

Gladman Developments Ltd

Land at The Hill, Littlebourne

Flood Risk and Drainage PoE 2

Alan Atkinson, Vice Chair, the Little Stour and Nailbourne River Group,

The Nailbourne valley is prone to flooding, to the nastiest of flooding types, groundwater flooding.

Indeed, such an episode is likely about to start again within the week. So what happens? The GW rises up within the chalk, and ingresses at many points into the sewerage system. This system then becomes full of GW, and cannot accept local foul water from homes.

The sewer system thus fails as it cannot accept anything more. Everything down-pipe is affected.

The water company then might attempt to reduce the pressure upon the system, by pumping out from the sewer system, initially tankering the GW/foul water in the full pipework, to local sewer works, eg at Sturry in Canterbury. So that puts tanker traffic onto our rural country lanes. And if that proves insufficient, as has usually been the case, the pipework is voided into local watercourses.

So we thus have additional traffic on our roads, these minor country lanes, taking huge tanker traffic.

We have a sewer system that already regularly fails, to be placed under additional stress.

An E.A. that will too readily permit discharges into our river system, because the water company is not able to prevent GW ingress into its pipework.

Indeed Southern Water has not been able to effectively seal its network of aged pipes either here, or in the other chalkland area in which it operates, around Hampshire. I think , not ever.

Yet, incredibly, the proposed development application arrives with a Flood Risk and Drainage report that gives it all a clean bill of health.

Point 2.5 states "Groundwater and water ingress into the downstream sewerage system are noted, {noted, mark you!} but do not impact on the site in terms of flood risk to the development" and point 7.6 offers "the proposed development accords with national and local policy requirements. It will not exacerbate existing flood risk issues downstream and is not dependent on third-party infiltration reduction schemes."

This is a very bold statement w.r.t. the system; in the 25 years since 2001's floodings in the Valley, the water company has not managed to prevent Infiltration into its system that has removed the need for tanker-ing or worse: and there are tankers out in the Valley already today again. This development will most certainly place the pipework elsewhere under considerable additional stress. And then, in turn, the local road network.

A typical episode can be seen via the photographs:

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/pheasantscroft/albums/72157632910949427>



Image One 6361 : the rising groundwater infiltrates the sewerage system, requiring the water company to commence "tanker operations". The work results in sewage on the streets; regular heavy tanker traffic on rural roads; areas being fenced off to allow access to pipes. Here at Riverside Close, Bridge, the only vehicular route into a large residential area, was regularly blocked by tankers.



Image Two 6423 : As the groundwater rises, tankering operations become unsustainable, and the contents of the sewer system are emptied out into the river. There is a sieve, and a slotted pipe to catch larger objects, but the force of the pumped fluids ensures that virtually everything ends up in the river.



Tankers on the roads: three of them, main road link between two Villages.

Examine more images at [Project for Nailbourne River Group | Flickr](#)

And one final point: the E.A. was attempting model the watercourse in order that we in this Valley might put flood mitigation measures in place. This modelling work was started immediately after the 2014 flooding. They appear to have given up. And yet, this Development claims, again Point 7.6, that the development's requirements " will not exacerbate existing flood risk issues downstream."

The Development has not been directly opposed by the E.A. perhaps because without their model, they do not know exactly how things would develop, but it is too long and hopeful a hop from that position, to one where the Developer can be allowed to state that the proposed development "will not exacerbate existing flood risk issues" within this Valley.

It is the view of the LS&NRG, "the River Group", that this development is far too much and too concentrated to not cause immense difficulties within the Valley; we have considerable experience here, and we ask that you do not allow the appeal.