

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
1.	<p><u>RMA update.</u> Since our last MAM (22/2/23), please can each RMA, provide details of practical works carried out in the catchment that contribute to reducing the surface water/foul flood risk? Please email in advance to enable FLAG to digest contents.</p>	ALL	<p><u>Email from Sally Barford (Thames Water) 13/10...</u> <i>Operationally around 300m of sewer cleaning on Caterham Drive and Old Lodge Lane has been completed.</i></p> <p><u>Email from Daisi (LBC) 17/10...</u> <i>There has been the regular cleaning of the existing drainage infrastructure on Caterham Drive and the surrounding road. The Council continue to work on a flood alleviation measure to divert flood water into the woodlands. Infiltration testing was recently completed in the woodlands and the results would inform the detailed design.</i></p> <p><u>Jan (thank you)</u> Andy Treasure (SCC) PFR on 162 homes should be finished by Whitehouse Construction by Christmas, then post installation and flood risk reports. Whole project should be wrapped up by Christmas 2024. Tor asked – for snagging can they go to Whitehouse or come to SCC with enquiries. It was confirmed either is acceptable – the homeowners were given a pack containing this information, but Whitehouse are very good.</p> <p>Andy Treasure confirmed that the culvert and Roffes Lane has been cleaned. He and Al Davis had walked the catchment. He will send information on this to Julie. This will improve the flow of the water discharging onto the golf course – they are expecting a planning application for bits of the golf course, nothing so far. Julie - is there anything that can be done to stop repeat blocking. Some flooded residents were previously reprimanded for lifting manholes to protect their homes; this is causing blockages to TW assets. These residents did not attend the drop-in. Water is flooding on the way to the culvert. Six gardens are affected, no plan to hold water back on hillside this financial year and maybe not the next.</p> <p>Al Davis came to meet Andy Treasure to say what plans are to hold back the water in Queens Park. Meeting on 17th. Seeking grants, more at next MAM.</p> <p>Clive Medley said Thames Water working in Godstone Road, strengthening channels at back of properties and have plans with culverts in Whyteleafe. There is a Network Rail problem as work not done properly. Culvert relined should help further down the catchment.</p>	Attached

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
			<p>Tor warned for QP that if management of surface water is scoped into the design at early stages it becomes more viable than trying to retrofit. If there is a scheme there that includes drainage Tandridge need to stick their hand up to see if joint funding can become available, and maybe Thames Water can contribute. Lauren Wolfe has not yet been briefed but she and Mark Davis Project Manager at Surrey County Council are going to be working together.</p>	<p>TDC to confirm.</p>
2.	<p>Next steps. As the PFR scheme comes to an end, please can each RMA provide a list of plans/projects in the catchment (with timeframe) that will contribute to reducing the surface water/foul flood risk? Please email in advance to enable FLAG to digest contents.</p>	ALL	See above.	
3.	<p>Press Release. JB was recently informed that £6m has been spent (so far) in our catchment. To raise awareness of the seriousness of flooding, the flood alleviation efforts undertaken to date and to encourage community participation, can a professional press release explaining works and next steps (as 2) be issued to residents?</p>	ALL	<p>Email from Daisi (LBC) 17/10... <i>This will be looked into with colleagues in our Comms/Press Team.</i></p> <p>Julie pointed out that all this work has been done but the authorities are not quick to sing their own praises, so why not issue a Press Release to residents, the win being to raise awareness, to hear that 162 properties have PFR and are not getting flooded? Tor appreciated the sentiment but said there were no plans to do a press release owing to the difficulty of communicating to people in that catchment which will need input from so many sources, from property owners, risk management authorities and the community at large and might alarm people about their house prices. Tor wondered if FLAG should do it, driven by community through this group?</p> <p>Thames Water (Graeme) wondered about a joint flyer with SESW occasionally to alert people to take more responsibility for flooding, but not on social media.</p> <p>Clive Medley said he was not against some sort of release but will need to be carefully managed, raising awareness and would take offline to discuss as a partnership.</p> <p>Georgina Betts (Planning LBC) said LBC have been discussing more communication as LLFA on their website... Celebrating successes – in the pipeline. Tor -Don't feel the need to fight our corner. SCC have thick skin, but we are best approached directly on flooding enquiries.</p>	<p>Partnership to liaise???</p>

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
4.	<p>FLAG next steps. Can the RMAs support, through funding the NFF, the FLAG in re-engaging and encouraging community projects to reduce risk of flooding in Chaldon, Caterham on the Hill and Old Coulsdon?</p>	ALL	<p>Email from Daisi (LBC) 17/10... <i>This will be looked into. However, given the Council's current financial situation, this may not happen any time soon.</i></p> <p>Tor Looking at a bid for the Thames region over a period of years to bring NFF in as a consultant/contractor. Bidding for funding. Working with Thames Water. Other community projects would be useful for the community to think about actions they may wish to carry out. He would say they might like to carry out X. Can you help us deliver X? A possible way forward. Julie – keen to know the options available. Tor – link up with various organisations to find this information. Flood bunds, water butts etc.</p>	
5.	<p>Thames Water (TW) participation. Thames Water (TW) contribution is vital to the success of future flood alleviation plans, PFR was never going to stop the rain from falling, more can be done to manage the flow throughout the catchment and keep surface water out of TW assets to reduce foul flooding.</p> <p>a. Will TW re-commit to the FLAG Multi-agency meetings? b. TWs DWMP dedicates a full page to foul flooding in Caterham on the Hill (page 14 https://www.thameswater.co.uk/media-library/home/about-us/regulation/drainage-and-wastewater/surrey-catchment-strategic-plan.pdf), thus acknowledging assets to be storm sensitive. The map on page 18 states a selection of partnership opportunities for Caterham on the Hill, please can you provide details that can be found on the 'Practitioner portal'.</p> <p>Polite reminder... Appendix 3 page 8, lists FLAG as a Partner Organisation.</p>	TW	<p>Email from William Bedser 12/10... <i>Morning Julie, I will not be able to attend the meeting. Tim and I have moved area and are no longer covering the Caterham area. @Sally Barford, please could you confirm attendance at this meeting? William Bedser London Systems Planner (Waste)</i></p> <p>Email from Sally Barford 13/10... <i>a, TW are committed to attending these meetings, but there are times when this may not be possible and or may be different representatives attending. b, TWs DWMP dedicates a full page to foul flooding in Caterham on the Hill (page 14 https://www.thameswater.co.uk/media-library/home/aboutus/regulation/drainage-and-wastewater/surrey-catchment-strategicplan.pdf), thus acknowledging assets to be storm sensitive. Caterham FLAG – DWMP slides on attachment. Disclaimer: The information/maps provided from the DWMP Portal do not consider the piped watercourse as the details of the piped watercourse were not on our asset records.</i></p>	

#	Action Points	Authority	Comments
			<p>Content The information provided by or in connection with this portal is provided strictly for general interest purposes only and should not be used or relied on without undertaking prior independent verification. Although Thames Water makes reasonable efforts to update the information on this portal, Thames Water makes no representations, warranties or guarantees, whether express or implied, that the content on our portal is reliable, accurate, complete or up to date or that your access to that information will be uninterrupted, timely or secure. Thames Water accepts no responsibility for loss suffered as a result of reliance by you upon the accuracy, completeness or currency of information contained on this portal.</p> <p>While Thames Water endeavours to ensure that this portal is normally available 24 hours a day uninterrupted and error free, Thames Water will not be liable if for any reason this portal is unavailable for any time or for any period.</p> <p>Copyright in the content of this portal (together with this portal design, text and graphics and the arrangement of them) is owned by or licensed to Thames Water and may not be copied or otherwise incorporated into or stored in any website, electronic retrieval system, publication or other work in any form without the prior written consent of Thames Water or in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 as amended. The Thames Water roundel logo is a registered trademark of Thames Water. You may not use this mark without our express written permission.</p> <p>Unless Thames Water agrees otherwise in writing, you are provided with access to this portal for your use only. You should keep the information on this portal confidential and may not without our written permission share the information obtained from this portal with any third party. This obligation shall not apply to any information which is already in the public domain, other than through a breach by you of this obligation, or which is required to be disclosed by law or a regulatory body.</p> <p>Data protection Thames Water will only use your personal information as set out in our Privacy Policy. Should this portal and its content contain any personal data, this shall be held by Thames Water as data controller for the lawful purpose of legal obligation. By accessing this portal and any such personal data you acknowledge you are accessing this as an independent data controller having satisfied yourself of your own lawful purpose to access such personal data and acknowledge you are responsible for complying with the data protection laws in respect of any such personal data and have the appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure such compliance. Thames Water takes no responsibility or liability for your use of data.</p> <p>General Thames Water accepts no liability for any failure to comply with these terms of use where such failure is due to circumstance beyond our reasonable control. A waiver by us under these terms of use on one occasion, shall not be deemed to apply on any other occasion.</p> <p>If any of these terms of use are held to be invalid, unenforceable or illegal for any reason, the remaining terms of use shall nevertheless continue in full force. These terms of use, this portal and its use shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of England and Wales. You agree to submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of that jurisdiction.</p> <p>Julie said that TW'S lack of participation has been disappointing, and we weren't expecting Graeme to attend the meeting. Sally Barford (TW) is our new rep and she has sent a long email of information and said they are committed to attend the meetings but it isn't always possible. She sent slides – the Practitioner Portal of very technical data [drainage water document]. Sally and Mark main people - William (and new person Theo) will be working on this together.</p> <p>Graeme Kasselmann has asked for maps to be sent, showing exact information on the local area, and easier to read copy.</p>
6.	<p>Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Cllr Jeremy Webster, JB and other volunteers invested a great deal of time to create the SPD, the lack of progress, albeit from SCC or TDC (?), is incredibly frustrating.</p>	<p>JW TDC SCC</p>	<p>Email from CS 5/6... <i>Julie</i> <i>TDC cannot take this forward without the input of the lead local flood authority, Surrey County Council, which I understand we are awaiting.</i> <i>Best Wishes, Catherine</i></p>

Attached

Please provide.

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
	<p>a. Will TDC commit to the SPD, or do you intend to dismiss this document in favour of the LP?</p> <p>b. If so, will the LP be upgraded to include contents of the SPD, with robust flood policy as per LCB LP?</p> <p>c. JW please can you confirm if the new NP will include flood policy?</p> <p>d. We believe the lack of a local plan leaves the catchment at risk to some unscrupulous and disingenuous developers. A Press statement dated 22.08.23 states... <i>The Council still has development plans and policies in place which will help guard against the risk of unsuitable planning development and protect the Green Belt which covers 94% of the district.</i> Please can TDC provide said list of the plans and policies (via email), that will safeguard against unsuitable planning development in a known flood risk area?</p> <p>e. Do TDC intent to implement these in our vulnerable catchment?</p> <p>f. Please provide timeframe to avoid further frustration.</p>		<p>Email from Katya Fox (interim planning office TDC) 10/10...</p> <p>Hi Julie, As requested here are responses to the questions flagged for TDC in the action plan.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Planning Document Progress</u> TDC have been working on the SPD and liaising with SCC to resolve various issues. With the departure of the team’s senior policy officers, including our flooding expert, this workstream has had to be paused. We will resume work on the flooding workstream once the replacement staff are in place.</p> <p><u>Local Plan</u> The Tandridge Development Plan, (formed of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029, Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021, Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019 and Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016) will continue to be used for decision making purposes. The key policies of relevance with regards to flood risk are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Core Strategy – Policy CSP15 Environmental Quality https://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Planning%20and%20building/Planning%20strategies%20and%20policies/Current%20and%20adopted%20planning%20policies/Core%20strategy/Core-Strategy.pdf - Detailed policies – Policy DP21 Sustainable Water Management https://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Planning%20and%20building/Planning%20strategies%20and%20policies/Current%20and%20adopted%20planning%20policies/Core%20strategy/Local-Plan-part-2-Detailed-policies.pdf - Caterham Neighbourhood Plan – Policy CCW5: Design of Development - https://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Planning%20and%20building/Planning%20strategies%20and%20policies/Parish-Council-(neighbourhood)-plans/CCW/Adopted-Version-CCWNP-2020.pdf <p>All decisions will also be made with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), which also contains flooding policy – see Planning and flood risk, paragraphs 159-169. National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p> <p><u>Meeting attendance</u> With the departure of two key staff members, we are unable to attend the meeting at this point. We have secured replacement staff and are currently negotiating start dates. If, this aligns with the meeting date, I will be in touch again to confirm their attendance. Hope the above addresses your questions but happy to have a call if not. Kind regards, Katya</p> <p>Katya Fox (Interim Planning Officer) from Tandridge has emailed – they are working on the SPD document, but it has been paused until permanent staff are in place.</p>	

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
			<p>SPD crucial as there has been a failure of the Tandridge Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plan, flooding policy was removed last time but this is to be rewritten to include it.</p> <p>Without this policy in place, it leaves us at risk from inappropriate developments. For instance, the development in Macaulay Road – all surface water will be discharged into the main sewer, this undermines the whole process of the project team.</p> <p>Andy took three copies of the SPD, which went into Glen’s team, and they had pushed this on from the last meeting.</p> <p>Jeremy Webster said he was angry; he was going to present a question to planning policy committee but was persuaded not to. Glen came back to him with a detailed email to tell him what was happening and now passed into Tandridge planning and with Katya Fox.</p> <p>Heard that it does not have enough levers now.</p> <p>If the policy doesn’t include levers, then can’t produce them from nothing. If this is implemented, are planning officers in front line able to take this on as it is becoming more complex? Are they going to have to use older policies to judge the increasing large applications coming through (such as Victor Beamish Avenue) and do they have time to implement a SPD?</p> <p>Geoff - If you look at document, Tandridge produces on recent decisions will see references to no local plan. What can we do if no local plan? Would make sense to understand with a meeting on how decisions will be made without a local plan. We should have a collective session with Tandridge to understand where things are so that agencies such as FLAG, the County Council and so on can all be appraised on how decisions are going to be made at Tandridge. If they are in a weaker position because there is no local plan, then decisions on applications will have different outcomes to the ones we are used to. We need to sit down with senior planners at Tandridge.</p> <p>Tor – When it comes to individual applications such as Macauley Road, Tandridge can seek guidance from SCC on non-minor applications. If you ask a question, SCC will bend over backwards to get an answer. It looks like TW are very keen as well. Policy wise can be vulnerable, will comment back.</p> <p>Julie -Surrey and TW should be consulted on this application for Macaulay Road. TW said any application will be sent a response back if asked in a sensitive area. We will respond.</p>	<p>TDC to advise.</p>

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
			<p>Planning applications above a single digit – five homes or more will give a detailed response. Do not have rights to restrict development on existing rights. We will look at what Tandridge have in their policy. No legal standing, just to support.</p> <p>Absolute right to connect to a sewer, although DEFRA published guidance to consult to remove this right, although they have not said when.</p> <p>Schedule 3 FWMA FROM 2010 – decided at the time not to do it. Other laws that need to be changed. Strong intention to consult with lead local flood authorities. Don't know timetable.</p> <p>Georgina (LBC) reported that internal training has started with the EA and reviewing the Local Plan with their SUDS policy work with LLFA implementation of Schedule 3 so internal training sessions working with legal team on conditions for SUDS. Works closely with the LLFA - SUDS approval policy if comes in next year. Might roll over into 2025 - reviewing.</p> <p>SUDS approval body made a decision but still in consultative phase. SUDS will be mandatory.</p> <p>SUDS - High risk as General Election sometime next year. This will affect decisions.</p> <p>In terms of Schedule 3, this is not going to magic all the surface water out of Caterham Hill and Old Coulsdon. In 30-50 years, substantial redevelopment of these sites will have to have sustainable drainage. Vulnerability of the sewer still very high.</p> <p>Talk to your MP about it.</p> <p>Incremental changes over a sustained period.</p> <p>Not enough engineers to fulfil the requirements. Need 50-60 people.</p>	<p>TDC to advise.</p> <p>FLAG to liaise.</p>
7.	<p>Flood plans. Can LPAs please explain what is in the multi-agency flood plan for Chaldon, Caterham on the Hill and Old Coulsdon? Please email in advance to enable FLAG to digest contents.</p>	LBC TDC	<p>Email from Daisy (LBC) 17/10... <i>Clarification is needed on this action please.</i></p> <p>Tandridge didn't send anything. Georgine will check with Daisy and ask him to send.</p>	
8.	<p>Dollypers. LBC please can you provide details of alleviation scheme to divert flood water into Dollypers woodland? FYI Dollypers Hill - Wikipedia</p>	LBC	<p>Email from Sally Barford 13/10... <i>This statement implies that we are intentionally discharging raw sewage into this Nature Reserve, which is incorrect. During rainfall events (high rainfall intensity) the foul sewer is overwhelmed. This implies that surface water drainage has been connected to our foul sewer. The EA surface water flood risk map shows that there is a significant risk of flooding from surface water along Caterham Drive.</i></p>	


#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
	<p>TW please can you provide details of works to prevent raw sewage discharging directly into the Nature Reserve at the bottom of Caterham Drive, when it rains?</p>	TW	<p><i>It is the landowners' responsibility to manage their surface water appropriately on their land.</i> <i>No monitors are currently in place.</i></p> <p><u><i>Email from Daisi (LBC) 17/10...</i></u> <i>The proposed flood alleviation scheme involves the installation of kerb drainage along the footway on the odd numbers side of Caterham Drive which would discharge into the soakaway by the entrance to the woodlands. This soakaway would then be connected to a new soakaway in the woodlands which would act as an overflow. Infiltration testing was recently completed in the woodlands and the results would inform the detailed design.</i></p> <p>Georgina will check as not aware.</p> <p>TW did not recognise the problem. Vented manholes spewing sewage onto road and into the woodlands. They said there were no monitors – JB saw them go in, where are they now – was the flow so great they are elsewhere? Graeme only operate foul water. Very common for large amount of surface water to get into the foul network. Responsibility for surface water rests with landowner. Partnership schemes with LLFA. It will have to charge the customers. Find where water coming from put somewhere else that is safe, which is a challenge. Graeme will see what happened to monitors. Hopefully Schedule 3 will help.</p> <p>Graeme will talk to Tor later. Thanked Graeme.</p>	<p>TW to liaise with SCC.</p>
9.	<p><u>Keston Avenue.</u> The road has been closed for some time Ref BB SA-844298.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What was the problem? What caused this? 	TW	<p><u><i>Email from Sally Barford 13/10...</i></u> <i>Collapse of the foul sewer in Aug, our contractor Cappagh carried out a repair with completion of the repair to the backdrop in Sept. Road closure and diversion was in place for the duration.</i></p> <p>Graeme - Keston had a collapsed foul sewer in August and repaired it. Backdrop where sewage drops down a pipe into a deeper pipe. In the past, 5-6 metres of debris gets wedged in the dropped pipes and damages it. They don't allow it now, but these are old sewers and pipes get damaged. Bits of timber get wedged. You excavate it and surround with concrete to give strength. Now only allow a metre.</p> <p>Janet mentioned a subsiding area further up the hill – will send picture she took outside No. 33 Keston to Mark Warnes. Mark will look at it.</p>	<p>TW please advise.</p>
10.	<p><u>Keston footpath.</u> JB notified LBC (25/8) of works carried out by a resident that changes the</p>	LBC	<p><u><i>Email from DO 4/9...</i></u> <i>Dear Julie,</i> <i>I have added the location to our Flood Alleviation Programme and asked for it to be</i></p>	

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
	<p>lay of land and covers a gulley, increasing the surface water flow onto Caterham Drive and reducing the capacity of Catchpits, thus putting residents at greater risk of flooding.</p> <p>What do LBC propose to do to ensure this now buried gulley be reinstated, the associated pipework / soakaway cleaned and how do you propose managing the flow down the footpath? Please provide timeframe.</p>		<p><i>investigated and a viable solution that could be implemented to slow down the flow of water onto Caterham Drive identified.</i></p> <p><i>I'll provide updates regarding the investigation and proposed solution at the multi-agency meetings.</i></p> <p><i>Regards,</i> <i>Daisi Osibona (he/him)</i> <i>Drainage Engineer</i></p> <p><u><i>Email from Daisi (LBC) 17/10...</i></u> <i>As previously mentioned, the location has been added to our Flood Alleviation Programme and investigation commenced. A site visit was carried out on 08/09/23 and a solution which would involve the installation of a cattle grid at the bottom of the footpath discharging into a new soakaway is being developed into a detailed design. This proposal has been combined with the Dollypers Hill scheme (8) to ensure it does not have any impact. In addition, we are looking to restore the existing drainage infrastructure at the top of the footpath to slow down the flow of water to the bottom of the footpath.</i></p>	
11.	<p><u>Litter and catchpit maintenance.</u></p> <p>Cllr Sayer confirmed (email 17/1/22) that the street cleaning rota would be reorganised to ensure easy access to heavily parked streets) to clear litter and leaves enabling SCC to better manage gulley catchpit clearing.</p> <p>Note date of confirmation, that being Jan 2022, is this still being reorganised, why the delay? Please provide update.</p>	Cllr Sayer TDC		TDC to advise.
12.	<p><u>Culvert.</u></p> <p>Thames Water (TW) now have 'ownership', of the culvert, they are therefore responsible for surcharging of contaminated surface water onto the NNR during rainfall, in a Ground Source Protection Zone (GSPZ).</p> <p>a. Please can you provide a copy of documentation showing proof of ownership? Please send via email.</p> <p>At the SES 'your water, your say' event JB asked if SES Water would work with TW to manage the flood risk in a GSPZ to protect the aquifer to safeguard the water supply, Tom Kelly (SES) replied YES.</p> <p>b. Will TW collaborate to reduce the surface water entering the</p>	TW	<p><u><i>Email from Sally Barford 13/10...</i></u> <i>A, Ownership has yet to be confirmed.</i> <i>We have had a response from our legal team, but we must consult with Surrey County Council before we provide details.</i> <i>Once we have come to a mutual agreement and ironed out disagreements with Surrey County Council, we will then release it to the public and share it in this forum.</i> <i>We will hold a meeting with Surrey County Council as soon as possible.</i> <i>Flood risk on GSPZ is not a problem. There should not be a pollution risk for SES.</i> <i>Please ask Tom Kelly to make contact with TW, we are not aware of any contact to date.</i></p> <p><i>B, We will engage with our Surface Water Outfall Programme (SWOP) team, and they will work with the Environment Agency (EA) to get this asset on their prioritisation list. They will aim to reduce water entering the culvert by targeting misconnections. This work does not include any pollution study work until the misconnection work is finished.</i></p> <p><i>SWMP – required by third parties to initiate them, and then we'll part-fund.</i></p>	

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
	<p>culvert (and their assets ie sewers) and how?</p> <p>c. Will TW collaborate to reduce the failure of the culvert during rainfall to protect the NNR and GSPZ (to protect the water supply)? If not, why not?</p> <p>d. Will TW provide details of surveys to establish illegal connections and how do you propose removal (if any) of these?</p> <p>e. Can TW confirm the culvert is in full working order and that defects highlighted (Cracks, Roots, Silt and comments reported in 2016) in the Atkins report (refer to Appendix B1 https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/106069/Caterham-on-the-Hill-Surface-Water-Management-Study-v2-November-2016.pdf) have been repaired?</p> <p>f. Surrey CC issued a SY08 form for the Caterham Hill catchment, can you please provide an update?</p> <p>g. The City of London (CoL) Risk register... https://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s175971/Appendix%205%20-%20Coulson%20and%20Other%20Commons%20Risk%20Register.pdf contains item ENV-NE-COC 008, the continual pollution of Coulsdon Common through defective drainage infrastructure. Do CoL intend to appoint the QC and question TW regarding breach of contract (Sept 1937 and Mar 1957).</p> <p>h. What action are CoL considering taking to protect the NNR?</p>	<p>SCC</p> <p>C of L</p>	<p><i>C, Overwhelming of the culvert does not cause a pollution risk, unless the surface water is polluted. We will address the misconnection through the delivery of the SWOP. Once complete, we can be further encouraged that this is safe.</i></p> <p><i>D, We are unable to provide details of illegal connections found on a property as this is considered personal data and we would be in breach of the Data Protection Act. However, following the work from SWOP, we will be able to provide summary data of the results from the SWOP of the asset, it won't be attributed to specific properties. E.g. there are "X number of illegal connections to this asset."We will share this in the forum when this becomes available in an appropriate format.</i></p> <p><i>E, Once we have met Surrey CC, any assets we own will ensure that our colleagues in Ops will have sight and ownership of the defect. A programme of work will be proposed off the back of that to repair any defects of the asset in line with normal business procedures.</i></p> <p>Graeme –given data from SCC, discussed with lawyers who have now given their final position. Graeme needs to have a meeting to discuss this. Lawyers have been involved. When they have final information, he will meet with Tor. Will send info... This is the current situation.</p> <p>Tor – told by TW that the surface water sewer built in 1955 is a TW asset. If this has changed Tor wants to know now as this person has not been telling the truth. This has been going on for several years. Graeme just needs to summarise seven-hour discussion with lawyers and give to Tor. Wants SCC to see what lawyers have said before release to everyone.</p> <p>Allan Cameron now only working with TW and LBC as it affects the Common – not working with Surrey on this anymore.</p> <p>TW will update sewer records once all done.</p> <p>The culvert is polluted so TW does need to protect the GSPZ. The approach to deal with surface water is called a Polluted Surface Water Outfall programme and TW has one. There is a register which is prioritised with the EA – important ones get done first. Have already discussed this with Polluted Water Outfall team. They won't start work immediately as need to do quite a bit of work on budgets, teams, contracts etc. – 6-8 months.</p> <p>How it works - have no statutory requirements to make landowners fix it. They will find what it is and write a friendly letter, to which 80-85% of people respond</p>	<p>TW to liaise with SCC.</p>

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
			<p>Spaces Committee and what they want to do about the process.</p> <p>TW have identified themselves as the asset owners – it has taken quite a lot of work to get this far. The committee must make a decision about whether they are going to pursue TW.</p> <p>There are five known applications to breach from local applicants. There are two stages CS08 and CS03 applications from local individual dwellings or businesses to make a connection.</p> <p>TW to investigate who these people are. From 2017 there have been five addresses locally to tap into the system. No permission was given but they do not know if the connections were made. Know the addresses but follow up position is for the City of London to push TW to check if applications translated into physical breaches.</p> <p>Will City of London take this up with Thames Water, Allan has a feeling that they will? In a hiatus that the information he has gleaned over the 18 months will be taken on by the City of London as a project. The legal team is keen. Want to avoid reputational damage and reputational risk of having our Nature Reserve polluted.</p> <p>Graeme said he has seen this sort of escalation before in the North, Wanstead for example but has never seen escalated to this level here before – makes sense to have a discussion. Expensive to engage lawyers. He will talk to Allan. Normally less legal action.</p>	<p>TW and CoL to liaise.</p>
13.	<p>Cumulative development. The CoL risk register item ENV-NE-COC 004 addresses Local Planning Issues. TDC as LPA are failing to consider cumulative development (as NPPF 160) in a flood risk area and the impact on the NNR and our community.</p> <p>a) What policies (provide via email) do TDC have to protect the NNR and adjacent residents (at risk of flooding) from cumulative development? b) Does TDC intent to implement these policies?</p>	TDC	TDC needs to be pressed. Cumulative development not recognised in this catchment. Julie will chase.	TDC to advise.
14.	<p>Planters. Please share update.</p>	SCC	Andy Putting more time back into the planters, had issues on supply side with SCC. They will look for more – source internally or buy them in. Had involvement	

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
			<p>recently in a River Thames scheme. Trialling at Merrow depot and looking at Hillcroft Court.</p> <p>Reach out to Caterham Hill Parish Council to see if survey done on the High Street still stands. Needs to work with businesses to see who would manage them as ongoing impact.</p> <p>Geoff can you liaise with our Divisional councillor aware of this. Please get in touch. Planning application required to put planters in the High Street. Can go into Library, Schools.</p>	Geoff to advise.
15.	<p><u>Queens Park.</u></p> <p>Please provide update.</p>	ALL	<p>Tor published design for that site and then given to a drainage engineer. Attenuation scope look at the beginning at stage 1 for minimal cost. Use a landscape architect cheaper way in design.</p> <p>Al was looking at a filter drain. He met Jane Wandsworth from the Friends of Queen’s Park group. Lauren is picking up Queens Park filter drain and a lot else going on. Will talk to Mark Davis. Happy to be a contact on this.</p>	SCC to advise.
16.	<p><u>Placehouse Lane.</u></p> <p>Soakaway not working, what is happening? Why the lack of action? Please provide update.</p>	LBC	<p>LBC response 16/5</p> <p><i>A Works Order has been issued to our contractor to arrange for the failed soakaway to be replaced/upgraded. The work has been programmed and is expected to be completed around August/September 2023, subject to a works permit being granted and funding available.</i></p> <p><i>Email from Daisi (LBC) 17/10...</i></p> <p><i>A Works Order has been issued to our contractor to arrange for the failed soakaway to be replaced and associated works completed. A start date would be confirmed once a works permit has been granted and the proposed traffic management approved.</i></p>	
17.	<p><u>Ninehams Close.</u></p> <p>Residents have reported highways flooding for over two decades, which plan from item 2 will manage the surface water to reduce the flood risk to residents?</p>	SCC	<p>Lots of maintenance, but there is no surface water attenuation project.</p>	
18.	<p><u>NaFRA2 flood mapping.</u></p> <p>Data is being collated and NaFRA2 to be complete by end of 2024. However improved maps will need policy in place to support change, FLAG would like to see surface water flooding to have the same level of scrutiny as flood zone 3.</p> <p>Essentially amend flood zone classification to reflect the risk from ALL</p>	EA NFF	<p>Clive Progressing gone through first drafts iteration. Expecting next tranche of review still on track to be delivered in 2024 as suggested.</p> <p>Question for Action Plan. Tor - Believe planning policy changed means all forms of flood risk have to be considered.</p> <p>We need to ask a Planning Officer what this means. Is the policy in place. What is the detail?</p>	JB not confident in this if a planning app goes to

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
	<p>Please therefore provide details of the LNRS.</p>		<p><i>the early stages of creation in collaboration with Natural England. Maybe its something to revisit early next year for an update as I think its in its infancy right now? I'm happy to keep the group updated. Regards Andy</i></p> <p>Keep on plan!</p>	
<p>23.</p>	<p><u>Recent flooding.</u> Rainfall on 9/5 caused local flooding. Caterham Drive became a river of effluent, several garages in Caterham on the Hill were flooded but it seems on this occasion Chaldon was the worst affected. FLAG is grateful that SCC hosted a public drop in (13/6). What plans are there to prevent the runoff from high ground (with soil/debris) that repeatedly blocks the drains and the culvert, clearing of which is costly.</p>	<p>SCC</p>	<p>Refer to notes in item 1.</p>	
<p>24.</p>	<p><u>Development.</u> Cumulative development increases the flood risk, properties built after 2009 are not eligible for Flood RE (affordable insurance), locking new residents, in new builds, into Flood poverty, unable to sell, it is irresponsible to grant planning permission in areas at risk of Flooding (refer to Gov Flood Risk maps) ...</p>  <p>FLAG asked for a moratorium on development in flood risk areas in 2016, that was dismissed yet planning applications have and continue to be approved. So, FLAG ask again for a moratorium on development until a policy is in place to protect residents and the long-term Flood Alleviation Scheme the JB was promised in 2000 is delivered?</p>	<p>TDC LBC</p>	<p>Tor - Question is for Secretary of State – not doing that. Challenge is that all have duty to process applications not legally allowed to say we will not process. Adversarial process, not collaborative so right type of drainage SUDS can be put in place. Huge changes coming in putting in appropriate sustainable drainage. TW also good.</p> <p>Julie – worrying development in Caterham Drive. People might not be able to get a mortgage if the flood risk is changed like an energy assessment but can get PFR.</p> <p>Julie reiterated this was a hypothetical question (info gathering for Surrey Flood Forum action plan) and no reflection on this catchment BUT she stressed how hard the FLAG process is and that other communities might not be so lucky, this is upsetting.</p>	

#	Action Points	Authority		Comments
25.	<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTION re Boosting action on surface water flood risk. In a blog dated 23rd Nov '22, Julie Foley states... Boosting action on surface water flood risk - Creating a better place (blog.gov.uk) <i>Lead local flood authorities are responsible for managing surface water flood risks on the ground, but the Environment Agency has a legal supervision over all sources of flooding.</i> Up and down the country FLAGs, formed of flood victims, are 'battling' against RMAs to find a solution to manage the flood risk in their locality, when in fact the EA already have a legal supervision role.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What triggers the EA to undertake that responsibility when a LLFA fails to begin to manage the flood risk? Who requests that the EA take control and supervise? How long must the public wait for the EA to invoke this role? In this 'legal supervision' capacity, what further intervention/powers do the EA propose to manage the flood How long must the public wait for the EA to invoke this role? 	EA	<p>Another info gathering item for Surrey Flood Forum. What can the EA do upfront?</p> <p>Clive – question is misleading. We assess current and future risk, allocate funding where it has the greatest impact. Working with new communities, help local authorities, districts and boroughs, RMAs etc. to help those that are at risk. Day to day basis.</p> <p>Have to work on risk-based approach. Higher risks dealt with first. Have worked with local authorities to do detailed surface water models. Benefitted 3 million people, working to benefit another 3 million people throughout the country. Personnel restrictions – working as fast as we can with finance as well. NAFA2 maps will show greater level of detail and show climate change impact. Have a £150m Flood Resilience Innovation Programme, working with local authorities to bolster the resilience of communities to surface water flooding. Partnership with Ofwat have recently published approach as to how water companies should consider coast and river reliance as part of their statutory obligations. Firmly on the radar. Never goes as fast as everyone wants.</p>	
26.	<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTION re Thames Water update Wandle Catchment Partnership. Unfortunately, TW were not in attendance at the SERT CaBA partnership meeting (14th sept) but sent an update, which covers River Health, Storm Discharge and the plan for reducing harm to water quality in the River Thames catchment (refer to item 12).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If putting untreated sewage into rivers is unacceptable, is pumping spewing sewage (during rainfall) spewing from TW assets and the culvert onto the NNR, in a GSPZ, also unacceptable and how do you intend to reduce this (refer to item 2)? SERT proposed applying for CaPS funding to update their Catchment Partnership plan, will this include our catchment at the top of the Wandle catchment? 	TW SERT	<p>Email from Sally Barford 13/10... See answer to Q12 above</p> <p>Julie will chase Petra of SERT.</p>	SERT to advise.
27.	Next MAM 7th Feb 12-2			