

RM LR 006 Mrs Robertson Question 2

1. The revised scheme seeks to increase the capacity of the Leigh FSA to give greater flexibility to deal with flood events that threaten to occur 'In this part of the River Medway'.

- there is little or no mention in the revised scheme of 'and further downstream', as stated in the River Medway Act 1976, mainly Tonbridge and Hildenborough.

- please ensure that this does not lead in its use to the alteration of the natural flood plain in such a way as to adversely affect downstream communities. For example by capturing the peak early to save Tonbridge leisure facilities which are on the flood plain using this new 'flexibility' it should be ensured that the outflows do not adversely affect downstream communities (for example by bad timing effecting the confluence at Yalding by the Medway preventing the Beult from getting away in its time of flood and backing up).

*1 See ambition of Tonbridge and Malling District Council as shown in their submission.

*2 This evidence on how this flexibility is achieved and possibly for development may be currently being withheld by EA and TMBC (see Mrs R submission 2 and 3).

16. Modifications or conditions must include that the scheme adequately refers and considers downstream.

- downstream communities such as Yalding were not made Specified Interests by the Minister as advised by the EA. Our communities though kindly heard at the Inquiry have not had the opportunity to fully outline our conditions or modifications.

17. The fact that the operating procedures **are** material considerations to the inquiry means that the operating procedures must in the full spirit of the 1976 Act consider in a fair and reasonable way how mitigation of flooding 'further downstream' can be achieved through the increased capacity of Leigh FSA.

- the word 'only' must be removed from the Leigh Barrier Operating Procedures (See Mrs R submission 1).

18 We agree that the revised scheme should respect the wording of the 1976 Act.

- therefore it should be modified throughout to include 'and further downstream' and not reference Tonbridge and Hildenborough only.

18a. 'To prevent... inundation caused by the overflow of the river downstream'.

- this should also mean that the EA should alleviate the inundation that the Medway causes at times of peak flood at the confluence of the Beult at Yalding. This affect can be felt some 12KM upstream at Stilebridge. (See Dr Ackerman submission)

18b emergency

- this should include emergency evacuations of Little Venice that could have been prevented by the operation of the Leigh FSA if it had been in operation.

24. d.i - altering of operating procedures.

- this is not the full list of conditions. For example additionally - removal of ONLY in the operating procedures and modelling of the confluence at Yalding under different combinations of flood event conditions.

29. 'that material is before the inquiry'. Currently the website does not contain the EA's response to me, Mrs Robertson, or to Stephen Day, Chairman of the Medway, Beult and Teise Flood Group.

30. the evidence about the public evidence, p10.

- the evidence held in the 2010 review may have been withheld from the inquiry. Please see Mrs R Submission 2 and Mrs R submission 3.

32. 'the expansion of the Leigh FSA will ensure further benefits can be derived'

- we argue that downstream communities such as Yalding should also benefit from its expansion through its fair and reasonable management, including modelling how outflows could affect our confluence community under different rivers flood conditions. So that flooding is not exacerbated through 'seat of the pants' operation as published after the flooding of 2000. An enhanced Leigh FSA demands an enhanced awareness of how outflows, particularly the timing of their release impacts river peaks downstream to ensure they do not coincide.

33. 'extra protection to Tonbridge' - does this include altering the natural flood plain capacity? For example if protecting the sports fields or swimming pool leisure facilities requires more capacity, can it be ensured that its release does not affect downstream communities due to bad timing?

- Hildenborough - can taking water out of the floodplain on this large a scale be good for downstream communities?

37. If confidence is lacking then we would like there to be more detailed and specifically briefed modelling done of the confluence at Yalding, more river monitoring stations on the Beult and Teise, and more rain gauges in the Catchment in order to become more confident.

43. Does this modelling include looking at the timing of outflows from the revised scheme and how they impact the confluence at Yalding?

89. If the operational procedures are of material consideration to this inquiry then we as residents **should** be concerned that the revised procedures have inserted the word ONLY as in Tonbridge and Hildenborough only (Mrs R submission 1)

90. These greater benefits refer to, for example,

- timing the outflows so they do not coincide with the peaks of the Beult and Teise.

- using the new 'flexibility' to investigate how to help alleviate a Beult flood, which for example the evacuation of Little Venice is an Emergency. (See our political representatives submissions).

94. Our point is that the modelling that could help investigate how to reduce risk to communities downstream (that has been referenced from at least 2005 as being possible to do) should now as a matter of priority be done. By only optimising Tonbridge (see Mrs R submission 1) perhaps in some flood events the greatest benefit is not always achieved (see C Findlay submission).

96. the revised scheme should have the reference to communities downstream throughout and that should follow through to the operational procedures.