

## Appendix D

# Leicestershire Asset Register and Record Policy

## Contents

1	Introduction and scope.....	1
2	The purpose of Asset Register and Record.....	2
3	Local definitions and interpretations.....	2
4	State of repair .....	3
5	Data fields.....	5
6	Consultation and review.....	6

## 1 Introduction and scope

- 1.1 Leicestershire County Council (LCC) is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for Leicestershire. Section 21 of the Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010,

***Box 1. Section 21 FWMA, 2010. Lead local authorities: duty to maintain a register***

(1) A lead local flood authority must establish and maintain—

(a) a register of structures or features which, in the opinion of the authority, are likely to have a significant effect on a flood risk in its area, and

(b) a record of information about each of those structures or features, including information about ownership and state of repair.

(2) The Minister may by regulations make provision about the content of the register and record.

(3) The lead local flood authority must arrange for the register to be available for inspection at all reasonable times.

(4) The Minister may by regulations provide for information of a specified description to be excluded from the register or record.

(5) In this section, “the Minister” means—

(a) the Secretary of State in relation to authorities in England, and

(b) the Welsh Ministers in relation to authorities in Wales.

“Lead local authorities: duty to maintain a register” came into force on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2011. The legislation is contained within Box 1.

- 1.2 This policy defines LCC’s local approach to fulfilling the requirements of the legislation. It is not intended to outline the full process for managing the Asset Register and Record.
- 1.3 The following information and guidance has been reviewed in support of this policy:
  - FD2680 Evaluation of the arrangements for managing local flood risk in England (Defra, 2017)
  - Surface water and drainage: review of responsibilities (Jenkins, 2017)
  - Living Draft Information Note: Lead Local Flood Authority Duty to Maintain a Register (2011)

## 2 The purpose of Asset Register and Record

- 2.1 Through the Asset Register and record, LCC aims to:
  - collaboratively identify structures or features with a significant effect (see definition in 3.7) on flood risk, and compile information about them;
  - communicate information regarding the most significant flood risk assets to stakeholders such as risk management authorities (RMAs), communities at risk, local planning authorities and developers;
  - through the record, encourage responsible bodies or persons to proactively inspect and maintain assets;
  - build evidence to support business cases for asset maintenance and investment and applications for external funding.

## 3 Local definitions and interpretations

- 3.1 Most terms are not currently defined in the legislation or associated guidance, meaning local interpretation and definitions are required.
- 3.2 The definition of significant effect is particularly important, as it allows LCC to focus on maintaining a register and record of the most significant assets. Data on other assets is still compiled and maintained by relevant RMAs.
- 3.3 **Register:** A tabular format which can also be displayed spatially using Geographical Information System (GIS) software.
- 3.4 **Record:** A tabular format which can also be displayed spatially using GIS software. Not made publicly available for inspection.
- 3.5 **Structures or features:** these can be manmade (usually structures) or a natural or man-made feature of the environment. These may be recorded individually (e.g. a culvert), or as a group of structures or features which together have a significant effect (e.g. urban drainage system, or a floodplain system).

- The Register and Record will not contain individual properties with Property Flood Resilience (PFR), but may record sizeable groups, for example where a PFR scheme has been delivered.
- In GIS, the assets may be represented as point, line, or polygon data. Groups of assets are likely to be presented using a polygon.

- 3.6 **In the opinion of the authority are likely:** In forming an “opinion”, a risk-based assessment is made using the evidence available to determine whether significant effect has already occurred or is likely to occur, with or without the structures or features (refer to 3.7 below).
- 3.7 **Significant effect:** where the design or condition of the structures or features can significantly impact the likelihood of internal flooding to one or more properties, or the flooding of critical infrastructure. This effect can be positive (e.g., a well-functioning flood storage area), or negative (e.g., an undersized culvert).
- 3.8 **On flood risk in its area:** this is interpreted to include all sources of flood risk, not just local sources (ordinary watercourse, surface water and groundwater). Structures or features affecting other sources of flood risk (e.g., main river) may also be considered for addition to the register. The inclusion of these structures is not compulsory; RMAs often maintain their own extensive registers and records of assets, and it is not the purpose of the asset register to replicate these.
- Most entrants to the register will be wholly located within Leicestershire, however there may be some crossover into other administrative areas. Where this is the case, the relevant organisations will be consulted.
- 3.9 **Ownership:** Responsibility for management and maintenance. Not always, but often, riparian.
- 3.10 **State of repair:** see section 4.
- 3.11 **Visual inspection:** Systematic visual assessment of the condition of the visible elements of an asset resulting in the assignment of a condition grade.
- 3.12 **Register to be available for inspection at all reasonable times:** This does not require LCC to publish the register, although, the register may be published in the future with the agreement of relevant stakeholders. The register will be available for inspection upon request, with the method of sharing will be agreed with the persons making the request. The record will not be published.

## 4 State of repair

- 4.1 There is no formal obligation on the asset owner to provide information on the state of repair of an asset for the purposes of the record, or for LCC to inspect other RMAs assets. LCC may consider it necessary to advise or request that assets are inspected in line with their role as LLFA.

- 4.2 An inspection conducted by LCC may take the form of an in person visual inspection, analysis of photographic evidence or via the use of online photo images such as street imaging. Local anecdotal information may also be considered.
- 4.3 Any visual assessments made of state of repair will use a 1 to 5 grade system defined by LCC (please refer to Section 4.7). A 1 to 5 asset condition scoring system is commonplace within UK FCRM organisations. It is not necessary for partner organisations providing information graded in this way. The information provided can be interpreted by LCC, and assets graded accordingly.
- 4.4 It will not always be possible to conduct a visual inspection of an asset at the time of publication to the register and confidence in asset condition will be recorded accordingly. The condition and confidence ratings will be stored in the asset record and will not be made publicly available.
- 4.5 Ratings will be assigned based on confidence of the visual assessment of each asset as per Section 4.7. Where further condition information is known beyond visual inspection (e.g., structural information) grades may be adapted to reflect the descriptions.
- 4.6 Confidence ratings will also be assigned using a corresponding score of 1 to 5 as defined by the LLFA in Section 4.7.
- 4.7 Based on the asset record, the LLFA will make an assessment on when an asset may need to be re-inspected to update its state of repair, and whether there has been any change to the level of flood risk associated with the structure.
- 4.8 The 1 to 5 grading systems for Visual Inspection Condition and Condition Confidence have been defined by LCC below:

<b>Visual Inspection Condition Grades</b>		
<b><u>Grade</u></b>	<b><u>Rating</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Cosmetic defects that will have no effect on performance.</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Minor defects that will not reduce the overall performance of the asset.</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Defects that could reduce performance of the asset.</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Defects that would significantly reduce the performance of the asset. Further investigation needed.</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Very Poor</b>	<b>Severe defects resulting in complete performance failure.</b>

<b>Visual Inspection Condition Confidence Grades</b>		
<b><u>Grade</u></b>	<b><u>Rating</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Thorough on-site inspection by more than one LCC officer, includes access to all elements of the asset</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>On-site inspection conducted by a LCC officer, clearly able to see and access most elements of the asset.</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Site visit conducted by a LCC officer with access to a limited number of elements of the asset. Or assessment supported by photos/CCTV or detailed anecdotal information.</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>No on-site inspection by a LCC officer but limited anecdotal information on condition available.</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Very Poor</b>	<b>No information available.</b>

## 5 Data fields

5.1 Asset register information may include but not be limited to:

- Unique ID
- Watercourse name
- Watercourse type (main river, ordinary watercourses)
- Feature type
- District / Borough
- Town / Village
- Ward
- Easting / Northing

5.2 Asset record information may include but not be limited to:

- Ownership
- Last Inspection Date
- Condition
- Condition Confidence (at time of last inspection)
- Published S19
- Notes
- Confirm Central asset ID

## **6 Consultation and review**

- 6.1 The Asset Register and Record are 'live' documents.
- 6.2 RMA's will be consulted when proposing that assets they manage are added to the register. This will include discussion of how they are best presented in GIS format. Assets added to the register will predominantly be those identified during formal flood investigations and those identified as being high-risk on the resilient highway network.