**United Utilities Water Limited**
Haweswater House
Lingley Mere Business Park
Lingley Green Avenue
Great Sankey
Warrington WA5 3LP

Telephone: 01925 237000

unitedutilities.com

**Our ref:** EIR-1008
**Date:** October 2026
**Email:** EIRRequests@uuplc.co.uk

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your request for environmental information. We appreciate your interest, and we want to let you know that your request has been carefully considered in accordance with the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR).

Please note the three questions (numbers 3 to 5 from the request) below are being treated as a new EIR response, which is purposely separate from the request for an internal review on the same issue (EIR-1009).

We note that that your request for an internal review was undertaken on the proviso that the request for further information is declined. However, as this request has been accepted, and further information provided below, please can you confirm if you would now like to withdraw the internal review request, or for it to remain open.

**Your request and our individual response to the questions, are outlined below:**

**Question 3 - The basis for the "would have flooded regardless" conclusion**

**Your response states that the modelling indicated No. 38 "would have flooded regardless of whether flood gates had been installed at number 42," and would still have flooded "even if flood gates had been installed at all properties within the flow path." I ask you to provide the underlying modelling report and outputs on which this conclusion is based, including**:

**(a) The rainfall event and return period modelled;**

The model explores a flooding scenario resulting from a 1 in 30-year storm return period.
A storm return period is a way of describing how often a storm of a certain intensity is likely to happen. For example, a 1 in 20-year storm means that statistically a storm of that severity has a 1 in 20 chance of occurring in any given year, or about 5% chance annually. It doesn't mean the storm only happens once every 20 years, it could happen more often, or not at all for many years. Storm return periods are about a probability, not a prediction. A certain year may see numerous extreme events observed, followed by a year with no events. The duration of the rainfall event/storm was then modelled as 60 minutes.

As outlined in our previous correspondence, we are unable to provide you with a copy of this modelling summary report. This report contains information on multiple properties from your local area that extends beyond that of your property and your adjoining neighbours. Whilst this information may not technically used to 'identify' an individual, it does contain specific information on their property, which should be classified as information personal to that individual.

EIR Regulation 13 states that disclosure is prohibited if releasing the information to a general member of the public would contravene any of the data protection principles set out in the UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) or the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA 2018). These principles include Integrity and confidentiality, where data must be processed in a manner that ensures appropriate security of the personal data, including protection against unauthorised or unlawful processing.

Likewise, EIR Regulation 12(3) explicitly states that a public authority shall not disclose requested environmental information if it constitutes the personal data of an individual other than the applicant, unless doing so complies with Regulation 13. Unlike other exceptions under Regulation 12, Regulation 12(3) is not subject to the standard public interest test.

The modelling report was obtained for the purposes of considering a dispute you have raised, and we therefore consider that it is covered by litigation privilege in any event. We further understand that as part of that dispute (which is being dealt with separate to this matter and is ongoing) you have been provided with an independent expert report which provides expert opinion as to flooding mechanism.

**(b) Whether a scenario without the flood gates at No. 42 was actually modelled, or whether this conclusion is inferred from a single, current-state model;**
Yes, a flooding scenario was modelled without flood gates being present at Number 42.

**(c) The predicted depth, extent and other relevant characteristics of flooding at No. 38 under the modelled scenario(s), rather than a binary indication of whether flooding would occur;**
The model is 2D and therefore does not predict depth. It only considers the extent of the predicted flooding path. As such, under Regulation 12(4)(a) of the EIR, we cannot provide this information, as it is not held.

**(d) Whether the model distinguishes between a scenario with a gate at No. 42 only and a scenario with no gate at any property, and if so, what difference (if any) it predicts for No. 38 between those two scenarios;**

The model considers three independent scenarios:

1. No flood gates being present at any of the properties on The Ridgeway.
2. A flood gate being installed at Number 42 (in line with the current situation).
3. Multiple flood gates being installed at various properties on The Ridgeway.

Flooding is predicted to occur in varying degrees at Number 38 in all three of these model scenarios.

**(e) The type of model used, and whether it incorporated topographical survey or LiDAR elevation data, or measured kerb, threshold and gully levels, for the area around Nos. 38, 40 and 42**;

The model is 2D overland flow impact model, which incorporates topography survey data. It does not incorporate elevation data, or measured kerb, threshold and gully levels.

**(f) Whether the model was calibrated or validated against any observed flooding event, and if so, which event(s); and**

The model is not calibrated against a specific flooding event, but our models utilise rainfall data. The storm return periods are calculated using rainfall data that United Utilities receives from the Met Office and the application of the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) methodology. The FEH methodology is a nationally recognised standard for rainfall and flood estimation, and rainfall-runoff modelling. This method is approved by the UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology and is based on calibration to large hydro-meteorological datasets from gauged locations across the UK. More information on this topic can be found on the UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology website:

Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) | UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology

**(g) Whether the modelling considered any interaction between flood gates or other property-level protection at different properties within the flow path, and if so, what that assessment found**.

Yes, as mentioned above, the model considers various scenarios that include the implementation of flood gates at various properties. The model still predicts flooding at properties even with multiple floodgates theoretically installed.

**This last point matters because your response also states that, even with gates at every property in the flow path, "the runoff would have continued to travel overland between property boundaries." If a single gate does not remove that runoff but only affects where it travels, I ask whether the modelling assessed which properties would receive that runoff as a result of a gate being installed at No. 42 alone, as opposed to no gate being installed anywhere. If no such assessment was made, I ask you to confirm this expressly**.

The various scenarios explored within the model show the theoretical impacts and changes to the runoff path by the application of each floodgate installation scenario.

**Question 4 - Consistency with other United Utilities correspondence**

**On 12 August 2025, United Utilities' Service Recovery Department (Ms Emily Beech, ref 07418212) wrote to my neighbour, Ms Suzanne Potts of No. 40 The Ridgeway, stating that a "feasibility survey" and modelling had shown that "protecting your property would require extensive mitigation across multiple properties, making it unviable without significant funding and multiple legal agreements." I ask you to confirm whether this is the same exercise as the February 2025 modelling referred to in your response to EIR-958, and if not, how the two exercises relate to one another**.

The modelling is its own individual exercise.

**Question 5 - No property-specific assessment for No. 38**

**Your response confirms that No. 38 "was identified as potentially requiring flood gates," while separately confirming that "there was no specific survey or assessment specifically in relation to number 38." I ask you to explain the basis on which No. 38 was identified as potentially requiring flood gates in the absence of any property-specific survey or assessment, and in particular to confirm what predicted flow condition or mechanism led to that identification**.

As described above, the modelling included several scenarios, including one with flood gates being installed at Number 38. This modelled assessment does show some benefit to the installation of flood gates at this property, but as repeatedly expressed, we are of the view this would not completely negate the issue.

The underlying, historic flooding issues pertain to highway drainage, which is not the responsibility of United Utilities. We understand that the flooding issues have since been resolved following work by the Council on the highway gullies.

We hope that this response answers your request. However, if you're not satisfied with how we've handled it, you can request an internal review. To do this, please write to us at Environmental Information Office, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere, Warrington, WA5 3LP or email us at EIRRequests@uuplc.co.uk, addressing your request to [redacted], and explaining why you're unhappy with our response. We'll be very happy to review your request and ensure we've done everything we can to assist you.

Any request for an internal review should be made within 40 working days of receipt of this response, and we will reply within 40 working days from receipt of the request for internal review.

Many thanks

We'd love to hear your feedback on how we handled your request! If you have a moment, please complete our short survey here – your input helps us improve our service.