

## Meeting of the Flood Advisory Group

30 March 2022

11:00am

Remote Meeting via Zoom

Link to the livestream: [Rochford District Council: Flood Advisory Group - YouTube](#)

Agenda Item	Notes
1.	Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Mrs J R Gooding, J Lawmon, Mrs C A Weston and S A Wilson.
2.	<p>The Minutes of the Meeting held on 1 November 2021 were agreed as a correct record by Members of the Panel, subject to the following amendments and observations: -</p> <p>Cllrs Mrs Christine Mason requested that it be reiterated, as documented in the previous minutes, that detail when matters are reported to the Flood Forum be noted with corresponding reports.</p> <p>A further observation was made with regard to Cllr Mike Steptoe being a Member of the Barling Magna Parish Council. This was not documented in the previous minutes but was corrected.</p>
3.	<p>Cllr Mike Steptoe declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of Barling Magna Parish Council, Essex County Council, Essex Flood Forum and the Environmental Agency Group. He further declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of living within the proximity of Kimberley Road, as the stream ran through his garden.</p> <p>Cllr Mrs Lauren Shaw declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of Essex County Council and being a Ward Member of Roche North.</p> <p>Cllr Mrs Cheryl Roe declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of Rayleigh Town Council.</p> <p>Cllr David Sperring declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of Rayleigh Town Council.</p> <p>Cllr Ian Ward declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of Rayleigh Town Council.</p> <p>Cllr Ian Ward declared a pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of the Rochford 100 Golf Club.</p> <p>Cllr Chris Stanley declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Member of Rayleigh Town Council.</p> <p>Cllr Mrs Christine Mason declared a pecuniary interest in Item 6 of the agenda by virtue of living at Englefield Close.</p>
4.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ASHINGDON</b></p> <p><b>Lower Road/Ashingdon Road</b></p>

ECCH notified the Panel that this had not yet been attended due to Traffic Management/Permit difficulties. They were not aware of any serious flooding in this location; however, they would be attending when appropriate.

The Panel made no further comment.

**29 Brays Lane, Ashingdon**

The contact for the Developed was passed on by RDC Planning as requested by ECC. ECC engineer had visited the site with the Developer and reported back on 27 July 2021, stating that there was no evidence for the filling in of a ditch by the Developer.

The Panel made no further comment.

**Moons Close to Highcliff Crescent**

ECCH advised the Panel that gullies were attended as part of the cyclical gully attendance on 3 February 2022. The gullies south of crossing had seemed to be clear, but there were consistent reports of water backing up from the Anglian Water main.

Anglian Water had been asked to check their main.

**621 Ashingdon Road**

This item was reported clear in previous minutes.

ECCH commented that the blocked ditches were attended in this vicinity a number of years ago. A gully defect was raised by a Highways Inspector earlier this year. The defect was attended on 28 October 2021 and was cleared.

**BATTLESBRIDGE**

ECCH commented that Timber Wharf Cottages are not maintainable public highway as it was a private road.

Comments were fed back by RDC to local contacts asking for reports and photos of flooding to be sent to Highways.

The Panel made no further comment.

**CANEWDON**

Cllr Mrs Lauren Shaw notified the Panel that the corner of Anchor Lane, in close proximity to the Primary School, continued to flood as the drains were not cleared.

**Canewdon**

Location details were missing to undergo a sufficient investigation.

A request was made for further detail.

**Canewdon Gardiners Lane**

Ditch at the bottom of the allotment site which abuts Gardiners Lane was found to be full of approximately 6 ft of water.

**Paglesham**

It was advised by ECCH that investigations and discussions were continuing and progressing. In the meantime, this site was attended periodically with last visit on 14 March 2022.

**Apton Hall Road**

This issue was not ECCH's responsibility and down to the private landowner.

**HAWKWELL****Clements Hall Way**

The Panel made no further comment.

**Holly Oak Lane**

ECCH advised that the drainage system would be dependent on ditch system. It was further advised that this was showing up as a private road on the asset register. No further assistance was available.

**Rectory Road**

ECCH advised that there were no known issues at the time.

Cllr Mrs Christine Mason advised that there had been a persistent issue for the past 12 years by the Clements gate. Works had been carried out in that area that involved traffic management which resolved the issue; however, the problem had returned. Reports had come through to advise that this could likely be a collapsed drain.

Cllr Mrs Christine Mason requested that this item be on the agenda for the next meeting of the Panel.

**Belchamps**

The Panel made no further comment.

**HOCKLEY****Cornhill Avenue**

ECCH advised that following a RDC request, the site was attended on 7 January 2022 and a preventative jet was undertaken. No issues were reported at the time.

**Folly Lane**

The Panel made no further comment.

**Park Gardens**

ECCH advised that they were not aware of any reported flooding in this area.

Cllr Mrs Mason advised that there had been no further comments from residents and this item of the agenda could now be closed. Cllr Mrs Mason also pointed out that Park Gardens was within Hawkwell, not Hockley – a correction would be made in future reports.

**Plumberow Avenue**

Cllr Ian Ward commented that as per previous minutes, 126 Plumberow Avenue had a significant amount of flooding from an underground stream, subject to planning being approved on an application. Cllr Ian Ward advised that this had not been resolved, with residents experiencing flooding in their gardens and basements.

Cllr Ian Ward highlighted that given fact that the planning application had been approved, giving no consideration to the stream causing flooding, action would be required from RDC as the planning authority.

**Westminster Drive**

Cllr Mrs Christine Mason advised the Panel that in August 2013, six properties were damaged along Westminster Drive as a result of flooding caused by blocked ditches. The ditches were cleared by the authorities; however, within the last year, the ditches had collected a significant amount of debris. Cllr Mrs Mason, on behalf of the residents, queried the responsibility of this land to possess the correct information in order to resolve this matter.

**HULLBRIDGE****Watery Lane**

ECCH advised the Panel that a preventative cleans, including any other maintenance issues were planned with a road closure. This had been delayed as the relevant closure permit could not be obtained due to a multitude of works on the diversion route.

**Malyons**

The Panel made no further comment.

**Dome Caravan Park**

The Panel considered this item as a separate item under Item 5 on the Agenda.

**Hullbridge Road – opposite Lubbards Farm**

As stated in previous Minutes, no further work was planned at this time.

**Grassmere Avenue and the Drive**

The Panel made no further comment.

**Kingsman Farm Road**

The Panel made no further comment.

**RAYLEIGH****Boston Avenue Culvert**

The Panel made no further comment.

**Grove Road**

Cllr Ian Ward requested an update with regard to pumping that was scheduled to be carried out by Anglian Water. Residents had been expressing concern that no action was taken and a site visit that was highlighted in the previous minutes between Anglian Water, Cllr Ian War and Marcus Hotten had not taken place.

**Rawreth**

The Panel made no further comment.

Cllr Chris Stanley raised comments with regard to pumping in Fairglen into a reservoir that was not sufficient enough in size to handle the amount of water resulting in overflowing. This would be investigated.

**Sweyne Park**

The Panel made no further comment.

**Eastwood Road**

As per previous minutes.

Cllr Ian Ward commented that this had been an ongoing issue since 2008. Phillip Lord of ECC had promised that the work would be done. Letter affirming this was sent to all residents – this letter was still with the legal department at ECC. Cllr Ian Ward queried why the letter was refuted.

#### **Hockley Road**

As per previous minutes.

#### **Victoria Road and Sweyne Court**

ECCH comment that they were not aware of any flooding reports or defects.

#### **33-45 Windsor Way**

ECCH advised that this was attended by their cyclical gully crew on 23 November 2021. The gullies were cleaned, and no defects were reported at that time.

Cllr Mrs Cheryl Roe confirmed that Windsor Way had been cleared in January 2022.

Cllr Simon Wootton commended the work carried out by Essex County Council. He further stated that routine maintenance was imperative to avoid further flooding issues.

### **ROCHFORD**

#### **Sutton Road**

ECCH advised that this item was as per previous minute.

Cllr Mike Steptoe made a reference with regard to a ditch that was dug out towards the canal. ECC had recently carried out a survey of the drainage system, as the ditch that was required to be dug out by ECC did not have outlet into the stream and the water continued to sit there. Cllr Mike Steptoe had not yet received findings of the survey, thus until the information would become available, no further action could be taken.

#### **Hall Road Development Suds**

Cllr Mike Steptoe advised that he had been in touch with Bellway Development along with the planning department. A number of issues was raised by residents who live at the back of the development. Bellway Developers fed back to Cllr Steptoe advising him that their alleviation system runs out into the ditch alongside Ironwell Lane with the culvert going into the Roache that had a sluice gate with the flap found to be missing. At the moment, information was not available as to who is responsible for the sluice gate flap missing. The water, if it were to be at high levels, could back feed underneath the culvert into Ironwell Lane and potentially blocking out the outlet from the subsystem as the subsystem in Hall Road would not flow directly into the Roache.

#### **Depot**

The Panel made no further comment.

#### **Rochford Hundred Golf Club**

Cllr Ian Ward queried whether there were any updates with regard to this item.

Jeff Stacey advised that he had been investigating this particular item; however, would be considered by the Panel as Item 6 of the Agenda.

### **WAKERINGS**

Cllr Mike Steptoe queried whether action of enforcement for riparian landowners with regard to ditches would rest with ECC as opposed to RDC.

David Chapman advised that watercourse enforcement where there would be misuse of a watercourse, would result in enforcement procedure carried out by ECC. This, however, would not extend to capacity increases. ECC currently had one watercourse engineer that covered county-wide issues. David Chapman further advised that ECC had an enforcement officer who dealt with highways enforcement related issues.

### **High Street, Great Waking**

ECCH advised that this item was as per previous minute.

Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson advised the Panel that as reflected in the previous minutes stating: Mark Lloyd from Anglian Water to investigate the sewage system along with the pipe system, was carried out. Anglian Water attended on 20 February 2022 with a full report provided. The sewage was cleared and inspected for overgrowth and collapsed pipes. It was flowing clear to the outfall. The outfall pipe would come into the ditch at the rear of the Recreation Ground. Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson attended the site on 7 March 2022 with the Asset Manager. RDC part of the ditch was clear and had capacity; however, riparian rights were not fully down to RDC, thus the part of the ditch that was not cleared did not fall to under RDC's responsibility. Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson stated that responsibility of the riparian rights must be clarified to remedy the issue.

Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson commended the work carried out by Mark Lloyd in Anglian Water on this item.

Cllr Mike Steptoe referred to certain homes along the High Street with issues that had not yet been resolved. He further requested that an investigation be carried out to determine the issues in the homes affected once the location details had been verified.

### **Barling Road, near Ye Olde Shoulderstick**

ECCH advised that this item was as per previous minute.

Cllr Mike Steptoe advised the Panel that this item fell under the responsibility of the riparian landowner.

### **Kimberley Road**

ECCH had no further comment on this item.

Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson stated that the repairs had been carried out by the riparian landowners. She further requested that this item remain on the agenda as issues with the pumping system had not yet been resolved.

Cllr Mike Steptoe advised the Panel that the watercourse (which ran through his garden) had been taking the water runoff to new developments of Star Lane and Hall Road. Cllr Mike Steptoe further advised that there was a separate issue within this item regarding the pumping station which rested with Anglian Water. During the flooding of the ditch, it would flood into the sewage system; however, a distinction between the two matters must remain to ensure they would both be addressed and resolved.

### **Poynters Lane/Waking Road**

ECCH advised that this item was as per previous minute.

	<p>Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson queried whether maintenance on the ditches had been carried out. The item remained outstanding.</p> <p>Cllr Mrs Jo McPherson requested that ECC reviewed their reporting system to make investigating and searching for matters more accessible.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>DOMESIDE RESIDENTIAL CARAVAN PARKS Flood Risk Report for the Rochford Flood Forum</b></p> <p>Jeff Stacey advised the Panel that no further action was expected from the Panel, with all relevant information being shared with the interested parties directly involved with this site.</p> <p>Cllr Simon Wootton commended the work done by Jeff Stacey; however, made the point that this item remained within the scope of interest of the Panel. This was to ensure that the interested parties are held accountable and to ensure that solutions had been implemented. Cllr Wootton pointed out that there had been infrastructural failings on this site, noting the risk assessment; however, the infrastructure failed to work. It was vital that all potential risks are addressed by the accountable bodies and reported back to the Panel to monitor the situation.</p> <p>Cllr Ian Ward supported Cllr Simon Wootton in the Panel continuing to monitor this item.</p> <p>David Chapman advised that the area surrounding Hockley had work done previously as part of the capital flood programme and that a bigger feasibility study would be carried out in the next financial year, to cover the options reviewed by ECC and the Panel. The report collated by Jeff Stacey would be used for contextual information.</p> <p>The options would be brought back to the Panel once the feasibility study had been carried out.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>WATERCOURSE CONFLUENCE IN ROCHFORD – Improving Flood Resilience</b></p> <p>David Chapman advised that options within this site would be considered, particularly the potential mitigation options that could be available as well as funding options.</p> <p>Cllr Ian Ward commented that these issues predominantly originate from Rayleigh Hills, with locations such as Eastwood Brook or Rayleigh Weir being affected by the River Roache. Maintenance of the River Roache, Noble’s Green Ditch, was now incorporated into the annual maintenance program which stopped a lot of the flooding from topping out. Cllr Ian Ward highlighted that the Panel must focus on where most of the flooding issues originate from to be able to suggest sufficient and efficient solutions with the assistance of the external partners.</p> <p>Cllr Mrs Christine Mason commented that points 4 and 5 in paragraph 1.2, page 6.1 of the Report were inaccurate – the Hawkwell Brook ran along Clements Hall Leisure Centre, at the back of the Christmas tree farms estate and closed on Thorpe Close, running parallel with Rectory Road: the stream would join at Windsor Gardens by a significant flow which would run parallel along the railway line/Magnolia Road. It then would split by the farmer’s ditches, towards the beginning of Ironwell Lane and towards the end of Ironwell Lane. Where the stream would join at Windsor Gardens, it had experienced flooding in the past, though not tidal, should the high tide be in, the water would have no space to disperse to, therefore causing overflowing and flooding. The flow at the back of Clements Hall Leisure Centre and Englefield Close was designated as a river and fell under the responsibility of Anglian Water. Cllr Mrs Mason highlighted</p>

that Anglian Water had been responsive when matters were reported to them and commended their work. However, she did request that the description be clarified and corrected to reflect accuracy of the locations and offered to a site meeting with Jeff Stacey to aid with the report.

Cllr Mike Steptoe queried the outflow from Rochford Reservoir and whether silting had been taken into account from tidal reaches and the effect that this would have. He further queried paragraph 3.18 on page 6.7 of the Report, which referred to flooding in Sutton Road as Cllr Steptoe was unaware of any tidal flooding that would come from the Roache or the Prittlewell Brook and requested further information on this matter.

A further query was made by Cllr Mike Steptoe whether the Panel considered areas where water flow could be slowed down and potentially stored.

David Chapman advised that each scenario was considered on its own merit and flooding could be the result of various tributaries; however, as part of the feasibility study discussed in the earlier part of the meeting, it would be considered to attempt to capture water and manage it naturally through the reconnection of floodplains, leaky dams and creation of additional storage options.

David Chapman further advised that the build up of silt on the road would be passed on to the Environment Agency as it concerned the main river section. Main river elements had the same riparian responsibilities as ordinary watercourses. The Environment Agency would have to confirm whether this was on their maintenance schedule.

Roger Webster advised that it could be considered to dedicate finance on clearing out the tidal sections; however, in due time, it would fill up with silt again resulting in no benefit to clearing out the tidal areas around the salt bridge. Regarding riparian ownership, Roger Webster clarified that all riparian owners had responsibilities to clear sections, that included outfall or tidal lock system areas.

Cllr Ian Ward queried page 6.2 of the Report regarding the flood risk and requested that any action points that would reduce and minimize the risk of flooding be noted on the risk assessment.

**7. Any other Business from Partners**

David Chapman advised that the Hockley area would have a feasibility study conducted in the 2022/23 financial year. The Capital Programme had also been authorized and funding was available for 2022/23 financial year. He further advised the Panel of the Essex Forest Initiative project where it was sought to plant 375,000 trees over 5 years and currently being at the end of the second year. This would aid ECC with attempting to evaluate how tree planting would impact flooding issues, in light of its environmental benefits.

Roger Webster updated the Panel that Environment Agency had a meeting with Rawreth Flood Action Group in the following month to address issues in that area.

Cllr David Sperring advised the Panel that the flooding at Sweyne Park car park entrance off Rawreth Lane was being addressed and resolved following Cllr Chris Stanley bringing this matter to the attention of the Panel.

Cllr Mrs C E Roe raised flooding issues along Church Road which would be addressed outside of the meeting.



8.

The following questions asked by the public had been received in office: -

**Question 1:**

*"My understanding is that developers are given planning permission without agencies, such as Anglian Water, being consulted. As a result of the lack of pre-planning with the relevant agencies, prior to any building developments taking place, the necessary infrastructures are not upgraded sufficiently to cope with the increased demand placed upon them. Why then does the Council not make it a requirement that developers have to future-proof against flooding by planning in conjunction with those agencies, and those developers have to fund the necessary improvements?"*

*Areas such as Watery Lane (the clue is in the name) in Battlesbridge is regularly flooded. So, why does the Council allow housing estates to be developed so close to such areas, (e.g., the estate in Hullbridge at the end of Watery Lane) when, surely, the new extensive roads and buildings dramatically increase the surface run-off that the drainage systems already struggle to cope with?"*

**Response to Question 1:**

This is more a question about Planning Policy and outside the scope of the Flood Forum. As a general comment, new developments have to put in place systems for attenuating the flow of runoff water, so that it is the same as it was when it was open fields.

**Question 2**

*"Does the fact that the Council rarely sweeps the roads or clears the leaves from pathways/gutters and no longer removes the leaves from the surface water drains have any bearing on the issue?"*

**Response to Question 2:**

Rochford District Council carries out road sweeping and Essex County Council maintains the highways, including drain clearance. If a specific problem has been identified, this can be referred to the appropriate Council with details of the location and the nature of the issue.

**Question 3**

*"in my experience, a lot of surface water problems in the rural parts of the district are caused by poor maintenance of roadside ditches and culverts. A prime example of this is the stretch of Barling Road from Clay Street Farm down to the junction of Shopland Road. In very wet spells the ditch simply overflows, and the water runs down the road instead. Because the culvert across the road just past the junction is blocked, the water forms a huge puddle across the road and flows into the stream on the other side instead."*

*Whose responsibility is it to ensure these ditches and pipes are kept clear and how can the public report the problem? I have tried reporting to Essex Highways twice and had been told each time, that they will investigate on their next inspection. Of course, by that time, the problem is no longer evident so, nothing gets done."*

**Response to Question 3**

Essex County Council Highways comment that, "assuming this is the Shopland Road/Barling Road junction given the location description, this is an Essex County Council "Structures Team" culvert and the ditches and piped ditches are the adjacent landowner's responsibility.

**Question 4**

*"Why is Sutton Road flooding not being pushed by Essex Highways? I have been fobbed off by them for several years – I have evidence of my efforts to get this resolved. If you want my evidence, please let me know."*

**Response to Question 4**

Essex County Council Highways comment that, "although no exact location details were given, there are known problems between Purdeys and Warwick Drive, with surface water defects shown. The gullies were last attended by the Ad Hoc Team for investigation on April 2020, but this section is on the provisional Essex County Council Surface Water Alleviation Scheme programme for 2022/23 for a scheme between Purdeys and Warwick Drive/ The last cyclical (routine) attendance was February 2022.

**Question 5**

*"Having had recent experience of the regular flooding under the railway bridge in Church Road, Hockley, I wonder if it would not be a good idea to install 'depth' signs on both sides of such bridges. I have seen these marked boards on other bridges which give a good idea of flood depth, so a decision can be made as to whether to go through the flood. At this site, there is already a permanent sign saying the road is liable to flood, so it is a regular occurrence. In the latest incident, a car did become stuck under the bridge. Even when there is no rain, the drains leading to the bridge are full of water, so something is stopping its getaway. Perhaps more regular maintenance is required at these sites."*

**Response to Question 5**

Essex County Council Highways comment that, "the gullies under the bridge usually just block because of the debris and leaves over them. Extra road sweeping would probably help here. Cyclical last attended February 2022."

Depth signs would need to be taken for consideration via the Local Highways Panel route.

**Question 6**

*"2 questions: -*

*1) when we have surface overflow situations, the undersized process plants cannot deal with the increase in water flow runoff, so directly bypass the system and dump this into the local rivers. What checks are made on what the pollutants and their levels are being made? Who is responsible for letting other authorities such as the CHA and Parish Councils know, so it can be posted ASAP either on a website or by placing notices?*

*2) we have many areas below the high-water level, that is such a heavy surface water discharge takes place upriver at the process plant discharge points on an exceptionally hightide, due to storm surges and winds. It can be seen, and it has taken place recently "topping" of the sea walls. The Environmental Agency has been indicating it is no longer prepared to strengthen/heighten any sea wall in the area, and in fact it has been stated it ill be realigning them in the future at a loss to many home and farm owners. Can they make a clear definitive statement on what is being proposed and when it will take place? Please do not hide behind "when funds are available" as are always available for major cities."*

**Response to Question 6**

Regarding question 1):

This question has been passed to Anglian Water for comment.

Regarding question 2):

Because the Flood Forum has a focus on flood risk related to internal drainage and this is related to tidal flooding, the Environment Agency representative on the Flood Forum is unable to comment. It was suggested this is referred to the River Crouch Coastal Community Team, which has been done.

The Environment Agency member on the River Crouch Coastal Community Team has replied as follows: -

Many thanks for sending this through, I have looked through the questions and provide the following response; however, we will require some clarity around locations.

Question 6.2 makes a sweeping statement that the EA has indicated that no strengthening or raising of defenses will be undertaken to the area and that realignment schemes are being proposed. I am not aware of any such statement and would request confirmation of where this statement originated.

The question (6.2) refers to a number of variables coinciding together (heavy rainfall, high discharge rates, spring tides, storm surge and winds), and these are all related to likelihood or probability rates. When assessing flood risk, we take into account such variables to ascertain the standard of protection and the potential likelihood of defenses being exceeded on an annual basis – term referred to as Annual Exceedance Probability. This allows for some of these variables to align but does not assume an absolute worst-case scenario and that would be an extreme probability. Therefore, there is always the potential that if the variables align to nearer the extreme probability scenario, then there is the potential for defenses to be overtopped.

The allocation of funding for improvement works requires existing properties and businesses at flood risk to be moved into a lower risk band. Those properties that are currently in a low risk area cannot be moved to a lower risk band and therefore will not attract funding. Conversely, those at higher risk will attract funding but under the current Treasury rules, there needs to be a positive cost benefit to schemes whereby the value of the benefits (people, property, land, businesses, infrastructure etc.) is greater than the cost of the scheme. This is where raising of defenses in rural locations with isolated communities is challenging with such long lineages of embankments, wholesale raising is not always economically justifiable, so projects may need to be done in isolation, and some projects may not be affordable with Government funding alone, and will require contributions from partners and stakeholders to deliver a scheme. Major cities have significantly higher benefit values due to the higher number of properties, businesses, infrastructure etc., that would be impacted by a flood event and generally cost benefits for schemes in these urban areas are greater.

We have a capital programme which is published that shows where and what projects are proposed over the next 6 years, and where future raising and improvement works are being planned.

<https://environment.data.gov.uk/asset-management/index.html?element=http%3A%2F%2Fenvironment.data.gov.uk%2Fasset-management%2Fid%2Fcapital-project%2FAEO000E%2F000A%2F718A&layer=capital-projects>

Additionally, we have a Revenue programme – also published: -

<https://environment.data.gov./asset-management/index.html> - which is the maintenance programme for existing defenses. This work is more focused on ensuring the assets are at their target condition, rather than improving them, but nevertheless, ensuring that the assets can perform are key to managing flood risk.

There are suggested locations where potential managed realignment sites have been proposed within the Essex and South Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan, and these were identified through the extensive consultation process over 10 years ago. With regard to realignment schemes, any managed realignment projects can only be progressed with landowner support.

**Question 7**

*"I live down Sutton Road in Rochford, near the Anne Boleyn pub. When it rains, the road and drains are flooded, people cannot walk down the road without getting wet from the water and cars. I had my front door open when a car went pass and the puddle that was out the front was splashed into my hall, my lounge window got mud splashed over it, as the drains overflow with water and mud – it is very bad, it gets very flooded – is this something that you will be looking into? Kind Regards."*

**Response to Question 7**

Essex County Council Highways comment that, "Map 16 shows the gullies in this section as clear when they were last attended by the Ad Hoc Team on 9 April 2020 – cyclical last attended February 2022".

**Question 8**

*"On the hill on Greensward Lane, right by Crouch View Crescent, the water rolls off the hillside and onto the main road for days after heavy rain. This is what causes huge issues in the cold months as this freezes, and we have repeated accidents due to this water freezing over. I have reported the drains are full a number of times each year, yet only once have they been cleaned out. The one on the same side as the road gets clogged with mud and therefore is as useless as anything. It has been reported repeatedly but nothing happens. Just once have the drains been cleaned out over a number of years."*

**Response to Question 8**

Essex County Council Highways comment that they last attended opposite Crouch View with the Ad Hoc Team on 19 February 2021 when the gullies were cleared. The last cyclical was December 2021.

**Question 9**

*"Has an evaluation taken place on how the 600 planned houses will add to this issue?"*

**Response to Question 9**

No further detail was provided, so it was difficult to make specific comments. Planning issues are outside the scope of the Flood Forum, but in general terms new developments have to put in place systems for attenuating the flow of runoff water, so that it is the same as it was when it was open fields.

**Question 10**

*"What can be done to improve the drainage in Southend Road, Rochford?"*

*"When it rains the drains do not empty away, and the water just sits there flooding the drains and road, causing a hazard, and soaking anyone who walks along the pavement whenever a car drives past."*

**Response to Question 10**

Essex County Council Highways comment that, "no specific location wa given, but that at Warner's Bridge the Anglian Water main is full up so it is with them to investigate.

They last attended with the Ad Hoc Team on 4 November 2021 and a Cyclical Team attended in February 2022.

This question has been forwarded to Anglian Water.

**Question 11**

*"We live in Arundel Road with a stream running across our property. Can we get any guidance regarding the extra water running down the Ashingdon Hill, along Fambridge Road into our stream? We have put in pipes in some areas near the house and dug the stream deeper; however, it appears to slow down and back up, going into next door's property and out into the Crouch. We have also raised all our ground levels in line with the flood agency. Could some extra drainage be out in to take some of the pressure away from the stream? Thank you."*

**Response to Question 11**

None of the Flood Forum's professional partners commented on this as being linked to any of their areas of responsibility. It may be a local drainage system which is the responsibility of the local residents and landowners. Help in investigating may be available from the Essex Flood Team – [Flood.Essex.gov.uk](http://Flood.Essex.gov.uk)

**Question 12**

*"If a development is given planning permission and then causes flooding issues to neighboring properties, what responsibility does the local authority have in rectifying the situation?"*

**Response to Question 12**

The Local Authority may have powers to act, but it is dependent on the individual circumstances.

**Question 13**

*I live on Southend Road near the airport control tower, when there is a downpour of rain, the road floods due to the lack of drainage. The damage to my front garden wall is extensive. When will the drainage issues be resolved along this road?*

**Response to Question 13**

Essex County Council Highways comment that they will programme jetting here for this section Map 16 defects shown. Cyclical attendance February 2022.

**Question 14**

*"The question I wish to raise is as follows: -*

*Marcus Hotten arranged for a site visit to be undertaken by a Rochford District Council representative to Cornhill Avenue last year to establish the following: -*

*To find a cost-effective solution to water accumulating around some residential properties trapping the residents in their homes and water running down the driveway to the highway drains.*

*Map photos have been supplied to previous Flood Forum. An update on the recommendation, please."*

**Response to Question 14**

Essex County Council Highways comment that, "we attended Cornhill Avenue with the Ad Hoc Team and cleared all gullies on 7 January 2022, and cyclical attendance was carried out in March 2022."

Marcus Hotten confirms that there had been a visit by Rochford District Council, but no definitive cause could be identified. A professional investigation is required, and Marcus Hotten is trying to identify a way to fund this.

### **Question 15**

*Question 1 of 2:*

*We, the residents of Malvern Road and the surrounding roads in Hockley want to make Anglian Water, the officers of Rochford District Council and all other interested parties aware of specific issues relating to the network's ability to cope along Greensward Lane and Spa Road. In particular in the vicinity of the railway bridge.*

*In response to the Council's call for questions at this meeting, and also in reply to Anglian Water's call for detail, as per their third bullet point in their "representation" sent in response to the Council's Plan to 2040, we invite Anglian Water to comment on the following. Please note an extract from their "representation" is included at the foot of this message.*

*We content any future development on Green Belt sites in the vicinity of Greensward Lane and including "CFS023: green belt land behind Malvern Road", will compromise the network of drainage pipes that run beneath Greensward Lane. Especially during periods of abnormally high rainfall over relatively short time periods.*

*The history of flood events clearly shows a network close to maximum capacity. Which in turn is causing traffic disruption along one of only three east-west transport routes through the district, excluding the A127.*

*As recently as Monday 21 February 2022, excessive flood water caused manhole covers in Greensward Lanes to lift and flood the road beneath the railway bridge. Prior to this, on the night of 20 October 2021, Greensward Lane was impassable due to a period of heavy rainfall leading to raised manhole covers and flooding beneath the railway bridge.*

*Source: Mrs Dawson and also Cllr Foster at the Flood appeal respectively.*

*Other flood events in this locale occurred at or near the railway bridge on the following dates: -*

*31 August 2020; 29 July 2017; 11 October 2017; 17 September 2015; 15 October 2015.*

*Source: Essex Fire & Rescue Service*

*Note: all dates correspond with historical rainfall either on the day in question or the date before.*

*Source: World Weather Online – Shoeburyness.*

*And without doubt, the most serious flood event at the railway bridge in recent times occurred on 24 August 2013 when the road flooded to a depth of 7 feet which almost resulted in loss of life.*

*Source: National news coverage, including the BBC.*

*In addition, we content that when this data is viewed against the back drop of the climate crisis it is a clear and unambiguous warning to infrastructure providers, planners and Councillors of a likely increase in flood frequency at this locale AND possibly an increase in damage severity especially to local property. Note that in the 2013 flood event, properties flooded in Willow Walk as a consequence of water moving from Greensward Lane and down Broad Parade and hence into Willow Walk. Also note the proximity of manhole covers at the junction of Greensward Lane and Broad Parade.*

*To underline the point, infrastructure providers and Planners are no doubt aware that authors of the "Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment" call for a 30% loading to likely flood events in the future as a consequence of the climate crisis.*

*Thank you for your time and we look forward to listening to the replies.  
From Mrs Dawson, Clarke, Olley and James.*

*Extract from Anglian Water representation:*

*"Colleagues in Pre-Development Services – who would consider sites at the preferred option stage and advise developers – have run the numbers and confirmed that: -*

- Along with Rochford, the other WR catchments likely to be involved are Rayleigh-West and Rayleigh-East (see attached).*
- All three WRCs have headroom to accommodate the additional numbers you are looking at (circa 2.5k units).*
- The pinch points are in the network and so would need considering when at preferred site shortlisting stage.*
- Currently they suggest additional housing sites should first be located in the Rayleigh-West catchment (as wastewater colleagues indicated) and then Rayleigh-East.*
- The preference would be for concentration of development as this enables investment at scale both by Anglian Water and developers.*
- The network will need looking at closer and may pose some issue with regard to the impact on frequency and volume from the Combined Sewer Overflows.*
- This would be at the ROCD SP and STBG SM (see attached).*
- Both of these discharge to sensitive watercourses and that may involve new storm discharge consents from EA which may cause some concerns for developers although with this should be resolvable at planning application stage."*

*ENDS.*

#### **Response to Question 15(1)**

Thank you for this information. This has been shared with others, but from the perspective of the Flood Forum, it relates to possible future planning issues, which are not in the remit of the Forum.

*Question 2 of 2:*

*Will the evidence document titled, "Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2018" be updated with a correction, please.*

*Note that it erroneously describes the River Crouch foreshore of earth embankments being, "typically fronted by areas of intertidal mudflats or salt marsh habitats, which act to dissipate wave energy and reduce the probability of erosion due to tidal and river flow."*

*The SOUTH bank from Hockley to Wallasea have no such intertidal mudflats. The only exceptions measure 0.8 of a mile to the east of Brandy Hole, and another measuring 0.25 of a mile west of the commercial quay at Wallasea Island.*

*The river profile is generally steep sided. The earth embankment is therefore the only defense against overtopping. Energy from the waves and also the wash from vessels underway is NOT dissipated before contacting the embankment.*

*Source: The undersigned experience of 25 years sailing on the River Crouch and supported by Google Maps aerial photography.*

*Members of the Flood Committee might be aware that the Crouch Harbour Authority already email river users on a regular basis throughout the year about the dangers of excessive wash from vessels underway and the threat it poses to “overtopping” the river embankment – typically twice a month at spring high tides.*

*Over the next 30 years, the risk of flooding is projected to double due to coastal/surface flooding and extreme weather events.*

*Source: Essex Climate Action Commission interim report, c.2020 – commissioned by Essex County Council.*

**Response to Question 15(2)**

Tidal flooding issues are not part of the remit of the flood Forum which has a focus on flood risk related to internal drainage issues. The comments will be shared with the River Crouch Coastal Community team.

The Environment Agency member on the River Crouch Coastal Community team has replied as follows: -

With regards to question 15 (2 of 2), the reference to the “Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2-18” is not an Environment Agency document. It is a report commissioned by Rochford District Council and therefore a response to this question is required by Rochford District Council, rather than the Environment Agency.

In the light of these comments, the information will be passed to Rochford District Council.

**9. TBC**