



Flood Alleviation Scheme Barnetby Le Wold

North Lincolnshire Council responses to Barnetby Le Wold Parish
Council

Extraordinary Meeting – 15 March 2021

Question 1

Please provide details of the design specification for the FAS along with details of any engineering issues/maintenance and design changes to the original specification.

NLC Response

This is a massive amount of information to disseminate and there will be a requirement of at least three months in order to gather the data required. We will require a data sharing agreement to be signed prior to providing this information.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q1

General concerns raised in respect NLC detail in respect of the timescale to obtain the information.

Was the design and construction of the FAS carried out under the Construction, Design and Management Regs (HASAWA 1974), if so then there should a completed file available from which the information can be obtained from in a relatively short time span.

Question 2

When did the capacity of the pump reduce from 38ltrs/sec to 25ltrs/sec? Was this when the pump was replaced (as witnessed by a local resident in conversation with the engineers)?

NLC Response

The figure of 38 litres/second was the initial designed discharge rate required. However, this would have required improvement works to the Victoria Road culvert. The cost of this work was prohibitive and therefore the alternative design/option to provide a smaller discharge rate of 25 litres/second and provide upstream storage within Deborah Services land.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q2 - If the initial design recognized that a discharge rate 38 ltrs/sec. is required, surely a reduction to 25 ltrs/sec. only increases the vulnerability?

In an email received from Billy Green on 27th Nov 2020 he states the total discharge is 30ltrs/sec, and Victoria Road 700 ltrs/sec - there seems to be many contradicting statements.

Previous communication from the Drainage Team stated the culvert under Victoria Road could handle 700ltrs/sec, so why the comment about it being restricted? Therefore, the culvert should be able handle 38ltrs/sec.

Whose decision was it to install the alternative design/option and provide a smaller discharge rate of 25 ltrs/sec?

Is there any officer decision records that evidences a full Impact / Risk Assessment has been undertaken to support the reduction?

Parish Council wish to request an independent assessment / inspection of the pumping system to be conducted to provide residents with true facts and assurance.

Question 2 .1

With the pump running at 25ltrs/sec and the new Keigar development feeding in 10ltrs/sec, that leaves 15ltrs/sec for the Woodland View/Chestnut Grove estate – a 40% reduction.

NLC Response

See above response to Q2

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q 2.1

This response is ignoring the question, a 40% reduction in the capacity available to Woodland View & Chestnut Grove residents is a significant amount.

Question 2 .2

Timings of the pump operation in Oct/Nov 2019 demonstrated the pump was running at 74% capacity on occasions. If the new development is feeding in 10ltrs/sec, for the pump to achieve the same volume from Woodland View/Chestnut Grove as in Oct/Nov 2019 it would have to run at 116% capacity – which is physically impossible, and the result will be flood water developing in Woodland View/Chestnut Grove.

NLC Response

Please refer to Q2 above and information below:

The surface water pumping station is a North Lincolnshire Council asset commissioned in July 2017 and is located on the old DSL site depot off Victoria Road, Barnetby. The wet well houses two number submerged pumps, type FLYGT 3102-190 (3.1KW/1450RPM/462mm impeller). Surface water is discharged into the adjacent 'Skegger Beck' watercourse via a rising main from the pump station.

A service interval was undertaken most recently on 15/07/2020 (Service record provided previously following FOI request). The mechanical and electrical service included the removal of the pumps for testing. These were then reinstalled and checked for operation. Both original pumps remain installed and operational.

The discharge rate for the duty pump, and operating parameters for the station in general is 25 litres per second.

The pipe system in advance of the pump station has storage capacity relative to 1 in 100 Plus climate change critical flood event. (Further information relating to the pumping station in responses to Q9 & Q10).

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q 2.2

No answer given, the question is quite clear, if the pump is running at 74% capacity (measured in Oct/Nov 2019) then feeding in an additional 10ltrs/sec will mean they will not cope with the total volume of water. Please provide detailed response to the question instead of a generalised comment about servicing.

Statements in respects of storage capacity are all very well but if the pumping system is not taking the water quick enough, this will result in it will flood and this was evidenced in 2017 too much water.

General concerns that residents of Woodland View and Chestnut Grove are heading back into the same situation as they were before all the works were installed.

It is noticeably clear that what we thought it was capacity is reduced – why we weren't told that the 38 was reduced to 25? This has only come to knowledge recently though recent communications – why was decision made to not install the system as per original specification?

Cont. next slide

Q2.2 Cont.

Whose decision was this – the manufacturer stipulation or has NLC taken the decisions for the reduction to be implemented.

In heavy rain if there is insufficient capacity to store the water when pump is 25 ltrs/sec. At present (25lps there has been 2 incidents which were of concern, one of which(2019) Bowser pumps were deployed to take the water away – this proves that pump cannot cope and will be overwhelmed, when the Deborah Scaffolding development completes this will take an additional 10 Ltrs/sec. from the 25 ltrs/sec. How will this massive reduction in capacity be managed?

The Parish Council have proposed to the Ancholme River Drainage Board via Ward Councillors that the discharge into Skeggar Beck is increased.

Note:- The comment “operating parameters for the station in general is 25ltrs/sec”. This raises the concern the pumps don not operate at 25ltrs/sec. Please provide measured evidence they do.

Question 3

It is clear a 40% reduction to 15ltrs/sec is inadequate to protect Woodland View/Chestnut Grove. What action is being taken to address this?

NLC Response

See above response.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q3

The question hasn't been answered, "above response" isn't addressing the issue, please answer the question.

There is a constant flow when water table rises, 2 springs develop which causes the system load up with additional water to take away.

For information - One spring is in the middle of the dry pond and one at the side

Question 3.1

Consideration should also have taken into account in the volume of water entering the FAS following the changes made to the dry pond, which is now in effect a gully allowing excess water to flow directly to the FAS.

NLC Response

Could you please clarify the above question with regards to the “Gully” comment?

Definition:

A gully is a ravine or channel formed by the action of water.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q3.1

It is a bit worrying the person answering the questions doesn't know what acting like a gully is. The officer(s) responding are supposed to be in a team that is supposed to know all about water and the effects of a gully? *This doesn't exactly inspire confidence in the response to the questions.*

The dry pond is no longer a dry pond – information we have been given is that the dry pond filled up and overflowed in 2019 and to protect 32 Woodland View they put access into FAS scheme which then turn out because of the slope of the grade. This has then created a gully – that's because of the access level into the dry pond. The pipe is at the bottom of the pond

Request - Investigation to deepening the pond, could go deeper where the weir is.

Again it is clear that original design intent of 38 ltrs/sec. has had a great effect on the whole system effectiveness. The current situation (and proposed additions) is so far away from original design it will no longer work effectively *as intended* – need to clarify and explain why there were changes to original design intent

Question 4

Was this change taken into account during the design of the Keigar drainage plan?

To return the dry pond to its original purpose,

NLC Response

Please see below response to Q5.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q4

No Comments – See Q5

Question 5.

Why hasn't a weir plate been fitted? That would allow the dry pond to collect excess water, but at the same time prevent it from overflowing and putting nearby properties at risk of flooding.

NLC Response

The 225mm Diameter pipe installed last Year was an amendment to the original design (2 X 100mm Underground) and was a measure to prevent flood risk to adjacent property (No. 32 Woodland View) during an exceedance flooding/Groundwater event. This created a more direct outfall into the new drainage system and the receiving oversized pipe network in Keigar Homes Development has the required capacity to accept this minor additional flow.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q5

The answer suggests the respondent doesn't understand the concept of a Weir Plate. A Weir Plate would allow the Dry Pond to operate as originally intended and when it reaches capacity, the Weir Plate would allow water to flow over the weir plate to the FAS, preventing any overflowing of the dry pond and causing risk of flooding.

As the response doesn't answer the question, please advise why this isn't being considered as an additional protection measure.

Question 5.1

Note - During the heavy rains in Oct/Nov 2019, Chestnut Grove suffered from back flushing flowing from the road drains, this more noticeable following the work to turn the dry pond into a gully. If there is not enough capacity in the pump with a 40% reduction with the additional input from the new development, it will inevitably produce larger amounts of backflow and for longer periods – a real major flood risk?

NLC Response

Could you please clarify the above question with regards to the “Dry pond into a Gully” comment”? We are not aware of any flooding issues on Chestnut Grove. The rainfall event was unprecedented and surcharged gullies was a common theme in many parts of North Lincolnshire. We are not aware of any properties flooded as a result.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q5.1

The back flushing of Chestnut Grove is a concern as it's occurring before the additional drainage entering the FAS from the new Keigar development. With the pumps operation as described (Q9 response), this back flushing from the drains can only become an increased risk of flooding when heavy rains occur.

It's worth noting we've had a 1 in 200 year (2007) and 1 in 100 year (2019) events within 12 years. Seems very unlikely it will be another 100 years before we have heavy rains which will be a flood risk – now with a 40% capacity reduction in the FAS!

As stated previously in 2019 there was a tanker in situ hour after hour for two weeks, taking away millions of litres of water from the site.

This is the ONLY reason that Woodland View and Chestnut Grove was not flooded in 2019 and why no flooding has been recorded.

Question 6

The above would indicate a design failure regarding drainage levels and/or incorrect installation? Which is it, please advise.

NLC Response

Please see above response to Q5.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q6

Question not answered, is it a design failure or incorrect installation this back flushing from the drains is occurring?

Question 7

High-Level Beacon - At what stage will this operate? What happens if the beacon activates during night hours (by the time it's noticed in the morning, it will be too late for the residents of Woodland View/Chestnut Grove, they will be under water)?

A high-level beacon is a very cheap and completely inadequate option for this pump system. As a minimum it should be a telemetry system that monitors the pump performance and levels. Systems are easily available to monitor remotely the FAS performance and in the event of pump failure or excess levels, will send a text message alarm to a monitoring centre or on call personnel.

Note – Thanks to work by Andrew Percy MP, the mobile signal is of a good standard for such a telemetry system.

NLC Response

It was decided that Telemetry was not a requirement or suitable due to poor signal in the area at the time of installation. Regular inspections are carried out at this critical flood asset and will continue to be undertaken relative to weather monitoring. A high-level beacon is appropriate to the installation type and location. It would operate at the time of total station failure which is assessed as low risk. .

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q7

At the time the FAS was installed the mobile signal in this area was of a good standard (thanks to the work of Andrew Percy MP), please provide data to show it wasn't at an acceptable level.

If the FAS is considered a critical asset, then surely it should be treated as such and a high-level beacon suggests its not being considered as critical enough.

If the pumps fail during heavy rainfall during nighttime, by the time it's noticed the beacon is operating, then Woodland View, Chestnut Grove and Victoria Road properties will be at risk of flooding or flooded. Please provide details of the risk assessment for the beacon alarm decision and a copy of documentation stating a beacon is suitable for this critical installation.

Question – The response to FOI - INF 283854713 states that the pumps are the original pumps - How many times have the pump been changed in the last 4 years? Manufacturer recommend 12- or 2-years shelf life.

If both pumps runs alternatively, they would both wear at the same time.

Question 8

It has been stated there is a second pump, is this correct? If so, please provide evidence when this was fitted.

NLC Response

The above statement is correct, the second pump being installed at the time of commission (July 2017). The pumps both work alternatively (please see responses to Q2, Q9 & Q10 for details)

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q8

No Comments

Question 9.

If there is a second pump in place, is there a system in place for the second pump to operate in event of failure of the primary pump or when high levels are being reached, which are beyond the capability of the primary pump?

Note - Pump failure is known to cause extensive flooding as demonstrated by flooding to the Peter Ward estate in Immingham. Any failure of the pump system in the FAS will result in flooding to the same level as occurred pre FAS in 2007.

NLC Response

The surface water pump station at Barnetby is a dual pump pumping station configured as to operate as a duty / standby station. This means that, when the level in the station rises to the pre-set start level (this is determined by the Pulsar ultrasonic level controller) the pump (in the first case pump 1) will start. This will then pump water out of the station at a performance (head/distance) rate of 25 l/s. This will continue until the level in the well drops to the pre-set stop point at which the pump will stop.

The next time the level reaches the start point the pump (this time pump 2) will start and operate as above. By having two pumps in the station operation on alternating duties you ensure that both pumps run for the same period of time and as such ensure even wear on both. Cont...

NLC Response cont...

Should the duty pump be operating and the level keeps rising, upon reaching another pre-set level (the standby level) the duty pump is stopped and second pump is started.

As the discharge from the station is configured as not to exceed 25l/s it is not set up as a duty / assist configuration. Both pumps can only be run simultaneously in Manual mode.

In the event of automatic level control failure, the pumps will still operate via a level control float and timer relays.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q9

Question partially answered.

A good explanation of how the systems operates, but the question asked was “is there a system in place for the second pump to operate in the event of the primary pump failing or when high levels are reached, which are beyond the capacity of the primary pump”.

The answer provided is very concerning, clearly stating when a high level is reached, i.e. the running pump cannot cope with the volume of water, pump 2 will operate but pump 1 will then stop. In simple terms there is no nothing in place for when the FAS is reaching high levels for the pumps to operate in a manner to reduce that risk. The only conclusion is that the water level will continue to rise in heavy rainfall (as seen in 2007 & 2019) and with the 40% capacity reduction, the risk of flooding is substantially increased for Woodland View, Chestnut Grove & Victoria Road.

In a critical wet pump system such as the FAS, it is normal practice when high levels are reached for the second pump to operate in tandem with the first pump to reduce the risk. It is clear as previous communication with the Drainage Team that the culvert will be able to handle the extra volume.

Question 10.

What is the capacity of the second pump and if it is activated does the total amount exceed the maximum discharge allowance (38 ltrs/sec). What controls are in place to reduce the discharge from Keigar, Coop and other potential sites?

NLC Response

Please see response to Q9 above.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q10

Question partially answered by Q9 response.

Question 11.

Proposed New Development Drainage Scheme

In the meeting at the NLC Offices (Attendees, T Lawson, A Tear, N Nutting, R Waltham, C Sherwood, B Green) it was stated that the proposed scheme wasn't adequate, yet the plan agreed is effectively the same? If it wasn't effective then, why is it effective now? (At that time we advised the pump was running at 38ltrs/sec, if it rated now at 25ltrs/sec surely the scheme proposed is even less effective).

NLC Response

The detailed design has made various amendments : - For example...

- All drainage has been designed to the 100 year plus climate change flood event.
- Removal of swales adjacent to Skeggar beck due to groundwater interaction

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q11

The only change between the drainage drawing reviewed at the meeting in the NLC offices and the updated drainage drawing which has been passed by NLC is the addition of a dry pond (which at the meeting with NLC was not considered a viable option). Please advise of any additional amendments.

Was the proposal by Keigar for the 1 in 100 year drainage solution based on the flood risk assessment provided EWE Associates? It should be noted the figures and data provided by EWE is from software dated 2010 and therefore not up to date with present climate knowledge. Therefore how effective will the drainage being installed be?

Please advise the location of the swales being removed.

Please advise on programme of inspections since 2007

Question 11.1

The Keigars drawing for Surface Water Drainage shows a freeboard of 500mm as required, but with an overflow level of 800mm, how will the gravity drainage system operate when Skegger Beck levels are high and will effectively stop the drains from working. It would seem fair to say that any storm water not able to empty into a very full Skegger Beck through gravity drainage, will collect on the land and find its way to the present lower lying Keigars Estate as occurred 2007?

NLC Response

The proposed drainage system complies with the 100 year plus climate change critical flood event. The dry pond is used as and when required. The developer cannot be expected to design above the national standard (100 year event). However, exceedance flows above the 100 year storm are directed away from property by the raising of finished floor levels.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q11.1

Was the proposal by Keigar for the 1 in 100 year drainage solution based on the flood risk assessment provided EWE Associates?

It should be noted the figures and data provided by EWE is from software dated 2010 and therefore not up to date with present climate knowledge.

Therefore, how effective will the drainage being installed be?

Question 12

How is the above issue being addressed?

Skegger Beck Overflowing

In March 2015 Billy Green emailed in relation to the Flood Alleviation Scheme – “Overland flow would also be deemed to be an issue at this location and does not appear to have been considered on the proposals”. It would seem it still hasn’t been considered and it is still a real risk (In Oct/Nov 2019 Skegger Beck nearly broke its banks again),

NLC Response

Regular Inspections of this Riparian (Private) drain is carried out (See response to Q15 below)

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q12

Please advise the program of inspections and when these regular inspections have taken place since the floods of 2007.

When the development is handed over from Keiger (current owners of old scaffolding site), who will be responsible once all properties are sold – property owners?

Who is responsible for ensuring Riparian owners uphold their responsibilities? - note in the event of a flood who would pay for it would be riparian owners?

What action is being taken into understanding and awareness is being undertaken to ensure Riparian owners fulfill their responsibilities?

Question 13

What steps are being taken to address this **real issue**?

It would appear this could be further compounded by the passing of the Windsor Way application PA/2020/790 (no Flood RA or updated drainage plans on the portal) with overland surface water running into Skegger Beck.

NLC Response

The proposed site connects in at a discharge rate of 5 Litres/second. This is comparable with the existing greenfield run off discharge rate.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q13

PA/2020/790 is a greenfield site and therefore should the information provided by the Ancholme Drainage Board apply, i.e. surface drainage into the Beck should be restricted to 0.9ltrs/sec per Hectare?

Why hasn't this standard been applied?

Question 14

How was this planning application allowed to be passed without a Flood RA and Drainage plan as requested by the LLFA team? Is this the new way of approving applications, no Flood RA, no agreed drainage proposals?

NLC Response

PA/2020/790 is a Reserved Matters application and NLC have recently agreed a compliant drainage scheme for the development as part of the discharge application for the outline planning application.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q14

There is still no updated Drainage Plan or Flood Risk Assessment on the planning portal for this application – why?

Seems odd a public document is not being published – please clarify.

Question 15.

It should also be noted the Beck hasn't been cleared since spring time and is very overgrown. The owners with Riparian responsibility are failing in their duty. What action is NLC taking on this matter?

Unless Skeggar Beck is cleaned on a regular basis, the likelihood of the Beck overflowing isn't a question of if, but when.

NLC Response

North Lincolnshire Council will continue to liaise with Riparian Owners (where known) and would also encourage the Parish Council to engage with residents. It must be noted that an overgrown watercourse does not necessarily mean it is blocked and unable to convey water downstream. Watercourse natural management.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q15

Vague answer, the specific question asked about Skeggar Beck and yet it would seem NLC do not know who the riparian owners are. Its common knowledge Keigar are the riparian owners, please advise why the regular inspection hasn't picked up the overgrown Beck and why Keigar have not been advised to clear it.

While an overgrown watercourse doesn't stop flowing, it does restrict the flow drastically, which in Oct/Nov 2019 nearly resulted in the Beck overflowing.

This response indicates NLC are not taking seriously the impact of failing to address riparian owners inaction.

It was cleared in 2007 but to the Parish Councils knowledge it has not been done since.

Question 16.

Ancholme Drainage Board

In regards to PA/2020/50 the IDB clearly state in their comments to this application that any discharge to any ordinary watercourse should be restricted to 1.4ltrs/sec per hectare.

As the Keigar development is 0.9 hectare the IDB guidance would indicate a discharge rate 0.64ltrs/sec, why wasn't this guidance considered in regards to the Keigar development PA/2019/1454 and why are they being allowed to discharge 15ltrs/sec for this development?

NLC Response

5 Litres / second is the generally accepted discharge rate. Due to the maintenance issues / difficulties of maintaining orifice plate sizes that restrict flows to a lesser rate (25mm or 50mm Diameter pipe for example) the rate of 5 litres/second is generally accepted as a practical discharge rate.

The Keigar Homes Development is a brownfield (pre-developed) site and therefore different regulations normally apply unless we have reservations on the receiving network (Skeggar Beck), which we did in this instance.

Due to our reservations, there is only one discharge point for this development which is adjacent to the dry pond area.

The other two discharge points are directed into the oversized pipe network or into the drainage prior to entering the pumping station.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q16

Restricting the outflow to one point for the new development and having two others feeding into the FAS helped pass the planning application. Good result for Keigar, but means a 40% reduction in capacity for the residents of Woodland View, Chestnut Grove and Victoria Road and puts them at greater risk of flooding. Especially with the operation of the pumps as described in response to Q9.

Question 17.

Keigar have purchased the land at the rear of 17 Victoria Road which has outline planning permission for a dwelling (PA/2020/106). They have already been consulting with owners of properties nearby to purchase their land for future development. If the drainage plans have been agreed for 23 properties, how will it cope with further potential properties connected to the system?

NLC Response

The above planning application is for a singular dwelling, all surface water will be retained within this site.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q17

Question not answered. Will NLC confirm no additional housing will be allowed to use the FAS drainage scheme.

Question 18.

During the floods of 2007, Keiger were nowhere to be seen re the flooding on the present Woodland View estate and did not contribute to the FAS, leaving tax payer with the bill. Is this going to happen again, with a scheme that seriously reduces the capacity of the FAS for the estate it was designed and constructed for? On past performance this seems to be realistic outcome.

NLC Response

I cannot comment on the past development proposals and subsequent approvals, but I assume the drainage system that was designed, built and approved complied with the appropriate Drainage Standards at that current time.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q18

Question not answered. Not enough detail provided to be able to pass comment.

Question 19.

Please provide copies of all paperwork submitted to the Government Department for the £1.2 m FAS.

NLC Response

Refer to question 1. and a data sharing agreement rather than an FOI again if specifics could be outlined this would expediate a reply however a reasonable timescale must be accepted to allow us to gather the required information.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q19

Refer to Q 1 comments - if we know the original submission granted for Woodland View and Chestnut Grove then are about to account for the addition.

Question 20.

Will a 90° piping spool piece be installed on the outlet of the Skegger Beck railway culvert? This was discussed at the NLC Offices meeting (Attendees, T Lawson, A Tear, N Nutting, R Waltham, C Sherwood, B Green). There is no doubt that this water flow 're-direction' facility is required to minimize risk of another Skegger Beck overflow at this particular location.

The 2007 flood was exacerbated due to the excessive water flow / velocity from the railway culvert outlet and its inability to make a 90° turn, to continue its flow downstream; this water created a tsunami towards the Woodland View estate

NLC Response

A headwall will be installed at the start of the watercourse to direct water from under the railway into the beck to mitigate against the erosion of the beck. We have met Keigar Homes on site and have agreed this. We will not adopt this section of Skeggar Beck until these works have been carried out.

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q20

In 2007 water came under railway and hit the bank of the beck and overshoot and cause the flood of 17 properties’.

What will the height of the headwall be? There will still be ability for watercourse to spillover if low level to turn the water 90° and point to the beck would be better in addition to the wall – wall is not the preferred option the preferred option would be the installation of a 90-degree bend pipe to turn the water away.

Question 21.

Could NLC give an update on whether the 'redundant' soak away (located in the front garden of 32 Woodland View) will be connected to the pumped surface water drainage system? It is understood that NLC had agreed that the soakaway would be connected to avoid a future repeat of the 2019 scenario when ground water flowed from the soakaway's manhole for at least three months, resulting in potential risk to water freeze / slip and trip hazards. This issue may be insignificant to NLC, but to Woodland View residents, this is a significant issue, with the residents of 32 Woodland View having to persevere with driving / walking through a flooded driveway entrance every day!

NLC Response

Refer to question 1 and a data sharing agreement rather than an EOI again if

NLC Response

As confirmed in an email to the property owner, we will continue to monitor this issue. Currently it has only occurred once in five years and all water retained in the Highway.

The scheme remains on the Drainage Minor works programme and will continue to be prioritized alongside the other minor drainage work requests. .

15 March 2021 - Consultation Feedback Summary

Q21

It would seem the respondent isn't up to date with the facts. This has now occurred twice in the last two year (becoming an annual event?). This is unacceptable, especially considering the soak away was sealed by NLC from the FAS installation and results in this water flowing from the soak away. In simple terms the soak away needs reconnecting and not monitoring.

In addition, water is also coming out of the Telecoms Box in heavy rain – this was most recently noticed in 2021.

END OF SLIDES