

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

KENT FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Kent Flood Risk Management Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 11 March 2014.

PRESENT: Mr M J Harrison (Chairman), Mr D Baker, Mr A H T Bowles, Mr R H Bird (Substitute for Mr M J Vye), Dr M R Eddy and Mrs P A V Stockell

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Tant (Flood Risk Manager), Mr T Harwood (Senior Emergency Planning Officer) and Mr A Tait (Democratic Services Officer)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Vickery-Jones (Canterbury CC), Mr T Edwards, Mr J Muckle (Dartford BC), Mr F Scales (Dover DC), Mr A Hills (Shepway DC), Mr G Lewin (Swale BC), Mr H Rogers (Tonbridge and Malling BC), Mr D Elliott Tunbridge Wells BC) and Mr M Tapp (River Stour IDB)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Membership
(Item 2)

The Committee noted the appointment of Mr D Baker in place of Mr B MacDowall

2. Minutes of the meeting on 18 November 2013
(Item 5)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2013 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

3. Update on the recent floods - Oral report by Ian Nunn from the Environment Agency
(Item 6)

(1) Mr Ian Nunn from the Environment Agency began his presentation by saying that the flood events over the recent winter months had been worse than those of 2000. It had rained incessantly over the entire period. He believed that Kent was the area of the UK most at risk from flooding and that the recent events bore this out. There had been widespread flooding across the County, including a high number of affected properties.

(2) Mr Nunn went on to say that the Flood Incident Room had been open for some 50 days and had only closed at the start of the previous week. Everyone concerned had worked very hard for long periods and he thanked the Committee for having already unofficially thanked all staff for everything that they had done.

(3) Mr Nunn briefly explained that most people registered to receive Flood Warnings rather than Flood Alerts (which called for people to stay alert and vigilant). Often, they were not prepared for the emergency when the Flood Warning came.

Fortunately, there had been no risk to life which would have necessitated a Severe Flood Warning.

(4) There had initially been a massive coastal event, which had seen water levels rise higher than they had in 1953 (particularly in places such as Dover and Rye), making it a straightforward decision to close the Thames Barrier. This had been essential to avoid London flooding, but had resulted in significant damage to Kent's tidal defences. Repairs to these were ongoing. Those at Sandwich and Jurys Gap were almost repaired at a cost of some £1.5m to date.

(5) The coastal event had been followed by very heavy rainfall. Between 23 December and 5 January the total rainfall had been some 500% of the usual average for that period. The months of October, December, January and February had all seen rainfall well above the normal average.

(6) Mr Nunn said that the key was "warning, informing and preparing". The highest priority was to get information out to the highest number of people at risk. Operationally, the EA sought to prepare its assets and to link up with its partners in order to ensure that its response was as effective as possible.

(7) Over 1,000 properties had been flooded over the period in question whilst some 40,000 had been protected by the flood defences.

(8) Mr Nunn continued by saying that over 12,000 Flood Alerts, Flood Warnings and Severe Flood Warnings had been issued during the coastal flooding period. Thirteen percent had been unsuccessful. Some 18,000 had been issued in January and February, of which 15% had been unsuccessful. 26,000 Groundwater alerts had been issued in the same period.

(9) The main reasons for Flood Warnings being unsuccessful were people picking up the phone and not listening to the entire message; unobtainable numbers; ringing with no answer; dialled but no ring; and engaged. A great deal of work would need to be undertaken to ensure that as many of the unsuccessful warnings as possible were rectified in the future.

(10) Mr Bird suggested that some people put down the phone immediately because they had already been contacted. He added that he personally had received 4 messages in 10 minutes. Mr Nunn replied that the Environment Agency would be visiting a number of people to gather their views as to why the warnings had not been successful in their case.

(11) Aldington Reservoir had been completely full and Hothfield (which some Committee Members had visited that morning) had been 80% full. Their channels and embankments had been designed to overflow and there had been no imminent danger. Full monitoring of all the data had taken place with officers visiting the reservoirs twice daily.

(12) The Chairman asked whether it would be possible to retain some 40% of the fresh water in the reservoirs in order to replenish aquifers at times when they dried up. This same water could also be released if a flood was imminent. Mr Nunn replied that there was no combined flood protection and water storage reservoir in the county. The problem would be designing the reservoir to hold the required amount of

water as well as the amount of water from the potential flood. This would certainly not be impossible.

(13) Mr Nunn showed some pictures of affected areas including the Stour Mouth pump which had worked non-stop for 1,600 hours. He then said that the Medway had been badly affected just before Christmas, particularly in Tonbridge and Yalding. Leigh water storage area had held 25,000³ metres of water. It had been the largest flood water storage area in Europe at the time it had been constructed. The barrier had been operated to allow peak flow for a very short period at some 160m³ per second.

(14) It had also become clear shortly before Christmas that the groundwater levels were rising significantly. Accordingly, a groundwater risk map had been produced to identify those areas where the risk was rising or reducing. There remained a significant risk, particularly in the North Downs area.

(15) Mr Nunn commented that there had been excellent multi-agency partnership working at Nailbourne, including tremendous support from the community. The main issue here was that Southern Water was still discharging some of its sewage into the watercourses.

(16) The Environment Agency was now gathering as much data as possible, including river gauging, damage to assets (the Government had made some money available for asset repair, areas where assets needed to be improved or where new ones were needed. The Government wanted to produce a state of the nation report in April. The Army (200 engineers in the UK) had been employed to walk the entire watercourse, with 15 military personnel inspecting some 12,000 assets on the coast and rivers in Kent and the South London.

(17) Mr Nunn concluded his presentation by saying that overall, the Environment Agency's co-ordination with its partners had worked really well. Everyone had been aware of their roles and knew what they needed to do. Work on assets and removal of blockages was projected to continue into October. Far more Flood Ambassadors had been sent out than in 2000. This had worked out well on occasions but less well on others. Groundwater risk would also continue to be monitored for a number of months. The view was that spring had arrived earlier than usual and that this would help because the plants and trees would draw moisture from the ground and reduce groundwater levels further. It was therefore considered that the most likely end of the groundwater risk would be May 2013.

(18) The Chairman thanked Mr Nunn for his presentation. He recognised that there had been hostile public reaction to the Environment Agency but that this was mainly an expression of understandable frustration which was to be expected, but did not give a true picture of the amount and quality of the work that had been undertaken. He suggested that some of the difficulties experienced had been the result of the pre-flood power failures and suggested that future presentations could explain this.

(19) Mr Hills said that parts of the Romney Marsh area had experienced the highest water levels ever and were slowly going under water. Pumps had been brought in but had not worked (largely because of the power failures) and the maintenance schedules had not been able to cope. He suggested that the lessons to

be learned were that there needed to be more knowledge of the maintenance systems and that storage pumps needed to be held in reserve for a flood event. Mr Nunn replied that this area had largely been affected due to the failure at Jurys Gap in October (which was now being repaired at a cost of some £800k). Because water could not be discharged through the outfall. The repairs could not start all the time that water was seeping under the sea wall and during the period of intense rain. The other problem had been the inability to bring pumps in to the area due to the decision of East Sussex CC not to permit closure of the road. Water and sewage levels in the Lydd area had now been considerably reduced.

(19) Mr Nunn commented on the power outage problems. The first of these had lasted several weeks. Following discussions between the Environment Agency and UK Power Networks, a number of power failures had been responded to by UK Power Networks very much more speedily.

(20) Mr Rogers thanked the Environment Agency for the brave way in which they had spoken to the public. The public meetings at Hildenborough and Yalding had been very useful, particularly in the ability of the EA to respond to public anger with facts and figures. The angriest people were those who had initially been flooded by sewage. The Environment Agency and the water companies needed to work closely together to reduce this particular aspect of flooding events.

(21) Mrs Stockell asked questions on behalf of her Yalding constituents. The residents did not consider that the warnings had been adequate. They were sceptical about the EA's ability to operate a national flood warning system in the future. She stressed the need for the data to be complete and accurate in order that the necessary measures could be funded and undertaken.

(22) Mr Baker asked whether the Environment Agency had examined the system in operation in Rotterdam. Mr Nunn replied that some of his colleagues had visited the Netherlands shortly before Christmas in order to observe an exercise involving the public in a village that had installed its own flood defence system. A reciprocal visit had been arranged with some Dutch engineers and discussions were taking place to see if it was feasible to carry out some joint project work.

(23) Mr Bird asked whether it would be possible to invite Southern Water to the next meeting so that they could describe the work they were undertaking to make their sewage systems more resilient. The Chairman agreed that to this request.

(24) Mr Bird said that there was still some confusion over flood warnings. None had been received in Yalding when the Medway was overflowing (the Environment Agency had agreed that a severe flood warning should have been issued), whilst such warnings had been issued on many occasions along the entire course of the Thames, which had not had any worse events than Yalding had experienced. However, since Christmas he had received a number of unnecessary warnings, including one in respect of the River Tees. Too much information could become counter-productive and people were losing confidence in the system. He believed that a very comprehensive survey was needed to fully justify the cost of the programme of improvements that were needed.

(25) Mr Edwards said that multi-agency work had been undertaken in respect of the Nailbourne (which was still flooding). A suggested programme of minor

improvements had been made. The deadline for bids to the Environment Agency for 2015/16 had been brought forward from May to March, which meant that the improvements to the Nailbourne could not take place until 2016/17. Furthermore the bidding schedule had become very much more complex with some 350 columns needing to be filled in. The previous year's schedule had only had 56 columns.

(26) The Chairman asked Mr Edwards to provide him with the pertinent information so that he could raise this issue at the EA Regional Flood Defence Committee.

(27) Mr Tapp said that the public remained confused over the roles and responsibilities of the various agencies in respect of flood warnings, alerts and defence. This led them to blame bodies that were not responsible and also promoted the view that there was official confusion over what should be done. He suggested that KCC would be the ideal body to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the various partners. This should be done both on the website and through other media outlets.

(28) Mr Tant said that the KCC website already explained these matters. Work was now taking place to provide an interactive tool which would enable people to identify the nature of their problem and then direct them to the appropriate organisation. The challenge was to get people to read the relevant pages.

(29) Mr Nunn said that the Environment Agency had previously carried flood awareness work but that this had largely ceased as it had needed to prioritise in the light of reductions in Government funding. Nevertheless, the EA was committed to attending as many public meetings as possible.

(30) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) Mr Nunn be thanked for his presentation; and
- (b) The Committee's heartfelt thanks be recorded to all the agencies and individuals involved in mitigating the recent flooding event be thanked for their dedicated and excellent work.

4. Oral Presentation by Martin Twyman from the Little Stour and Nailbourne River Management Group

(Item 7)

(1) Mr Martin Twyman from the Little Stour and Nailbourne River Management Group gave a presentation *that was accompanied by photographs which appear on the KCC website on the agenda for this meeting.* He said that the Management Group comprised 11 Parish Councils from Lyminge to Stourmouth, the Canterbury region to Sandwich Great Stour as well as many farmers and landowners who had once again been affected by the recent floods. He added that he was also putting forward views held by many other parishioners.

(2) Mr Twyman thanked Ian Nunn and Andrew Pearse and their teams from the Environment Agency as well as various councils. He wished especially to thank Ted Edwards from Canterbury CC. He also thanked other organisations, the Army and

the many local volunteers. He said that without everyone pulling together the situation would have been far worse.

(3). Mr Twyman continued by saying that the Management Group had attended a similar meeting after the floods in 2001. Similar warnings and events had been repeated on this occasion. The Nailbourne had started flowing in mid January as it normally did. This was the sixth time this had happened since 2000. This had caused 5 major sewage infiltrations and had led to disgraceful replications of the events of previous years. It was stressful and not acceptable to the local residents in this day and age. These stresses included overpumping by Southern Water into the watercourses, sewage into properties, a continual fleet of lorries throughout the entire 24 hours of the day (although they were doing a necessary job), many road closures and businesses being put out of action. Southern Water had on three occasions undertaken major repairs (some successfully) but these events kept on occurring. It only needed the Nailbourne to flow to find the leakages and breaks. The pumping station at Bekesbourne was again in a terrible state, with the major watercourse blockage through the underpass of the railway line. The villages surrounding Bridge had taken the brunt, and Bridge High Street looked like a war zone.

(4) Mr Twyman then said that consideration needed to be given to a holding area or reservoir in the Upper Nailbourne valley and to the construction of the Broad Oak reservoir, to cope with the fairly regular events of water availability and future water requirements. The Management Group considered that the Nailbourne had three different section. These were Lyminge to Barham; Barham to Littlebourne; and Littlebourne to Seaton. There were many pinch points along each of these sections.

(5). The Environment Agency had constructed the relief channel around Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux after the flooding of 2001. This had been a saviour as it had been successful in avoiding house flooding, and the Action Group was grateful to them and the landowners. There was, however, a major pinch point between Wickham and Ickham Lane as the underpass was not big enough. Major services ran in the road and 5 major pumps had taken the pinch point pressures off the 4 mill sluice structures, which had only just coped. If there had been just two more days of rain there would have been some major flooding. More rain had fallen than ever before, and the Nailbourne flow had risen to 4.5 m³ per second as against the previous flow of 3.8 m³ per second.

(6). Mr Twyman said that he had arranged a boat trip on the Great Stour with Roy Newing, the local MP, Ted Edwards and Paul Marshall (from the Environment Agency) and the local press in mid December. They had reported that the river was in poor condition and silted up. They had not been able to reach Fordwich from Grove Ferry as the river was not navigable due to fallen trees. The river flow had been less than 50% (although the EA had not agreed with this assessment). The Management Group had immediately warned that there could be serious consequences if river maintenance was not carried out. This warning had duly been borne out.

(7) Mr Twyman said that the Great Stour took flow from the Weald, Ashford, Canterbury, Sturry, Fordwich, with all their housing, businesses, roads and ground works, and that there would be many more of these to consider in the future. Canterbury itself had not suffered too greatly on this occasion. From there downwards the river access could not be seen, and hardly any maintenance had

been carried out for many years. The river was silted up. There were major blockages. Major tree surgery was required. The necessary work was not being carried out for Health & Safety reasons or due to red tape.

(8) Mr Twyman continued by saying that when the NRA had merged into what became the Environment Agency, landowners had been replaced by different representatives. As a result, biodiversity had become a major influence, and consequently, river maintenance had ceased to be a priority. Local knowledge and advice were no longer considered and various people with over 50 years' experience had been ignored. The IDB was now in agreement with the Management Group and was carrying out its regular maintenance. The events of the last few months had once again been bad for wildlife, nature, the SSSI and for Natural England. A lot of money and hard work had been wasted.

(9) Mr Twyman then said that due to severe blockages, the Great Stour had overtopped for 200 metres and flooded over 1,000 acres of valuable farm land and crops in the Grove and Plucks Gutter area alone. This area would be under water for at least another two months.

(10) Mr Twyman continued by saying that he believed the Environment Agency would now have to change its priorities and concentrate on managing waterways, getting water away for flood protection far earlier than it currently did, and running the Sandwich Cut for more hours. It should also become far less bureaucratic - a view shared by a number of ground staff. The EA needed to look after people, livelihoods, property, businesses, insurance and costs rather than bureaucratic EC Rules and other environmental schemes. He agreed that such schemes did have value, but it was more important to base decisions on common sense, taking full account of people's views.

(11) Mr Twyman summed up his presentation by saying that the Government was putting funding money aside for environmental schemes. The Management Group had sent letters to the Prime Minister, Mr Pickles and other key people. Farmers were seeing part of their Single Farm Payment being deducted to part fund them. This money now needed to be channelled into managing flood protection, waterways and the countryside. If regular maintenance continued to be neglected, it would cost far more to put everything right. Everyone needed to be positive and look after Kent's country, rivers, properties and residents. He therefore asked for Kent County Council's support in finding the necessary funds. This would ensure that the county was properly prepared to cope with the next weather event.

(12) Mr Vickery-Jones said that he had attended a meeting organised by the EA at Plucks Gutter. He said that the EA representative at that meeting had tended to express their priorities in the manner described by Mr Twyman.

(13) Mrs Stockell said that she had attended a number of Flood Group meetings including one with the local MP and the Leader of the Council. One of the problems that had been discussed had been that farmers were no longer being required to carry out necessary maintenance work such as ditching. As a consequence, rivers and streams were silting up and ponds were being filled in. These concerns were being taken forward.

(14) Mr Nunn said that he understood the concerns that were being expressed. Some 18 months earlier, the EA had commissioned a survey of the Stour. This had been part of a programme of collating evidence to prove that silt levels were building up. What was now needed was for the EA, other interested parties such as the Action Group and the public to discuss the best way forward. There were areas where silt was clearly building up in the channel. However, he was not in a position to categorically say what impact this was having on the flooding. A second survey had been carried out in October 2013. The results had very recently been released but the analysis had not been completed. He offered to share it widely once this was done. Mr Nunn then said that the 1960s had seen a great deal of concentration on land drainage and food security. In his view, food security was not now a high priority for the Government.

(15) Mr Hills said that the interpretation of wildlife and habitat regulations was currently putting people at the bottom of the pile. This, in turn led to the damage to the very thing that environmentalists wanted to protect. He added that he had recently attended a conference chaired by Lord Smith, in his capacity as Chair of the Engagement Group Romney Marsh. Lord Smith had stated that every case needed to be treated on its merits. This answer had been very encouraging as it indicated that the Environment Agency was slowly moving in the direction of putting the needs of the community first.

(16) Mr Tapp said that, in his view, the Environment Agency had too wide a remit. He suggested that the Minister should be lobbied to separate Flood Defence from the rest of the Agency's work. This would enable the Flood Defence function to stand alone, develop its own priorities and fight its own corner. He then said that one of the problems arising from the Stour not being properly maintained was that the water came out just upstream of Grove Ferry and then spread across the Marshes doing a tremendous amount of damage to wildlife and farming interests, and then needing to be pumped back in again. Some 50 years earlier, the Government had categorised the River Stour as "self-cleansing." Since then, two new catchment areas had been built up, reducing the speed of the waterflow so that the river no longer fitted that category. During the 1970s, there had been a number of droughts, which had raised silt levels. Environmentalists had then added to this problem by seeking to protect the species that were growing on the silt.

(17) Mr Tapp then said that between Sandwich and Fordwich the tidal river was somewhere between 15 and 20k. There was no fall on that river at all. Only a minimal obstruction would be needed to hold the flow up. There were a number of points along this stretch which needed de-silting (rather than dredging) in order that the water could flow out.

(18) Mr Vickery-Jones noted that the Netherlands was spending £4 billion on flood defence as opposed to the £0.5 billion spent by the UK. This led him to the conclusion that the real problem was lack of funding. This was exacerbated by EU Directives on the local environment, diverting funds from the areas where they were most needed.

(19) The Chairman noted that a number of local officer level meetings were taking place. He asked that the Committee be kept informed so that best practice could be widely disseminated.

(20) Dr Eddy thanked the Environment Agency for its work on flood defences in Deal and Sandwich. Although these had not been completed, they had stood up remarkably well to the storm surge. There had been groundwater flooding in Deal (particularly in Canute Road). This had been caused by the inadequate size of the soakaways and the fact that land and sea level were at the same height so that groundwater had nowhere to escape to. These problems had been exacerbated by the decision of Dover DC to turn an area of grassland into a car park. As a result more now water flooded the road than had previously been the case.

(21) Mr Muckle said that Dartford BC had a lot of praise and no criticism for the various agencies' work in what had been an area relatively unaffected by the flood. The exception had been KCC Highways for the way in which it had managed the situation at Bob Dunn Way. He had been highly critical about its lack of preparedness at a meeting of the BC's Scrutiny Committee, particularly as the water level of the lake abutting the road was at the highest level he could remember. The only reason the road remained clear was that water was being constantly pumped away. The Fast Track route had also been flooded, so that the buses had to make their trips through water. The groundwater levels remained high, as did that of the River Thames.

(22) Mr Muckle then said that the problem was not just one of lack of money. There was also a great difference of opinion on how the money that was made available should be used. A decision needed to be taken on the correct course of action and fully implemented thereafter.

(23) Mr Lewin said that KCC's Emergency Planning should be thanked for its response to the crisis. The impact on Swale (at Faversham and Conyer) had been caused by coastal rather than fluvial flooding. He then referred to the closure of the Thames Barrier and said that its impact downriver needed to be discussed in detail on another occasion. He then said that the constant rain had impacted road surfaces and also asked for consideration of the best way to access funds from the Bellwin Scheme of emergency financial assistance.

(24) Mr Tant confirmed said that funding under the Bellwin Scheme had previously required the Local Authority to provide the first £3.3m of funding. This threshold had recently been reduced by the Government in the light of the flooding. It would nevertheless remain a significant financial commitment from the County Council.

(25) On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman thanked the Little Stour and Nailbourne River Management Group for all its work and also expressed the Committee's condolences for all those affected by the floods. He thanked the Management Group for the open invitation to Members of the Committee to attend its meetings.

(26) RESOLVED that Mr Twyman be thanked for his presentation and that the accompanying photographs be sent to all Members of the Committee and posted on the KCC website.

5. Environment Agency Flood Alerts and Warnings and KCC Flood Response activity since the last meeting
(Item 8)

(1) Mr Harwood informed the Committee that the Environment Agency had issued 106 Flood Alerts and Flood Warnings since the previous meeting of the Committee on 18 November 2013. This contrasted with the total of 95 in the whole of 2013. The same period had seen 87 Severe Weather Warnings, as opposed to 42 in 2013.

(2) Mr Harwood said that the whole of Kent had been affected over the period, and that this had been in terms of storm conditions as well as flooding. The extent of power outages, some 28,000 recorded across Kent, had contributed significantly to the problems faced by responders.

(3) Mr Harwood referred to lectures given some ten years earlier by the Insurance Industry in which the prediction had been made that weather patterns were changing and that storms were increasingly tracking from the Atlantic Ocean across the southern UK, instead of the Bay of Biscay and northern Scotland. This prediction appeared to have been borne out by recent events. In a warming world, with increased sea and air temperatures, it was predicted that autumns and winters would become increasingly wet and stormy.

(4) Mr Harwood then said that emergency planning delivery in Kent was changing from the start of the 2014/15 financial year. Ten of the currently thirteen members of the Emergency Planning Team would be seconded to a multi-agency Resilience Team based within the Kent Fire and Rescue Service. KCC Emergency Planning would now consist of Mr Harwood himself and Mr Greg Surtees.

(5) Mr Harwood replied to a question from Mrs Stockell by saying that the creation of the multi-agency Resilience Team, comprising Fire, Police and KCC Emergency Planning, was designed to strengthen the County's ability to respond to emergencies. The Emergency Planning Centre would need to be retained as KCC was the Lead Agency for a number of functions. He said that it would now become even more important for Managers and other staff across KCC to engage more robustly with the emergency planning agenda to ensure that corporate resilience was maintained.

(6) Mr Harwood went on to pay tribute to the Voluntary Sector whose work across the entire range of responses to the winter severe weather emergencies had been crucial.

(7) Dr Eddy reported that he had visited the local Emergency Centre in Dover shortly after the coastal event had begun. Whilst he had been there, an urgent request had been received from the Police for some of its staff to go to Sandwich. Having done so, these Dover DC staff had neither been given the necessary equipment nor been fed.

(8) Dr Eddy also reported that some of the affected areas in the Dover District (such as East Studdle) had never experienced an emergency such as this before. Overall, the public had been very complimentary about the high quality response from local authority personnel in that area.

(9) RESOLVED that the level of alerts received since the last meeting of the Committee be noted together with comments made during discussion of this item.

6. Local Flood Risk Management and the Local Strategy

(Item 9)

(1) Mr Tant reminded the Committee that the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy had been adopted in June 2013. A review and update of the Strategy had been scheduled for the year-end. Both were progressing well, as set out in the Appendices to the report.

(2) Mr Tant then said that KCC's new role for SuDS was now expected to commence in October 2014.

(3) Mr Tant replied to questions from Dr Eddy by saying that the most significant action to be taken forward in Deal Town was likely to be in Church Road. The Wantsum Channel was a main river. The issue of the Nailbourne was that there were more than just fluvial issues (e.g. groundwater flooding and sewage). KCC's role in this case was to act as part of a multi-agency group. Kent's role in respect of the Wantsum Channel would be similar to this.

(4) In response to a question from Mrs Stockell, the Chairman confirmed that the Review would be considered by the Environment, Highways and Waste Cabinet Committee.

(5) Mr Tapp commented that the amount of wheat lost due to the flooding events amounted to some 8 million loaves of bread.

(6) Mr Bird said that the Natural Trust had estimated that more trees had been lost than in 1987. Many of these were on Council property. Even though they would fulfil a value flood defence function in their fallen state, they would need to be replaced as living flora.

(5) RESOLVED that the implications and risks associated with delivering the 2014/15 action plan be noted.

7. Next Meeting

(Item)

(1) The Committee noted that its next meeting would be held on Monday, 21 July. It would be preceded by a visit to the Leigh Barrier.

(2) Committee Members also expressed their appreciation of the site tour that had been organised in the morning and asked for a letter to be sent to Mr Nick Sandford at Goddinton House thanking him and the National Trust for welcome them on to the land and for giving his time to demonstrate the river remedial measures that had been put in place.