

References

- Alaszewski, A. (2006) *Using Diaries for Social Research* London: Sage
- Andrew, M. (2006) Housing tenure choices by the young, *Housing Finance* 7, 1-13.
- Armstrong, B. (2000) Small company “champions” liP disaster restoration firm finds training pays off. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 32(4), 135.
- BBC News (2007) Flood-hit Hull a ‘forgotten city’
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/humber/6270236.stm> [Accessed 18/12/ 2009].
- Bennet, G. (1970) Bristol Floods 1968: Controlled survey of effects on health of local community disaster. *British Medical Journal* 3, 454-458.
- Buckle P., Mars G. and Smale S., (2000) New approaches to assessing vulnerability and resilience. *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 15, (No. 2 Winter 2000), 8–14
- Biros, M. H. and J. G. Adams (2002) Reflections on resilience. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 9(3), 214-215
- Burby, R. J., L. J. Steinberg, *et al.* (2003) The Tenure Trap: The vulnerability of renters to joint natural and technological disasters. *Urban Affairs Review* 39(1), 32-58.
- Burningham K., Fielding J., Thrush D. and Gray K. (2005) *Flood Warning for Vulnerable Groups. A report for the Environment Agency*, Science Summary SC990007/SS.
- Cabinet Office/HM Treasury (2006) *Stern Review on the economics of climate change*, Cabinet Office/HM Treasury: London
- Cabinet Office (2008) *The Pitt Review: Lessons learned from the 2007 floods* The Cabinet Office: London
- Cabinet Office (2008) *Mutual Aid: A short guide for local authorities* Civil Contingencies Secretariat London
http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/132856/m_a_guidance_finaldraft.pdf [Accessed 10/07/09]
- CCS (2007) *National recovery guidance: recovery plan guidance template*. London, Civil Contingencies Secretariat.
- CCS (2009) *Emergency Response and Recovery Non-statutory guidance to complement Emergency Preparedness* , Civil Contingencies Secretariat.
- CLG (2009) *Support for Recovery from Exceptional Emergencies* Department for Communities and Local Government, London <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/fire/recoveryfunding> [Accessed 07/08/09]
- Clemens, P., J. R. Hietala, *et al.* (1999) Risk of domestic violence after flood impact: Effects of social support, age, and history of domestic violence. *Applied Behavioral Science Review* 7(2), 199-206.
- Convery, I., Mort, M., Baxter, J. and Bailey, C. (2008) *Animal disease and human trauma: Emotional geographies of disaster*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.
- Coote, A. and Lenaghan, J. (1997) *Citizens Juries: Theory into Practice*. London, IPPR.

- Coulthard, T., Frostick, L., Hardcastle, H., Jones, K., Rogers, D., Scott, M., Bankoff, G. (2007) *The June 2007 floods in Hull: interim report by the Independent Review Body*. Independent Review Body: Kingston-upon-Hull, UK.
- Coulthard, T., Frostick, L., Hardcastle, H., Jones, K., Rogers, D., Scott, M., Bankoff, G. (2007) *The June 2007 floods in Hull: final report by the Independent Review Body*. Independent Review Body: Kingston-upon-Hull, UK
- Coxon, A. (1996) *Between the Sheets: Sexual diaries and gay men's sex in the era of AIDS*. London: Cassell
- Deeming, H. (2008) *Increasing resilience to storm surge flooding: risks, social networks and local champions* PhD Thesis, Division of Geography, Lancaster University, UK
- Defra (2005). *Making Space for Water: Developing a new Government Strategy for flood and coastal erosion risk management in England: a delivery plan*. Defra: London
- Defra (2008a) *Consultation on policy options for promoting property-level flood protection and resilience* Defra: London
- Defra (2008b) *A National Flood Emergency Framework: proposals for consultation* Defra: London
- Dowswell, T., Harrison S., Mort M., and Lilford R., (1997) *Health Panels – A Survey. Final report of a research project funded by NHS Executive (Northern & Yorkshire) Project No HSR 015*. Nuffield Institute for Health, Leeds University.
- Elliot, H. (1997) The use of diaries in sociological research on health experience. *Sociological Research Online*, 2(2)
- Enarson, E. and B. H. Morrow (1998). *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster: through women's eyes*. Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.
- Environment Agency (2005) *Directing the Flow, EA's Flood Risk Management Strategy, Making Space for Water*, EA January
- Erikson, K. (1976) *Everything in its path: Destruction of community in the Buffalo Creek flood*. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Erikson, K. (1994) *A new species of trouble: Explorations in disaster, trauma, and community*. New York: Norton and Co.
- Fielding, J. and Burningham, K. (2005) Environmental Inequality and Flood Hazard, *Local Environment*, 10 (4), 379-395
- Ford, J. & Merriman, P. (1990) *The gentle art of listening: Counselling skills for volunteers*, London, Bedford Square Press.
- Fordham, M. and Ketteridge, A.M. (1995). Flood Disasters - Dividing the Community. *Paper presented at the Emergency Planning '95 Conference*. Lancaster, UK.
- Fordham, M. (1998) Making Women Visible in Disasters: Problematising the private domain. *Disasters*, 22 (2), 126-143
- Glaser, B. (1992) *Basics of grounded theory analysis* Mill Valley: CA Sociological Press.

- Gordon R (2004) The social system as a site of disaster impact and resource for recovery, *Australian Journal of Emergency Management* 19, 16-22
- Gunderson, L.H. (2000) Ecological resilience – in theory and application, *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 31, 425–439.
- Gunderson, L. and Holling (eds) (2002) *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press: Washington
- Haas, E., R. Kates, W., and Bowden, M. (1977) *Reconstruction Following Disaster*. Cambridge, MA. US., MIT Press.
- Harrison S. and Mort, M., (1998) Which Champions, Which People? Public and user involvement in health care, *Social Policy & Administration*, 32, 60-70.
- Hayes, N. (2000) *Doing Psychological Research: Gathering and analysing data*. Open University Press.
- HM Government (2005) *Emergency Preparedness: Guidance on Part 1 of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004* Her Majesty's Government, Cabinet Office: London
- HM Government (2006) *Evacuation and Shelter Guidance: Non-statutory guidance to complement Emergency Preparedness and Emergency Response & Recovery*, Her Majesty's Government, Cabinet Office: London
- HM Government (2007) *National recovery guidance: recovery plan guidance template* HM Government London http://www.iaem.com/regions/iaemeuropa/documents/011107_LIBRARY_AR_NationalRecoveryGuidance.pdf [Accessed 30/06/09]
- HM Government (2009) *Emergency Response and Recovery Non-statutory guidance to complement Emergency Preparedness*. (Version 2) HM Government, Civil Contingencies Secretariat <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/ukresilience/response.aspx> [Accessed 30/08/09]
- Holling, C. (1973) Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems, *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4, 1-23
- Home Office (2000) *Recovery: An Emergency Management Guide* Home Office <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/132910/recovery.pdf> [Accessed 09/06/09]
- Hulme, M. *et al.* (2002) *Climate change scenarios for the United Kingdom: the UKCIP02 Report*, UKCIP
- Johnson, C. L., Tunstall, S. M. & Penning-Roswell, E. C. (2005) Floods as Catalysts for Policy Change: Historical Lessons from England and Wales. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 21, 4 561-575.
- Johnson, C., Penning-Roswell, E. and Tapsell, S. (2007) Aspiration and reality: Flood policy, economic damages and the appraisal process. *Area* 39(2): 214-223.
- Kashefi, E. & Mort, M. (2000) *I'll tell you what I want what I really really want!*, Report of the SW Burnley Citizens' Jury on Health and Social Care, commissioned by Burnley Primary Care Group, 2000.
- Kashefi, E. (2006) *Citizens' Juries: from deliberation to intervention*, PhD thesis, Lancaster University, Lancaster.
- Kirschenbaum, A. (2002) Disaster preparedness: A conceptual and empirical reevaluation. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*. 20(1), 5-28.

- Luthar, S. S. and Cicchetti, D. (2000) The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies *Development and Psychopathology* 12(4), 857-885
- Marcus A. A, Nichols ML. (1999) On the edge: Heeding the warnings of unusual events *Organization Science* 10:482–99
- Mason, J. (2002) *Qualitative researching*, London, Sage.
- Medd, W. and Marvin, S. (2005) From the Politics of Urgency to the Governance of Preparedness: A research agenda on urban vulnerability *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 13 (2), 44-49.
- Meth, P. (2003) Entries and Omissions: Using solicited diaries in geographical research *Area* (35) 2 195-205.
- Mileti, D. S. (1999). *Disasters by Design: A reassessment of natural hazards in the United States*. Washington DC, Joesph Henry Press.
- Mort, M., Convery, I., Bailey, C., Baxter, J. (2004) *The Health and Social Consequences of the 2001 Foot and Mouth Disease Epidemic in North Cumbria* Available from: www.lancs.ac.uk/shm/dhr/research/healthandplace/fmdfinalreport.pdf [Accessed 4/1/2010]
- Mort, M., Convery, I., Baxter, J., Bailey, C. (2005) Psychosocial effects of the 2001 foot and mouth disease epidemic in a rural population: qualitative diary based study. *British Medical Journal*, doi:10.1136/bmj.38603.375856.68 (published 7 October 2005)
- National Audit Office (2001) *Inland Flood Defence*, HMSO: London
- Peacock, W. G., Morrow, B. H. and Gladwin, H. (1997) *Hurricane Andrew: Ethnicity, gender and the sociology of disasters* London, UK: Routledge.
- Pelling, M. and Uitto, J. (2001) Small Island Developing States: Natural disaster vulnerability and global change, *Global Environmental Change Part B: Environmental Hazards*, 3 (2), 49-62
- Pelling, M. (2003) *The vulnerability of cities: Natural disasters and social resilience*, Earthscan: London
- Perrow, C. (1999) *Normal Accidents: Living with high-risk technologies*, New Jersey: Princeton.
- Reacher, M., McKenzie, K., Lane, C., Nichols, T., Iverson, A., Hepple, P., Walter, T., Laxton, C., Simpson, J., (2004) Health Impacts of Flooding in Lewes: A comparison of reported gastrointestinal and other illness and mental health in flooded and non-flooded households. *Communicable Disease and Public Health*, 7(1), 1-8
- Riollia, L. and Savickib, V. (2003) Information system organizational resilience, *Omega* 31, 227– 233
- Sims, R., Medd, W., Mort, M., Twigger-Ross, C., Walker, G., and Watson, N. (2008) *Perspectives on resilience from households in Hull – response to Defra consultation on policy options for promoting property-level flood protection and resilience*. Lancaster, Lancaster University.
- Sims, R., Medd, W., Mort, M., Twigger-Ross, C. (2009) When a “Home” Becomes a “House”: Care and Caring in the Flood Recovery Process. *Space and Culture* 12(3), 303-316
- Strauss, A . and Corbin, J. (1994) Grounded theory methodology: an overview. In (eds) Strauss, A Corbin J (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (2nd edition) Sage.

- Tapsell, S., Tunstall, S. (2001) *The Health and Social Effects of the June 2000 Flooding in the North East Region. Report to the Environment Agency*. Flood Hazard Research Centre, Middlesex University, 1-143.
- Tapsell, S., Penning-Rowsell, E., Tunstall, S. and Wilson, T. (2002) Vulnerability to flooding: health and social dimensions, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 360 (1796), 1511-25
- Tapsell S., Tunstall S. M., and Wilson T. (2003) *Banbury and Kidlington four years after the flood: an examination of the long-term health effects of flooding*, Bristol: Environment Agency
- Tapsell, S., Burton, R., Oakes, S., and Parker, D. J. (2005) *The Social Performance of Flood Warning Communications Technologies* (No. TR W5C-016): Environment Agency
- Tapsell, S., Tunstall, S. and Priest, S. (2009) *A health impacts model for floods*. FLOODsite report no. T10-09-02. www.floodsite.net/html/search_results.asp?documentType [Accessed 22/12/2009]
- Thrush D, Burningham K and Fielding J, (2005a) *Exploring flood-related vulnerability: a qualitative study*. R&D Report W5C-018/3. Bristol: Environment Agency.
- Thrush D, Burningham K and Fielding J, (2005b) *Vulnerability with regard to flood warning and flood event: a review of the literature*. R&D Report W5C-018/1. Bristol: Environment Agency
- Tunstall, S., Tapsell, S., Green, C., Floyd, P., George, C. (2006) The Health Effects of Flooding: Social research results from England and Wales. *Journal of Water and Health* 4(3), 365-380
- Twigger-Ross C. (2006) *Managing the social aspects of flooding: synthesis report*, Environment Agency R&D Technical Report SC040033/SR6
- Verbrugge, L. M. (1980) Health Diaries, *Medical Care*, 18, 73 - 95.
- Walker, B. and Salt, D. (2006) *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining ecosystems and people in a changing world*, Washington: Island Press
- Walker G., Burningham K., Fielding J., Smith G., Thrush D. and Fay A. (2006) *Addressing Environmental Inequalities: Flood Risk*, Science Report SC020061/SR1 Bristol: Environment Agency
- Werritty A., Houston D., Ball T., Tavendale A. and Black A. (2007) *Exploring the Social Impacts of Flood Risk and Flooding in Scotland*, Scottish Executive
- Whyley, C., McCormick, J. *et al.* (1998) *Paying for peace of mind: Access to home contents insurance for low-income household*. London, Policies Studies Institute.
- Wildavsky, A. (1988) *Searching for Safety*, New Jersey, Transaction Publishers.
- Wisner, B., P. Blaikie, *et al.* (2004) *At Risk, Natural Hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters* (2nd edn.) London, Routledge.
- Zimmerman, D. H. & Wieder, D. (1977) The Diary-Interview Method *Urban Life*, (5)4 , 479 - 498.

Appendix 1: Participant Biographies

Abby (40s) lives with her partner and adult son. They own their home and had insurance and lived in a caravan during the repairs to their home.

Amanda (40s) is a carer for her disabled sister. They live in a council home and had no insurance. They had to live upstairs during the repairs.

Amy (40s) lives with her husband. They own their home and have insurance. When the floods happened, they moved out into rented accommodation in another part of the city. They also had to move out of their home a second time due to the poor standard of workmanship causing structural damage to the house.

Andy (30s) lives with his wife and baby daughter in a home that they own. They had insurance and moved into a rented house while the repairs took place.

Anna (60s) is married to Nigel (see below).

Barbara (30s) lives with her husband and two young children in a council home. They had contents insurance and lived upstairs during the repairs.

Betty (70s) is married to Chris and at the time of the flood, they lived in a housing association bungalow. They were insured but the value was insufficient to cover all their possessions. Fearing a repeat of the flooding, Betty and Chris applied for a transfer to an upstairs flat from the housing association.

Bob (70s) is married to Tessa (see below).

Bruce (30s) lives with his wife and two young children. His house was flooded twice in quick succession. The family had insurance and moved into a hotel for a few weeks before finding a rented property to live in during the repairs.

Caroline (50s) owns her house and lives with her partner. They were insured and moved to a rented property after 'secondary flooding' was discovered. Caroline has a disability and cannot drive.

Cecil (80s) is a widower who lived in a housing association bungalow. After the floods, Cecil moved to a different bungalow in another part of the city. Cecil has mobility problems and had no insurance.

Charlotte (20s) lived with her long-term boyfriend in a house that she owned. She had insurance and moved into a rented property while the repairs took place. She was also involved with the floods through her job with the council's Flood Advice Service.

Chris (70s) is married to Betty (see above).

Duncan (30s) is single and lives in a privately rented house. He had contents insurance but struggled to find somewhere to live after the floods and ended up dividing his time between a caravan and the houses of various family members.

Elizabeth (70s) is married and lives in a house that she owns with her husband. They had insurance and lived in a caravan during the repairs.

Emily (80s) lives with her husband in a home that they own. They had insurance and moved out into a rented house during the repairs.

Emma (70s) lives with her husband. They owned their home and had insurance but, because Emma's husband did not want to leave their home, they ended up living between their garage and the upstairs of their home during the repairs.

Helen (60s) lived in a council property and had no insurance. She lived upstairs during the repairs and also worked hard to support vulnerable elderly neighbours through her involvement with her local community group.

Holly (20s) lives with her husband and two small children. They rented privately, had no insurance and had real trouble finding alternative rental accommodation as prices had risen so much on account of the rise in demand.

Isobel (60s) lives with her husband in her own home. They had buildings but not contents insurance and lived upstairs during the repairs.

Jack (40s) had a near miss – his house was not flooded, even though other properties down his street were affected. Jack is a teacher and his school was badly flooded.

James (60s) lived with his wife in a house that they owned together. They were insured and moved out into a rented house during the repairs. James also had to deal with flood matters at work.

Jan (40s) lives with her husband and two teenage children in a council property. They had contents insurance and lived upstairs during the repairs.

Karen (20s) lived with her husband and their young daughter. They owned their home but didn't have insurance. Having managed to repair their house, they succeeded in getting insurance, only to suffer a repeat incident of flooding several months later. Karen also worked to support flooded residents through her job.

Laura (40s) lives with her husband and adult son. They own their own home, had insurance and moved into rental accommodation while their home was repaired.

Leanne (60s) lives with her husband in a house that they own. They had insurance and lived in a caravan during the repairs.

Len (60s) is married to Lucy (see below).

Lucy (60s) lives with her husband in a house that they own. They lived in a caravan on their drive during the repairs.

Lynne (40s) lives with her two adult children in a house that she owns. Shortly after the floods, Lynne's toilet began to block and overflow on a regular basis after the floods caused damage to a neighbouring sewer. Lynne had insurance but there was little that they could do to resolve the problem as the sewer belonged to a council property down the street which appeared unaffected by the problem.

Marion (50s) lives with her partner in a council rented property. They had no insurance and lived upstairs during the repairs.

Melanie (30s) lived with her husband and young son. She was pregnant at the time of the floods and had her second son while living in their rented house. They were insured.

Michaela (30s) lived with her husband and two young children in a house that they owned. They had insurance and lived in a hotel for a few weeks before moving into a rented house. Michaela was heavily involved in the flood work through her job with the council.

Natalie (40s) lived with her husband and two children in their own home. They moved into a caravan during the repairs after their home was affected by 'secondary flooding'. Natalie was very involved in the flood work through her job at the council.

Nigel (60s) lives with his wife in their own house. They had insurance and lived with family while their house was being repaired.

Norman (80s) is married to Emily (see above).

Olivia (30s) is married to Bruce (see above).

Rachel (30s) was separated from her husband and lived with her two young children. She had insurance and she and the children moved into a rented house after their home was found to be affected by 'secondary flooding'.

Rose (70s) lives with her husband in a home that they own. They had insurance and lived in their home during the repairs.

Sally (30s) is married to Andy (see above).

Scott (20s) lived with his wife, who was expecting their first baby. They owned their house and moved to a rented property during the repairs.

Sophie (40s) lives with her husband and two children. Their house was not flooded but they were affected through housing Sophie's elderly mother-in-law, who was flooded, for an extended period.

Suzanne (30s) lived in a council home with her young son. They had contents insurance and lived upstairs during the repairs.

Tessa (60s) lives with her husband in a house that they own. They had insurance and moved into rented accommodation while their home was repaired.

Tim (50s) lives with his wife in a home that they own. They had insurance and moved out into a caravan while the repairs were completed.

Tom (40s) lives with his wife and their young daughter. They owned their home and had insurance and moved into a rented property during the repairs. Tom also worked to support flooded residents through his work as a community warden.

Trevor (40s) is single and owns his home. He had insurance and moved into a rented property during the repairs.

Appendix 2: Interview Themes

Thematic material for householder interviews in Hull (Oct-Dec 2007)

The day of the flood

- What's the first thing you remember about the flood? When did it affect you? How did it affect you at first? What immediate practical problems did you face? What did you do (ask about family, friends, work, school)?
- How did you feel when you were coping with the flood itself?
- Did you get support from anyone? What did they do? How did they get in touch with you, did you know who was doing what?
- What was lost? How did the flood affect your property?

Your experiences since the flood

- Where have you been living? What's that been like?
- What effect, if any, has the flooding had on your daily life (think about work, school, relationships, friends, community)?
- What stage are you at in terms of the recovery of your home? What practical difficulties have you faced? (insurance, council, plasters, builders etc.)
- What support, if any, have you received from different agencies? How did you make contact with them?
- What/who has helped with the recovery and what/who hasn't?
- What do you think the clean up process has been like for the community around Hull more generally?
- Anything positive from the flood? E.g. sense of community?

Friends/people you know OR your role as a front-line worker

- **For residents:** How do your experiences of the recovery compare to those of your friends and neighbours? How have they managed? Any particular examples of situations?
- **OR for front-line workers:** As far as your job is concerned, what tasks did you have to do in the immediate aftermath of the flood? Who were you working with? What kind of situations did you encounter? Did you have any training or previous experience of performing this kind of role? How did this make you feel?

And now

- How are you feeling about things at the moment?
- Have you, or any of your friends or relatives, experienced any health impacts as a result of the flood, do you think? (either short-term or chronic)
- What problems are you currently facing? (nice lead onto the diary)
- If you could choose one thing that would make you feel better at the moment, what would it be? (E.g. getting back into house...)

The future

- How confident do you feel about the future?

- How are you planning for the future? What would you do if this was to happen again? (e.g. flood-proofing homes, insurance?)
- How does it feel when it rains now?

Thematic material for frontline workers

Setting the scene

- What's the first thing you remember about the flood? How and when did it first start to affect you – both personally and at work?
- In terms of your job, what kind of situations did you encounter? What did you have to do?
- So was this a case of trying to carry on with your previous work under different conditions or did you find yourself having a completely new role/set of responsibilities?
 - **If new:** Did you get any choice in what you did, or were you told that you had to do this work?
- Did you experience any difficulties in doing this work? (Either practically or in terms of how it made you feel.)
- **For those who were flooded or had friends/relatives that were:** what was it like trying to cope with work at the same time as what was going on at home?

How were you affected?

- Do you think the work had any impacts on you personally? E.g. Stress, health or relationships?
- How long was your work affected for? (Some people may still be affected now...) Did the nature of your work/the kind of situations you were encountering change over time?
 - **For those doing a different role:** What happened to the work that you would normally have been doing?
- Did you have any previous experience of dealing with these kinds of situations in your work or personal life?
- Did you receive any support or training from your employers? If not, what kinds of support would you have liked to have received that you didn't get?
- How about your colleagues – who were you working with? (i.e. people you knew already or strangers) How did you get on with each other? Did you help and support each other or was there conflict/antagonism?
- How did the public perceive you and your role?
- Have your experiences of doing this job been conveyed in some way to your employers – was there a chance to debrief for example? Have you been able to share your experiences of the floods and dealing with distressed people to your managers/those in charge?
- Does your job feel like it is “back to normal” or have roles and activities changed since the floods?
-

And now, more generally?

- There's a lot of talk about “lessons learnt” from the floods – do you think this has happened in terms of your employer or not? If not, what do you think needs to happen?
- What is your personal view of the general institutional and organizational response to the floods (not necessarily your own organisation)? Do you think some organizations coped better than others? E.g. what went well/badly and why?
- And finally, how about as a person – have the floods changed the way you think or act at all?

Appendix 3: Diary booklet

**Lancaster University
Hull Flood Recovery Project**

Weekly Diary

Week number:

Diarist name:

**If you have any questions regarding your
diary, please phone Beccy Sims on 01524
510261 or email r.sims@lancaster.ac.uk**

How to complete your diary

Thank you for agreeing to join this important study. Here are some points to bear in mind when filling in your diary.

Please remember that this is your diary. We are interested in finding out as much as possible about the way the flooding has affected your life, so please tell us as much as you can about yourself, no matter how unimportant it seems. For example, if you felt poorly but decided not to do anything about it, or were worried about your job but kept it to yourself, we'd like to know. If you are not sure whether to tell us something or not then please include it, we'd rather have too much information than too little. Please don't worry about spelling or grammar – this isn't important to us.

Try to make a few notes in the event section as you go through the week. This will help you when you come to fill in the diary at the end of the week. Please also feel free to include photographs, poems or other material with your diary entries if you would like.

If you would like to complete your diary in a different format in future, please let us know (for example, if you would prefer an electronic version so that you can email your diary, or if you would like a Dictaphone that you can speak into and record your thoughts).

This diary booklet contains the following:

- Some *initial questions* about how you have been feeling over the last week, your health, quality of life and relationships
- *Some things to consider* when filling in your diary
- An *event section* to help you when you come to complete your diary
- *Diary pages*

**If you have any questions about the diary please
phone Beccy Sims on 01524 510261 or email
r.sims@lancaster.ac.uk**

Some Initial Questions

We would like to ask you some questions about how you have been feeling over the last week, your health, quality of life and relationships. From the following questions please highlight the option that best applies to you. You can make some additional comments in relation to these questions, or discuss them in more detail in your diary entries.

1. How confident do you feel about the future at the moment?

2. How has your relationship with family and friends been this week?

Very poor Poor Average Good Very good

Comments:

3. How has your relationship with work colleagues been this week?

Very poor Poor Average Good Very good

Comments:

4. How do you rate your overall health during this week?

Very poor Poor Average Good Very good

Comments:

5. How do you rate your overall quality of life during this week?

Very poor Poor Average Good Very good

Comments:

Some things to consider

Please tell us about any experiences or problems that have occurred during the last week, no matter how minor they seem. Tell us what helps you and what doesn't help you. As you complete your diary, think about the following:

- Anything which might have caused you problems or upset you
- How such events affected your daily routine
- How did they make you feel?
- Anything you did to make yourself feel better, e.g. resting in bed, going for a walk or talking to a friend.
- Anything you did which made things worse.
- Anyone you talked to about your problems or who gave you advice or help in any way. This might include family and friends, work colleagues, your local warden, or other health professionals such as GPs or nurses.

Event section

People have sometimes found it useful to write down what happened each day to help them complete their diary. For example:

Tuesday	Went into town, bumped into Chris, talked about...
----------------	--

Monday	
Tuesday	
Wednesday	
Thursday	
Friday	
Saturday	
Sunday	

Diary

This is where we'd like you to write your weekly diary entry. Please use as many pages as necessary to complete your diary entry for this week.

NB This was then followed by a series of blank pages for diarists to write as much as they wanted.

Appendix 4: Diarist Recommendations for Flood Recovery

The following list was compiled by the diarists taking part in our project – it is their list of:

- Things that they found to be helpful during flood recovery
- Things that they found unhelpful during flood recovery
- Changes they would like to see in the event of a future flood
- Changes they would like to see being made now, in the community more generally

Things that helped during the recovery:

1. *Workers who responded quickly and flexibly to the situation*

What people valued most in the immediate aftermath of the floods were people who were quickly on the scene and able to provide practical help – for example, the fire service, police, community wardens, bin men doing extra collections etc.

“One of our neighbours, she had three children in a caravan... She had nowhere for washing, but we managed through finding out different things that she got a second hand washing machine delivered so that she could actually get the kids’ clothes washed... It’s the little things – you don’t want a brand new washing machine replacing whilst you are in the middle because you don’t know what’s going to go into your house when you are back. You just need something cheap that works, that will go into a temporary situation.” [group discussion]

“At the beginning of the flood... everybody was chucking their stuff out and the estate was a mess and they brought some prisoners with their warden and they really did work. They did a fantastic job and cleaned the estate brilliantly.” [group discussion]

“A wonderful policewoman who lives at the other side of the estate... wasn’t affected by the flooding but couldn’t get her car out. So she decided to police the area, stop the traffic coming in and out and look after everything. She was absolutely brilliant and I’ve written to the Chief Constable asking that she be commended.” [group discussion]

2. *Supportive neighbours and community groups/ local residents’ committees*

People really appreciated the support of their neighbours and community groups. Lots of people said the floods helped them get to know neighbours that they had not spoken to before.

“We’ve made friends with a neighbour who has lived there as long as we have and, other than wave to him in the morning, I’ve never spoken to him... Now we are best of friends.” [group discussion]

“Everybody was really friendly... I got to speak to neighbours that I’ve never really spoken to before and they were all really friendly, really helpful. And living in the caravan I had more there than when I was in the house. People would just come and knock on the window and say, “How are you doing?” [group discussion]

3. *Employing your own builders and making sure the building work was good quality.*

Some people had good experiences with their builders – this tended to be those who got a cash settlement from their insurers and who employed their own local builders. However, others experienced problems and felt that they had to put up with poor-quality workmanship, particularly if they allowed their insurance company to appoint for them:

“Employing your own builders... is a good thing... our builder had worked for a friend previously and I’d seen some of his work, so we were lucky in getting that... And our neighbours, as I say, have had three builders, supplied by the insurance company and two of them have been sacked. They’ve only just got their house finished now and they started it before... ours.” [group discussion]

4. *The flood archive.*

People like the idea of the archive that is being created for this project. They want to make sure that what they have been through is not forgotten and that lessons will be learnt from their experiences. They also find the group discussion sessions really helpful in enabling them to compare notes and share experiences. Several people have expressed an interest in taking things a stage further by having politicians/decision-makers along to group discussion meetings so that they can talk to them directly.

“I think the meetings are really good, I get a lot from them.” [group discussion]

“It’s the flood meeting; it’s my counselling session! Even using my diary, I’m using that as therapy. It’s awesome” [group discussion]

5. *Appropriate use of the media.*

There are mixed feelings about this – many people say that the local radio was a lifeline during the floods because it kept them in touch with what was going on. However, there is anger over the way that the national media handled the floods – many people feel that Hull was forgotten in comparison to Gloucester, while others think that much of the media coverage within the city has focused on Kingswood at the expense of other areas (e.g. Orchard Park and East Ella Drive areas).

“I think Radio Humberside was excellent really... I knew that my husband was stuck on Willerby Road... and I knew because of the radio - I knew he was safe because there were... no major disasters reported or anything... It did tie up a lot of things and it did co-ordinate – you know, if people needed to know, ‘how’s my granny in a particular area?’, it was coming on constantly what areas had been affected – it was useful.” [group discussion]

“There’s been nothing for us. Orchard Park has just been wiped off the face; there’s been no coverage about Orchard Park and what we’ve had to go through.... Yes, Kingswood – Bransholme, yes, but where’s Orchard Park when all this was going on, where are we?” [group discussion]

Things that didn’t help

1. *It wasn’t clear what funding was available.*

People were confused about what help/funding was available, and from which bodies. There are stories of people becoming upset because others were given greater assistance with no apparent reason or explanation. For example, some people reported responding to adverts about free trips and holiday

activities for school children, only to find that they were not eligible. Many people also did not realise that they could ask for refunds on things like council tax and TV licences if they were out of their properties. They would have liked to have been told that they could claim for these things too.

“All flood victims should have received council cash, not grouped into gold, silver and bronze - I found it difficult to understand how they decided who was silver and gold and bronze.” [group discussion comment]

“You can be left out of pocket as a result of lots of little things that you don’t realise you might be entitled to claim for e.g. child minding expenses. It would help in future if people were given some information to let them know/remind them that they can claim for these things.” [group discussion]

2. *Duplication of information collection.*

In the immediate aftermath of the floods, people talk about lots of different organisations coming round with questionnaires and forms and they found it frustrating to have to keep repeating personal information.

“Would it not have been possible to give people some kind of card/pass number to avoid having to fill in the same information on forms over and over again?” [group discussion]

3. *Impersonal approaches/ insensitive handling of belongings.*

Many people were upset by how their flood-damaged possessions were handled during the disposal process. They were told that their items were “contaminated” and were distressed to see their belongings getting “chucked” into skips. They would have liked a more sensitive approach where workers recognised that these items had a lot of sentimental value.

Olivia	I’ll never forget Bruce, Beccy, he said to the chap who turned the kitchen table on the side, “It unscrews underneath”.
Bruce	I said, “The legs unscrew”. He said, “Don’t worry” – crunch, he just broke them off!
Olivia	He broke the leg off the table, the kitchen table... It just went in the van, he just chucked it in.
Bruce	Well the legs had been contaminated, but I said, “If you turn it on the side, the legs unscrew”.
Olivia	He said, “We’re not moving house, Bruce, we are chucking it”. [group discussion]

4. *No continuity of service*

People were very frustrated by having to deal with different people all the time. For example, some residents kept being allocated new loss adjustors, while others were told that they couldn’t see their usual GP because their temporary rented home was out of the catchment area for the surgery, so they had to register with a new practice.

“It was awful. We kept getting passed onto another phone line after waiting and then had to go over everything we had said in the 1st place” [group discussion comment]

5. *Disrespect for property.*

People were upset by workmen treating their house disrespectfully e.g. leaving rubbish on the floor, leaving doors and windows open/losing keys (i.e. security problems), making a mess when they use the bathroom and tampering with personal possessions. They feel there needs to be some recognition that, although that house is the builders' workplace, it is also somebody's home!

"Tradesmen's comments like 'It's insurance paying for it so it's good enough' is the wrong attitude to have." [group discussion comment]

"I hated having to barter over prices with loss adjustors" [group discussion comment]

"Security was a big problem – builders kept leaving doors open and passing keys around different people – we didn't know who had the keys to our house and eventually had to get the locks changed." [group discussion comment]

6. *Unhelpful estate agents*

Many people have had bad experiences with estate agents (for example, hiking the prices on rented houses because they believe that insurance companies are paying, being very unhelpful to families with children and pets, making appointments for viewings and then letting houses to other people without warning etc.)

"People were profiting from others' misery" [group discussion comment]

"I went through the Yellow Pages, day after day after day – sometimes 16 calls a day and that was an average. And I would set up a viewing and you know, 'Yes, a week on Wednesday we are viewing you know, 12 Acacia Avenue' – whatever. And my name was on the list and just before the viewing I would ring... to confirm, 'Oh we let that last week'. That absolutely floored me, it was twice within an hour on the same day – two that I had been promised, they'd done that. And never have I felt more like a non-person than that particular day. I thought 'you don't know me, you don't know my circumstances'... I was gutted... When we did get a property... it was an exorbitant rent and the house has been nothing but problems since we moved in. And I just feel somebody has really taken us for a ride, I'm absolutely certain that we are not the only ones." [group discussion]

7. *Unhelpful utilities companies and other services*

People spoke of having trouble with re-directing/ receiving refunds on basic household services such as council tax, broadband, home phone, Sky TV etc. For example, one participant had to keep paying council tax despite living in her garage, while another was threatened with legal action for not paying bills because a company had not updated its details after the family had moved into temporary accommodation. Others were given reconnection charges upon moving back in and found that the companies involved behaved in obstructive ways that showed no sympathy for their situation.

"All these services should have given us some leeway in acknowledgement of the difficult circumstances we were in – they just didn't seem to understand what we were going through" [group discussion comment]

“We had to pay more Council Tax with our rented property – could that go down as a recommendation that the councils give you a bit of leeway, because we had to fork out for that?” [group discussion]

“There was a general lack of communication between services – for example, the transfer of addresses to temporary accommodation and back again.” [group discussion]

“I wrote them [TV licensing] a hand note and said ‘how dare you send me this letter [threatening legal action for cancellation of TV licence] - I have no internal walls let alone a television set!’” [group discussion]

8. *Resentment between owner occupiers and council tenants*

Resentment is harmful for community spirit but problems have arisen where there have been perceived discrepancies in the level of help and support provided.

“Some of the houses are council houses on our little estate. Our next-door neighbour is still a council property and they are almost a bit bitter about the amount of work that we’ve had done... The council houses have had nothing done, they fought to have skirting boards taken off and put back on again. They’ve had no drying process, they’ve had no redecoration, they’ve had to pay for it themselves.” [group discussion]

9. *People being ignored/ missed out*

Many people felt that they received no help whatsoever – they seemed to have been missed off the list of those receiving visits from the council, community wardens etc.

“No one came” [group discussion comment]

“We saw no one, we still haven’t seen anyone for a year, no one has been near, contacted us or anything.” [group discussion]

“I never saw Councillor xxx come round my estate and knock on the door or come to our committee meetings... and say: ‘Now what can be done for Orchard Park?’ He didn’t come anywhere near, he never saw nought, he was tucked up in his little office, not with his wellie boots on walking round.” [group discussion]

Changes people would like to see in the event of a future flood

1. *Having a supportive intermediary who could explain the process and give advice*

For example, someone who could help people manage their insurance claim and provide some continuity of contact over time. People talk a lot about how the floods involved a very steep learning curve – they had to become experts in how to make insurance claims, deal with builders etc. and they wished that someone had been on hand to tell them how to do it.

“We have so many skills now e.g. project management” [group discussion comment]

“If we could have had someone who had been through it at the time, who could help direct us and actually say ‘Look, you are going to go through this, you are going to go through that, you are going to go through the other, don’t just agree to it, or don’t just

say yes to that, don't just say no to that. What you need to think about is this, this and this'. That would really benefit for future events." [group discussion]

"It's almost like a sort of disaster co-ordinator or something - the Council or someone employs a specific person to then appoint, you know, to different areas and have meetings as quickly as possible." [group discussion]

"It doesn't actually need to be anyone employed, it can be a voluntary organisation that could do it. It just needs to be someone who's got the right skills because they've been through it." [group discussion]

2. *Someone to inspect the building work*

This is a big issue. People think there should be someone to inspect the building work and to make sure that things are being done properly. This is also something that people would like to see being done now. Several people want the reinstatement work to come with a guarantee, so that if you want to sell your house in the future, you have documentation to prove that the repairs have been done properly. People also want the companies to come back after 8-12 months to check the décor and deal with any snagging issues. Many are concerned that they do not know how much their builders are being paid to do the work and they are unsure if what is being done reflects this level of payment. They think that there should be a similar system to car insurance where you know how much your claim has cost and how the work that has been done compares to that. This was an issue for both owner occupiers and council tenants (see quotes below)

Owner occupiers

"It's important to have someone you can trust and who is fully qualified to inspect the work because you often aren't in a fit state to decide." [group discussion comment]

"You sometimes just give in and accept substandard work because you just want it to be finished." [group discussion comment]

"We'd really like somebody independent to check all the work because we don't know what we should have to put up with." [group discussion]

"Will I ever know how much they've been paid? Because I want the insurance company to say if it is worth that" [group discussion]

"I would have thought when they paid this money out, they would at least have thought 'Oh I'll come and check to see what has been done'." [group discussion]

"Nobody gets houses inspected if it's been redone by the insurance companies as long as the builders have got some affiliation – some paperwork to say that they are builders. They don't have to – even if they are being paid £30,000 – they don't have to be inspected afterwards. How many houses in Hull in the next five to ten years are going to find out that they've got leaks, they've got damp, the electrics have not been done

properly? Because there's been lots and lots [of builders] that should not have been used." [group discussion]

"Perhaps cheques could be sent direct to householders to give to the builders when they are happy with the work that has been done – this might help residents feel more in control of the process and improve the quality of work that is being done?" [group discussion]

Council tenants

"Hull City Council management to come to all its tenants to check if everything's OK." [group discussion comment]

"I think Connaught has got all that money but they haven't done the work. So where's the council housing manager? Why hasn't he ever been? Why hasn't he ever surfaced and said 'How are you getting on in your house?' or 'Have they done this for you?' But no." [group discussion]

3. *Greater use of local building companies, rather than 'cowboy' firms from outside the local area.*

People wanted to use local tradesmen as they felt they were more trustworthy and diligent – plus it was easier to call them back if there was a problem with the workmanship. However, we have been told that local builders could not get work from the insurance companies because their quotes were always being undercut by firms from outside the local area.

"Why didn't they use local builders? I mean we've got some good builders in this town but yet they wouldn't use local builders, they said, 'We don't want to employ local builders, we want to get people from out of town'. And they come in from Sheffield and down south." [group discussion]

"I heard that the estimates, they were just passed to the lowest ones out of town. And so the local builders were getting missed out altogether and the insurance companies were bringing in who they wanted because they said they were more reliable because they've always worked for them." [group discussion]

"They were passing on the estimates from local builders to their builders in all the different towns. So the builders in our particular area weren't getting the jobs. They undercut them straight away, so they didn't get jobs." [group discussion]

4. *Having a local office in each neighbourhood where people could go for advice.*

This is something that the council's mobile flood advice service did and yet few people in our project seem to have taken advantage of this – people wanted more of this kind of service at a very local level. There was also a demand for simple, practical tips on how to cope during the reinstatement work – for example, telling people to mask doors to stop dust when dehumidifiers and fans are in use.

"I think there should have been someone in each little area, you know, there should have been a mobile home... Because near me, where I live, there's quite a lot of pensioners and bungalows and none of them knew what they were doing." [group discussion]

5. *Someone to provide reliable and consistent advice.*

Again, it is really important for people to have consistent information sources that they can trust. Hearing lots of conflicting messages can be very confusing and frustrating for people.

“Perhaps there should be... some kind of leaflet or information on how to deal with insurance... To most people it is almost like it [the insurance] has been a closed book. I mean how many times do you deal with insurance on this scale in your own lifetime? And you know, [people have] lots of different experiences – some people have... appointed builders who are rubbish.” [group discussion]

6. *Better management of insurance claims*

Two things that would have really helped people would have been a) prompt settlements of claims and b) covering costs upfront (rather than people having to pay for things themselves and then claim them back). Residents have had problems with insurance companies constantly disputing details of claims and thus dragging out the whole process. Delays in cheques arriving from insurance companies have also resulted in builders being called off jobs (or in residents having to borrow the money in order to cover the shortfall and pay their builders).

“We paid so much money out - it cost us so much money at the beginning of the flood for like, getting the caravan – we had to pay for that ourselves and tried to claim it back, even though... they’d only give us half of it back. We paid for plumbing so we could have water in the caravan and I’ve never been able to claim back off the insurance because like everything we have said, ‘we needed this, needed that’, they’ve sort of just brushed it away, brushed it away all the time.” [group discussion]

“[company name] was a nightmare for the buildings... we had four different assessors and they were all nightmares and none of them worked in the same way and they wanted us to start from scratch, everything we’d done each time. So it drove me up the wall and some days I was tearing my hair out and I was pacing up and down this caravan going mad, that’s how it’s affected.” [group discussion]

7. *Sensitivity to people's situations.*

While the gold, silver and bronze system did attempt to provide extra help to vulnerable groups, people have examples of where this could have been improved by implementing an extra sensitivity to people’s circumstances. For example, council tenants told us that repairs were being undertaken alphabetically by street name, whereas many people felt that the houses of the elderly, the disabled and young families should have been done first. Others felt that planned improvements to council housing under the Decent Homes Act should have been undertaken at the same time as the flooding repairs in order to minimise disruption for vulnerable residents.

“I cannot see why, if they were doing the floor and the doors and the skirting boards, why they couldn’t have just done and concentrated on the kitchen. Because now one or two of the pensioners are back in the bungalows, now they are being contacted by workmen again, rewiring for the kitchen, upheaval again, and these pensioners cannot take it. They are very distressed... one or two of them have completely refused them... these pensioners are adamant they do not want their kitchen. Maybe, say, in a year’s time they might feel like it but at the moment they can’t do with the upheaval.” [group discussion]

8. *Emotional support/recognition of emotional impacts.*

People have found the recovery process incredibly stressful and think that the authorities should have acknowledged this. They also feel that some form of emotional support should be available to people who are affected by flooding in future.

“Have people fully recovered? The psychological and emotional impacts continue.”
[group discussion comment]

“People should be made aware of the emotional consequences of the flooding – for example, I’m only just starting to feel that all this new furniture is really mine – it takes a while to adjust and get used to it and nobody tells you that you will feel like this.”
[group discussion comment]

“Many people seem to have more illness, lack of confidence and fear of future floods”
[group discussion comment]

“Need for central places for people to go in both the long and short term where they can receive empathy and emotional support to help them know where to start with it all – gym passes, punch bags and relaxation classes are more helpful later on when you’re in the middle of dealing with builders etc!” [group discussion comment]

9. *A rapid, practical response.*

What people wanted most in the days following the flood were people who could provide immediate help with practical tasks – for example, getting temporary washing and cooking facilities set up quickly. Instead, lots of residents found that they had to fill in many different forms before they could get this help.

“It would help to have a door-knocking exercise immediately after the floods, not just to gather statistics but to refer people on to others who could help them.” [group discussion comment]

“Dettol and cleaning products delivered direct to people’s homes would be more helpful than just taking a load on a van and telling people to come and help themselves – what about housebound people?” [group discussion comment]

10. *Having a local office for the insurance company.*

People report real problems with trying to get in touch with insurers over the phone and felt that it would have been much easier had more local offices been set up so that people could talk to someone about their claim face-to-face.

“Did your insurance company in Hull – did you have somewhere to go to?... We didn’t, it was all on the telephone, which is a nightmare in itself because you can’t get hold of people... Only one person in our close, who were with [company name], I think it was – they opened a small office in Hull, so they had somewhere to go.” [group discussion]

11. *Need for flood resilience measures, not just expensive reinstatement.*

Some people were concerned that their homes were being put back as before, thus leaving them vulnerable to future floods. Instead, they wanted to see changes being made which would help make their homes more resilient to future flooding.

“What they could have done then, is really put in some measures – proper flood resilient measures. They could have lifted the foundations up a foot, which I was saying they want higher foundations or they want the flood plain areas to have three storey houses where the ground floor is a utility and garage and the accommodation is above.” [group discussion]

12. *Employers need to have some kind of national system to allow people time off in the event of a disaster (for example, along the lines of compassionate leave).*

Many participants had supportive employers but were concerned about those whose employers may not have been so understanding. It was suggested that time off for employees could perhaps be covered as a component of insurance policies?

“I keep saying to my manger, I’m going to need a fortnight off shortly [to move back into the house]. A week to get in the property and a week to sort the other [rented] one out ... but that’s two weeks of my holiday where me and [husband] could have done with going away at the end of the year when we’re back in the house, just to have a rest, but that isn’t going to happen because I’ll have used all my holidays up. You need compassionate leave.” [group discussion]

Changes people would like to see being made now, in the community more generally

1. *Information on what actions are being taken in the wider community.*

A year on from the floods, people are still confused as to what is being done across the city to a) prevent and b) prepare for future flooding. They want reassurance so it is important that the various agencies involved tell them what action is being taken.

“Flood victims should be included at any official meetings” [group discussion comment]

“What support is available for people in the community now? People are going back into their shells.” [group discussion comment]

2. *Need for a coordinated body that can oversee everything to do with flooding and drainage.*

People are very aware of the fragmented way in which the drainage infrastructure is managed (e.g. lots of different organisations involved, from Hull City Council through to Yorkshire Water and the Environment Agency) and they feel there is a need for a coordinated body which will ensure that these organisations work together and communicate properly.

“Residents need to know who is responsible for cleaning drains etc.” [group discussion comment]

“We need somebody – a group – to police Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency and the Councils – somebody who could go to all their meetings, so they would take all their comments, record what they promised to do and then make sure it was all going smoothly and was put into action.” [group discussion]

3. *Public participation in policy responses - listening to local people and building confidence.*

In the longer-term, people would like to see residents having more involvement in decisions around drainage, flood and infrastructure management in Hull. There is a feeling that the many agencies involved cannot be trusted to make the necessary improvements on their own and that local residents need to form groups that can liaise with these agencies to communicate their wishes and to make sure that action is taken.

“Some MPs have been good and others not so good – we would like politicians who are actually willing to see people’s houses and who will turn up and get things done away from the TV cameras i.e. not just as a PR exercise.” [group discussion comment]

“We need to build confidence in the infrastructure” [group discussion comment]

4. *Street level contingency plans.*

Many people feel there should be street level contingency plans in place across Hull which detail what should be done in the event of a future disaster.

“If anything is being learnt from this then it should be that they do now have a contingency plan – not that I ever want it to happen again.” [group discussion]

“Would it be possible to have something along the lines of neighbourhood watch?” [group discussion]

5. *A code of practice for estate agents*

Several participants had bad experiences with estate agents (for example, hiking the prices on rented houses because they believe that insurance companies are paying, being unhelpful to families with children and pets, making appointments for viewings and then letting houses to other people without warning etc.) and would like to see a code of practice being implemented to ensure that this does not happen anywhere in future.

“We were treated appallingly by estate agents and if anything comes out of this I would like to see that any area that’s been affected in such a way where people have to move – that there’s an immediate code of practice kicks in where estate agents have to stick to it.” [group discussion]

6. *Someone to clean up the neighbourhood after the flooding and building work*

People feel that their neighbourhoods still look dirty and uncared for even though the building work has finished in their areas. (For example, builders’ waste is still lying around and there is dust and dirt everywhere.) They would like to see the streets being cleaned up.

“The estate is still in a mess, there’s rubbish everywhere.” [group discussion]

“All the rubbish – you are getting more punctures in cars because of rubbish on the road... it does seem to be the out of town builders that are doing it and it just feels as though they haven’t got a care [as] to what happens to us. They are just getting on with the job.” [group discussion]

7. *Better community education and preparation about flooding and how to help prevent it.*

People were not prepared because they did not expect the flood to materialise in the way that it did. They are also concerned that the capacity of the drainage system is being reduced by people putting the wrong things down toilets e.g. builders' waste, nappies and newspaper.

"The flood wasn't how we expected it" [group discussion comment]

"Would it be possible for a flyer to be sent round with your water bill listing things that should not be put down toilets and drains?" [group discussion comment]

"Could we get local people to agree to a voluntary code whereby, at times where there is a danger of flooding, everyone agrees not to put any more water down the system than is necessary? i.e. don't run dishwashers, washing machines etc. Like a hosepipe ban but in reverse." [group discussion]

8. *Advice on flood resilience measures and their effectiveness*

People want information on what measures they can take to protect their home and how effective they would be.

"You are bound to get loads of companies jumping on the bandwagon and saying 'we can do this and do that', but do we know they'd work?" [group discussion]

Appendix 5: Stakeholder Engagement

Evidence to Government's Pitt Review

Sims, R., Medd, W., Kashefi, E., Mort, M., Watson, N., Walker, G. & Twigger-Ross, C. (2008) "The ongoing experience of recovery for households in Hull – response to the Pitt Review Interim Report Learning the lessons from the 2007 floods, Chapter 9" Lancaster, UK Lancaster University. *Cited as a case study in the Pitt Review (Chapter 9)*

Sims, R., Medd, W., Kashefi, E., Mort, M., Watson, N., Walker, G. & Twigger-Ross, C. (2008) "A Case Study to support these concerns Handling personal property - findings from Hull", chapter in Easthope, L. "The Human Aspects of Flooding: Personal Effects", invited submission to the Pitt Review, University of Hertfordshire, March 2008

Evidence to DEFRA consultations

Sims, R., Medd, W., Mort, M., Twigger-Ross, C., Watson, N., Walker, G. (2009) "Submission by Lancaster University for Defra consultation on the Draft Flood and Water Management Bill" Lancaster UK, Lancaster University

Sims, R., Medd, W., Mort, M., Twigger-Ross, C., Watson, N., Walker, G. (2009) "Locally appropriate response and recovery – response to Defra consultation on the National Flood Emergency Framework" Lancaster UK, Lancaster University

Sims, R., Medd, W., Mort, M., Twigger-Ross, C., Watson, N., Walker, G. (2008) "Perspectives on resilience from households in Hull – response to Defra consultation on policy options for promoting property-level flood protection and resilience" Lancaster UK, Lancaster University.

Stakeholder events/presentations

Whittle, R. (2009) "The customer experience: feedback from Hull", British Damage Management Association Annual Convention, Warwick, December 2nd, 2009.

Whittle, R. (2009) "Lessons from the 2007 Hull flood recovery", Greater Manchester Authority Flood Awareness Session, Manchester, November 18th, 2009.

Twigger-Ross, C., Whittle, R., Medd, W., Mort, M., Walker, G., Watson, N. (2009) "Understanding the work of recovery: a real time study of local recovery following the floods of June 2007 in Hull" , NORMIT study day, Norfolk, October 8th, 2009.

Meeting with Lincolnshire County Council emergency planners to discuss research findings, July 16, 2009.

Medd, W. and Sims, R. (2009) "Learning the lessons for resilience – linking the everyday experience of flood recovery work with local and national policy learning", Flood and Coastal Management Conference 2009, Telford, July 1, 2009.

Sims, R. (2009) "Flood, vulnerability and urban resilience: a real-time study of local recovery following the floods of June 2007 in Hull", presentation given to Cabinet Office Recovery Capability Board, June 3, 2009.

Sims, R. and Medd, W. (2009) "Flood, vulnerability and urban resilience: a real-time study of local recovery following the floods of June 2007 in Hull", Chartered Institute of Water and Environmental Management Annual Conference, London, April 29, 2009.

Sims, R. (2009) "Flood survivors" Emergency Planning Society Human Aspects Group Seminar, Leicester, April 28, 2009.

Sims, R., Medd, W. (2009) "Managing cowboys, dwelling in caravans: Life after flooding in Hull" Workshop at the Local Government Association Emergency Planning Conference, Leeds, February 3, 2009.

Medd, W. (2008) Presentation to the All Party Parliamentary Group for Social Science and Policy, Westminster, London, July 2, 2008.

Sims, R., Medd, W., Kashefi, E., Mort, M., Watson, N., Walker, G. & Twigger-Ross, C. (2008) "Flood, vulnerability and resilience: a real-time study of local recovery following the floods of June 2007 in Hull", Flood and Coastal Management Conference 2008, University of Manchester, July 2, 2008.

Sims, R. and Medd, W. (2007) "Flood, vulnerability and urban resilience: a real-time study of local recovery following the floods of June 2007 in Hull", Regional Workshop of Rotherham and Doncaster Mental Health Trust, Doncaster, December 7, 2007.

Appendix 6: Summary of evidence to Pitt Review

The ongoing experience of recovery for households in Hull

– response to the Pitt Review Interim Report *Learning the lessons from the 2007 floods*, Chapter 9 of the Pitt Review Interim Report

Summary

We support the Pitt Review's interim conclusions on recovery (Chapter 9):

- Highlighting the impacts on health and well-being as a significant factor during the flood recovery process;
- Seeking to ensure that those affected have access to the various forms of support available at the local level; monitoring of the impacts on health and well-being, and actions to mitigate and manage the effects, as a systematic part of recovery work at the local level (IC 74);
- That effective, coordinated communication is a key element of the recovery process, and that a systematic programme of community engagement, as demonstrated by Hull's Flood Advice Service and the work of the community wardens, is helpful (Interim Conclusions 75 and 76).
- That the arrangements for distributing financial assistance during the recovery should be transparent and equitable (Interim Conclusion 89):

However we argue that the following issues should also be taken into account:

- In relation to IC 73, even though support may be available, diarists involved in our study are not always sure about what support is available for them by the public and voluntary sectors.
- In addition to voluntary and community groups (IC 73), it is important to acknowledge the role that family, friends and social activities can play in providing emotional and practical support during flood recovery.
- In response to IC 74, certain people may be particularly at risk in ways that may not be immediately obvious. First, the burden of recovery falls unevenly on different people, particularly on women but effects also on children, carers, and front line workers. Second, there is an important issue about who is, and what counts as a frontline worker – often roles of blurred and hidden from official structures.
- The difficulties of promoting effective public communication and engagement are exacerbated by a fragmentation of responsibilities between the different agencies involved in the recovery process. Consequently, it is not just communication from these agencies to the resident that is a problem – it is also communication and coordination between these agencies that creates difficulties.
- Swift settlement of claims by the insurance industry is essential to enable people to make progress with their recovery.

- While it is essential to ensure that people are able to recover from flooding as quickly as possible (Chapter 9 9.45), attempts to improve the recovery process should also focus on the ways in which we can build resilience for the future.
- If the recovery process is to be improved, adaptability of wider policy initiatives to the unusual circumstances could be vital in some cases, for example the case of accelerating the implementation programme for the Decent Homes initiative to repair flooding homes more quickly.
- Indicators of insurance industry performance, such as calls to complaint lines, will be a poor indicator of quality of service because people are struggling with getting back to normality let alone following official channels for complaint.
- It is vital to understand the role that tenure can play in the degree to which a household is able to recover from flood, and that the agencies charged with coordinating the recovery should take the effect of tenure into account when formulating their plans.

Appendix 7: Summary response to property-level flood protection and resilience consultation

Perspectives on resilience from households in Hull – response to Defra consultation on policy options for promoting property-level flood protection and resilience

Summary

- The trauma and distress experienced by residents during the flood recovery process, which disrupts the fundamental fabric of social life within the household and community, cannot be captured by cost-benefit analyses. Therefore, although we accept that financial analyses will have some part to play in determining where property-level resistance and resilience measures are rolled-out, we argue that other, non-economic factors should be taken into consideration when deciding which properties to target. We would welcome further consultation on different approaches to targeting properties/groups.
- Many of those taking part in our study have had their houses returned to their original condition. We are concerned that this represents a missed opportunity that has reproduced people's vulnerability to future flooding. Consequently, more must be done to encourage resilient repair following future flood events. We therefore support the consultation's statement about the importance of resilient repair (paragraph 1.12). We agree that property-level measures which may normally be considered uneconomical become much more worthwhile – and much less intrusive to family life – if carried out during the repairs process when there is already a high level of disruption in the household.
- We support the consultation's statement that a lack of information on behalf of householders and tradesmen, coupled with an inability to cover the additional costs of resilient measures at a time when finances are already strained, can constitute significant barriers to implementation. However, our research indicates that the type of flooding experienced can also be problematic, with pluvial flooding being perceived by householders as particularly difficult to protect against, particularly when the water comes up from under the floor. By contrast, river or tidal flooding is often perceived as simpler to combat because the water is seen to have a single source.
- Many households in Hull experienced 'secondary flooding', where water entered beneath the property, soaking floorboards and joists, with the result that major repairs had to be carried out months later when the problem was finally identified. Given the magnitude of this problem in Hull, we suggest that it is particularly important to establish whether the kinds of resistance and resilience measures currently being proposed are capable of protecting households against this kind of 'hidden' flood event.
- Our research shows that debates about the causes of the flooding can constitute an additional barrier to the take-up of property-level measures. This is because such debates inevitably influence views about whether the flooding is likely to happen again in future.

- Hull's example indicates that residents might be more willing to protect themselves if they feel that other organisations are also working to improve matters. Such 'joint approaches' are considered by householders to be both fairer and more effective. This does not mean that residents expect flood defences to be provided – clearly, such circumstances are not covered by this consultation. However, residents do expect local authorities, water companies and other agencies to fulfil their responsibilities (by making sure that the drainage system is properly maintained, for example). In short, householders do not think household-level measures should be viewed as a substitute for continued investment in – and maintenance of – an effective drainage system in urban areas.
- We support the consultation's statement that more people would be likely to choose resistance and resilience measures if their actions were reflected in the terms of their insurance. Therefore, we recommend that, whichever policy option is chosen as a result of this consultation, the government and Environment Agency should work with the Association of British Insurers to ensure that more insurance companies provide financial incentives to encourage more householders to take up these measures.
- Our research shows that tenants – as opposed to homeowners – are particularly vulnerable to the disruptions created by flooding. Those in the rental sector could therefore derive considerable benefit from the installation of property-level resistance and resilience measures. The government should consider how best to engage tenants and – crucially – landlords to ensure that the benefits of these measures can be extended to the rented sector.
- We agree that the strength and nature of the barriers to implementation are such that market forces and individual choice are unlikely to result in more people taking up these measures. Government action is therefore needed to address these barriers by providing more information about such measures alongside funding to encourage their implementation.
- We believe that option 2, where some form of subsidy is offered to residents in addition to a survey, would be a more effective means of encouraging take-up of property-level measures. It would also offer a higher degree of flexibility at the local level which could be used to address concerns about fairness. For example, one approach might be to offer a partial level of subsidy to all households in the community but with the option of providing higher levels – or even a full subsidy – to more vulnerable groups.
- If the objective of the scheme is to create 'showcase' schemes with a view to encouraging implementation elsewhere, it is vital to choose the right communities to approach. We recommend choosing areas where there is already a high level of awareness, activism and community involvement around flood issues.
- When consulting with communities, it is crucial to identify individuals from the local authority and Environment Agency with good people skills who can then approach local communities via trusted intermediaries. These individuals must be willing and able to listen to and work alongside local communities in order to help them take ownership of the scheme.
- Much of the routine building work that is carried out after a flood is poor quality work that remains uninspected and unregulated. Therefore, if resistance and resilience measures are to be installed, either during the reinstatement work or at a later date, it is essential to ensure that this is done properly and then inspected

– perhaps with a certificate given to the householder that could then be shown to the insurance company in order to qualify for a reduced premium, or to future buyers who might otherwise be anxious about buying the property.

- We encourage the government to do everything it can to ensure that flooded homes are repaired in a resilient fashion. More research would be needed in order to establish the best way of doing this – for example, whether a voluntary code would be sufficient, or whether some form of coercion via the Building Regulations would be necessary. However, crucial issues to address include the following:

- Terms of insurance: Homeowners might be encouraged to introduce property-level measures if this were reflected in reduced premiums.

- Who pays for resilient repair? There is a lack of clarity and consistency in financing the repairs process. Homeowners are also often under financial pressure during the recovery process. Therefore, if resilient repair is to become commonplace after flooding, options for funding, including government or self-funding, must be clear to all involved (householders, builders, insurance companies).

- In addition to a general lack of information about what resistance and resilience measures are available, people who have just experienced flooding are often in a state of shock and they are therefore unlikely to spend any time researching and thinking about the options for resilient repair. Participants taking part in our study have said that they would like to have been given a guide which explains simply and clearly how to do all the things that you have to do after a flood. Information and guidance on resilient reinstatement should be included in this guide. Builders and surveyors should also be better informed about the options available, so that they can recommend suitable measures to householders.

- Poor workmanship has been a major problem for flooded residents. Given that it is already difficult to source sufficient numbers of quality builders, tradesmen and materials during the recovery process, serious thought would be needed in order to ensure that resilient repairs are able to be completed swiftly and to a high standard.

Appendix 8: Summary response to National Flood Emergency Framework consultation

Locally appropriate response and recovery – submission by Lancaster University for Defra consultation on the National Flood Emergency Framework

By way of summary we recommend:

- When developing formal guidance for issuing official flood warnings it is important to be aware of how these flood warnings interact with other, more local forms of knowledge that form part of the picture for the local communities.
- Official flood warnings must:
 - Cover all types of flooding (not just fluvial and coastal)
 - Be consistent across the various different agencies involved
 - Be reported clearly and consistently across the various local and national news media that residents will consult for information
- Flood warnings must be communicated effectively at the very local level of the street or neighbourhood.
- Roles and responsibilities must be clear within – as well as between – organisations:
 - Clearly defined roles and responsibilities are important in preventing – as well as responding to – flood emergencies.
 - Discussions about these roles and responsibilities should be extended beyond the domain of central and local government to include those companies, agencies and individuals who have a role to play in managing flood and drainage related risks at the regional and local level.
 - Discussions about roles and responsibilities should also be extended to include – and support – the broad range of capacities of the community and voluntary sector which can play a vital part in meeting the very immediate needs of householders on the ground.
 - It is essential to ensure that the public are kept aware of which organisations are responsible for which aspects of recovery, so that it is clear who should be contacted in relation to specific problems and issues.
- In the event of a future flood, Primary Care Trusts should use the media and other appropriate communication channels to ensure that all residents are made aware of what they should do to protect their health. It would also be helpful for health authorities to work with flood restoration companies to ensure that these companies are clear about the different courses of action available to

them. Companies should be able to discuss this health information with residents so that a joint decision can be taken on what would be the most appropriate strategies to employ.

- Residents should be able to stay with their own GP even if they have temporarily moved out of the GP catchment area
- Many of the so-called ‘mental health’ impacts of the flooding are a consequence of householders being treated badly by the various companies and agencies involved in flood recovery. While for some mental health support might be helpful, a rethink of the ways in which the recovery process is managed to ensure that repairs are handled in sympathetic, helpful ways that minimise distress and make the process as quick and efficient as possible will have a greater impact.
- Efforts to improve the flood recovery process must be guided by the needs and the timescales of affected communities, rather than the ‘official’ recovery templates of local and national government organisations. Integrating the recovery effort more closely with the local community and voluntary sector is the best way of ensuring that appropriate resources reach those most in need of help.
- We need to recognise that the agents of flood recovery include a wider range of people and organisations though they might not see themselves in this role. Government bodies need to explore how to officially recognise, support, educate and if necessary, regulate, these wider private and voluntary sector deliveries of care and recovery.

Appendix 9: Summary response to Draft Flood and Water Management Bill Consultation

Submission by Lancaster University for Defra consultation on the Draft Flood and Water Management Bill

By way of summary:

Section 2.1 New approaches to flood and coastal erosion risk management

- We agree that it is not feasible to protect every area from flooding and that some communities may need to learn to live with more frequent floods in future. However, in practice this is going to require a high level of support for householders that minimises the impact of flood and reduces the likelihood of protracted flood recovery.
- It is vital for the government to rethink the recovery process to ensure that better, more long-term support is available for residents affected by flooding. The draft bill makes very little reference to this longer-term process and yet learning how to provide better support for people during flood recovery must form a vital part of managing flood and coastal erosion risks successfully.
- One suggestion could be that local authorities – in cooperation with other relevant organisations at the local and national level – are required to develop a plan for how residents could be supported during the long-term flood recovery process. This plan could be included as a chapter in the local flood risk management plans that authorities will be called upon to produce as part of the bill.
- A shift also needs to take place in the leadership and organisational cultures of the companies involved in flood recovery so that builders, insurers and utilities companies are encouraged to see themselves as agents of recovery (in much the same way as police, firemen and other emergency response workers are deemed to be). If this disaster recovery role were to be encouraged and legitimised, it might be possible to start a cultural shift whereby firms come to see themselves as having a constructive role in aiding people's recovery.
- Resilient repair is also vital. The consultation document on property-level flood resistance and resilience measures mentioned a number of possible avenues for encouraging resilient repair, including a possible revision of the Building Regulations – we would argue that the government should think seriously about this and other options for promoting resilient repair as the current consultation document is unclear about how this could be achieved.

Section 2.2 Future roles and responsibilities

- We agree that the existing legislative position provides insufficient clarity as regards the roles and responsibilities of the various organisations involved in managing flood risk and we welcome the

government's proposals to develop greater clarity and accountability from the national to the local level. This move towards greater clarity and accountability should also be extended to cover the management of the longer-term flood recovery process because, at present, there is no consensus or coordination around what different organisations should be doing to help and support residents during this time.

Section 2.4 Local flood risk management

- We agree that the current situation – whereby no one organisation is required to carry out a comprehensive assessment of local flood risks, needs and priorities, and where there is no duty on organisations to cooperate or share information – is ineffective and in need of transformation. The suggestion of an enhanced role for local authorities, combined with a new duty on all partners to cooperate and share information, would seem to be a sensible one.
- Having some form of effective public consultation in place is essential in order to ensure that local people are able to get involved in decisions around drainage management. This is particularly important in areas like Hull which have experienced flooding as residents have amassed much valuable information about the drainage issues that affect their locality. A good communication strategy is also essential in order to ensure that local people are kept informed of the decisions that are made.
- As well as being included in the list of organisations required to cooperate and share information, IDBs and water companies should also be included in the list of bodies required to cooperate with overview and scrutiny committees.

Section 3.2 Current funding structure

- We agree that funding should be aligned with responsibilities to ensure that those accountable for delivery have the resources to achieve what is required. Channelling money to local authorities to spend in order with their local flood risk management plans would seem an effective means of doing this.
- By encouraging the public to become involved in local flood risk management plans and decisions on how funding is allocated, the government can ensure that there is greater transparency and – potentially at least – greater public understanding of what monies are being spent, and where. We recommend that the new legislation makes it mandatory for local authorities to provide some opportunities for the public to be involved in decisions on flood risk management and its associated funding mechanisms.