on Churchill Drive reported to have flooded. This is on the Lead Local Authority Authority flooding hotspot list. Station House suffers from surface water flooding and backing up of sewers. No CBC issues known.

## **Coastal Incidents**

### Parton

Coastal defence overtopping was reported to have caused garage flooding. Issues of tidal (or gravity) locking of watercourse did cause problems, but reports of it entering properties limited. Environment Agency/Lead Local Flood Authority primary authorities to investigate. The EA is the primary lead for tidal flooding

Movement of rock armour has occurred to the north of the slipway. In addition the gabion baskets and the concrete plinth they sit on have collapsed to the north of rock armour. Erosion behind and to the north threatens the integrity of the railway and may make it easier for water to flood down the subway into Foundry Road in future. Some of the rock armour needs reconfiguring and additional rock placed in the lower areas. It would be more effective to replace the gabion baskets with rock armour, rather than new gabion baskets.

CBC own the coastal defence assets. Estimated figures, excluding access costs, is £27k. Network Rail have a programmed scheme at Parton and indications are they are willing to work with the Council to dovetail their works with ours.

### Whitehaven North Shore

The northern slipway is badly damaged at the end, there is superficial damage to the block paving along the promenade to the north of the main slipway. There has been some undercutting of the concrete slab to the south of the main slipway. Rock armour has moved and some reconfiguration is required. There would be a benefit from installing further armour in locations where the levels have dropped.

CBC own the coastal defence assets. Estimated cost to rectify is £12k. No issues anticipated issues with consents and access.

### Whitehaven Harbour / South Shore

Significant damage to Whitehaven harbour occurred during the storm on the 5<sup>th</sup> December 2013, which was from the north west. The harbour withstood the storms on the 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2014, as the storm was from the south west.

CBC asked to be the accountable body for repair funding.

Further significant erosion has occurred at South Shore.

Cumbria Constabulary are asking the Council to close the area to vehicular access as soon as practical. Closure is an inevitability as the colliery spoil erodes back to base rock. Estimated cost £3k

#### St Bees Promenade

A sink hole has appeared at St Bees promenade. This appears stable, but further investigations are planned and repairs carried out before planned works are undertaken to the Rottington Beck scour apron ( for which the contract has been awarded)

CBC Estimated cost of repairs is £15k

Erosion behind the promenade on the privately owned land has made Hartleys' café more vulnerable. The owner has been contacted made aware.

No CBC issues

#### Seamill lane, St Bees

Gabion baskets at Seamill have been badly damaged and erosion has taken place behind them. The rock armour appears to be in reasonable condition. It is likely to be difficult to repair and/or replace the gabion baskets, so additional rock armour would be the preferred solution. Access would need to be from St Bees slipway over the St Bees Head SSSI and Marine Conservation Zone. A Marine Management Organisation licence may be required. A review of the Council's files indicates it has no formal responsibility for the defence works, which primarily protect the railway line with consequential benefits for the properties in the near proximity. In the past the Council has undertaken some limited works on the gabion baskets for H&S reasons, and Network Rail have also undertaken rock armour placement.

No direct CBC issues.

#### Coulderton, Nethertown and Braystones

Significant damage and flooding to properties occurred on the 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2014. There is some informal beach profiling by residents to try and provide some protection. Subsequent to the storm event, efforts by CBC officers, the EA and police to identify people and properties at risk and provide future warnings has taken place.

No direct CBC issues

### Seascale

Damage to CBC gabion baskets has occurred. The preferred restoration option is the placement of rock armour, which is much more robust and easier to maintain. The Parish Council have indicated they are prepared to accept responsibility for the coastal defences as part of the Community Asset Transfer of the foreshore area if remedial work is carried out.

CBC Estimated cost are likely to be around £35k

Some damage has occurred to the main seawall to the south, which is primarily a Cumbria Highways issue.

Very little if any CBC responsibility. (limited costs included in gabion works at Seascale above)

### Saltcoats

No known damage but the storm surge came close to overtopping defences

### Ravenglass

A number of properties flooded at Ravenglass. Full details are not known, but it is believed that the integrity of the private defence walls may have been a contributory factor for some. It is also understood that overtopping in one garden led to a homeowner lifting a sewer manhole, which then inundated the combined sewer system, leading to several properties being flooded with sewage.

The Environment Agency is the primary agency for tidal flooding and United Utilities for sewer flooding.

### Eskmeals

The defence works undertaken by the Community/Parish Council at the foreshore to protect the access road to Eskmeals have been damaged.

No CBC issues.

## **CBC Obligations**

### **Coast Protection Authority**

Copeland is the Coast Protection Authority for its coastal boundary. Coast protection is defined as the protection of the land from erosion and the encroachment of the sea. The Council's powers are permissive not obligatory and there is no absolute right of protection. DEFRA may provide Flood Defence Grant in Aid for capital works, not repairs.

### **Land Drainage Authority**

Copeland is a Land Drainage Authority, but nowadays has fewer powers than it did prior to the Floods and Water Management Act 2010. The Council's former powers are now largely vested in the Lead Local Flood Authority.

The Council as a riparian owner has some obligations to deal with water on its land. The Beck Maintenance Programme undertaken by Parks and Open Spaces covers most of the Council's obligations regarding this.

### **Unadopted Sewers**

Following the housing stock transfer, the Council retained responsibility for a number of sewers. To date there is no evidence that these have contributed to flooding.

The Council also has powers to investigate private sewers where these may be contributing to public health concerns.

Total cost exposure = £125k (incls some for design/spec work)

## Appendix B

### **Examples of expenditure that would be expected to qualify**

- a) in relation to non-administration purposes, the costs of setting up temporary premises including costs of removal, increased costs due to rent, rates, taxes, lighting, heating, cleaning and insurance;
- b) where local authorities issue sandbags as a result of an emergency the cost can be claimed through the Bellwin scheme.
- c) hire of additional vehicles, plant and machinery that are not those already in use by the authority, and incidental expenses;
- d) removal of all trees and timber which are or may be dangerous to the public, including trees in public parks, local authority trees on highways, and trees owned by private householders which have fallen on or threaten public highways or rights of way;
- e) the costs of initial repairs to highways, pavements and footpaths, where a tree, item of street furniture or debris from a damaged building has fallen, and the surface of the road must be replaced at the time or temporarily patched (however, subsequent permanent repair would not qualify);
- f) the costs of initial land drainage works to clear debris and unblock watercourses which are or may be the cause of danger to the public (however, long-term repair or replacement of previously dangerous or damaged structures would not qualify);
- g) the costs of other work to clear debris causing obstruction or damage to highways, pavements and footpaths;
- h) additional temporary employees or contractors, to work on the emergency or replace permanent employees diverted from normal work;
- i) special overtime for employees, either during the emergency for overtime worked on the emergency itself, or afterwards to catch up on work from which they were diverted by the incident;
- j) emergency works required to safeguard dangerous structures, including making them secure (where not insurable);

- k) costs of evacuating people from dangerous structures, and temporary rehousing;
- l) costs of providing emergency supplies of food and other emergency provisions, and key services to affected communities during the period of the emergency;
- m) costs of maintaining key communications, in particular clearing roads or providing emergency information to affected communities;
- n) where repair is insufficient, the removal and replacement of street lighting, street signs, bus shelters and other street furniture, fences, railings, and uninsurable outbuildings damaged by the incident, where in its damaged state it presents a danger to public safety or security;
- o) legal, clerical and other charges incurred on the above work;
- p) Expenditure in respect of works undertaken by internal trading organisations (or internal trading services (formerly Direct Services Organisations) in response to an emergency will be eligible for grant in the same way as other expenditure of the Local Authority i.e. if it is additional to what the authority would have paid in the absence of an emergency and is otherwise eligible it will qualify for grant.

## **Examples of expenditure that would not be expected to qualify**

The following are examples of expenditure that would normally not qualify under this scheme:

- a) costs which are normally insurable, whether by the authority or any other party (e.g. under household insurance policies);

The Department for Communities and Local Government currently takes the Zurich Municipal SELECT policy that can now be obtained for costs exceeding £100,000, as its definition of what is normally insurable by the authority for the purpose of schemes set up under section 155. Authorities should in particular note that:

- the shoring-up or dismantling of damaged buildings is an insurable cost;
- authorities whose policies may bear less risk than the Zurich Municipal SELECT Policy would still be bound by its definition of normally insurable risks as regards qualifying expenditure under a Bellwin scheme: authorities whose policies include cover for greater risks than the basic SELECT Policy should exclude from their qualifying expenditure all costs for which they are covered and will be compensated.

- b) Environment agency levy costs.
- c) loss of income (e.g., from facilities closed as a result of the emergency), as this falls outside the scope of section 155 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989;
- d) the normal wages and salaries of the authority's regular employees, whether diverted from their normal work or otherwise, and the standing costs of the authority's plant and equipment;
- e) longer term works of repair and restoration, such as tree planting and repair or refurbishment of damaged but not dangerous structures;
- f) any element of betterment, e.g. repairs to buildings to a significantly higher standard than their condition on the day before the incident;
- g) expenditure eligible for any other specific grants, e.g. police grant;
- h) Any amounts in respect of specific works on flood defence or coastal protection which had already been allocated within budgeted expenditure to

these works before the incident occurred (however, subsequent amounts for emergency work resulting from the incident above the level of any amounts thus allocated would usually be eligible for assistance);

- i) any expenditure on flood defence or coast protection that will be compensated by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs by means of grant.

## **SANDBAG POLICIES**

Below are details of the Sandbag policies for the District Councils and the Environment Agency.

### **Allerdale Borough Council**

The Borough Council do not have a sandbag response service.

### **Barrow in Furness Borough Council**

Barrow Borough Council do not supply sandbags to members of the public. They inform them that sandbags will not stop water ingress, they are only useful for diverting the flow of water.

### **Carlisle City Council *(this supercedes the policy in the Multi Agency Flood Plan)***

Carlisle City Council does not issue sandbags.

### **Copeland Borough**

Local Authorities are not required to provide materials for flood protection, but as a caring authority Copeland will supply sandbags as an emergency or preventative measure in accordance with our Sandbag Policy.

However it should be noted that sandbags are of limited use. In the short term they are adequate for deflecting running water or deflecting the effects of waves produced by passing vehicles and in filtering any contaminants in the water. Where there is standing water and the water level is higher than doors or airbricks, sandbags will be of no use. Sandbags will be of no help if your property is already flooded and Copeland will discourage their use in these circumstances unless there is a risk from sewage contamination.

A sandbag barrier can be made more effective by draping a plastic sheet over the top of the bags and then weighing this down with further sandbags to make a seal. Copeland do not provide plastic sheets or plastic bags. Once sandbags have been delivered they become the property owners responsibility and this includes the responsibility for their deployment, appropriate maintenance and subsequent legal disposal.

The number to phone to request sandbags is:

**Copeland Direct on 0845 054 8600**

**(This number has out of hours support for flooding – after a message about what out of hours support is available it automatically diverts to an out of hours call centre).**

### **Eden District Council**

What Eden District Council will do:

- Provide sand and sandbags to properties located in formal flood warning areas during a declared Flood Warning period in Appleby, Eamont Bridge, Bolton, Eden Hall and Armathwaite.
- Deliver sand bags to individual properties at imminent risk of flooding subject to available resources and other priorities during a flooding event.
- Provide a maximum of eight sand bags per property.
- Make sand bags available for collection by residents from TFE Accord depot at Old London Road, Penrith only on approval of Eden District Council's Client team telephone **01768 817817**.
- Provide sand bag dumps at places vulnerable to flooding that in the opinion of the Director of Technical Services can assist in reducing the demand on resources during a flooding incident. Currently these dumps are maintained at Eamont Bridge and High Bridge, Stockdalewath.

What Eden District Council will not do:

- Provide sand bags to non-residential properties not in formal flood zones.
- Clear blocked culverts, bridges and watercourses during a flood event, or afterwards on land that is not in the Council's ownership.
- Accept responsibility for placement of sandbags, except at locations where infirmity or disability is an issue.
- Accept responsibility for the disposal of sandbags other than in the formal flood warning zones.
- Provide sandbags to protect gardens, outbuildings or other structures.

### **South Lakeland District Council**

**Public No - 0845 050 4434**

To help prevent the flooding of homes in the area, South Lakeland District Council hold stocks of both empty and filled sandbags at its key depot sites:

- Canal Head, Kendal
- Ecclerigg, A591 Troutbeck Bridge, Windermere
- North Lonsdale Road, Ulverston

These sandbags are available for collection during periods of severe weather or during normal office hours (by prior arrangement).

Whenever resources allow, we will attempt to deliver sandbags to the elderly and infirm (by prior arrangement).

There is no charge for the sandbag service but we cannot guarantee that we will be able to supply sufficient sandbags or deliver them during emergencies. Unfortunately, we cannot provide sandbags for commercial premises and we must restrict the provision of filled sandbags to 10 per property (where stocks continue to allow).

**Environment Agency**

The Environment Agency have a stock of sandbags which they use to maintain their flood defences. Following a formal request from a District Council they may provide them with sandbags, should resources allow.