

THE RIVER STOUR (KENT) INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board held at 14:00 on Thursday 8 June 2023
at the Jury Room the Guildhall Sandwich Kent CT13 9AH

PRESENT

Mr G R Steed (Chairman), Cllr S Blair, Ms N Dyas, Mr P N Howard, Ms A G Lynch, Cllr W Scobie, Mr M P Wilkinson and Mr L Woollorton.

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr P Dowling (Clerk & Engineer), Mr J Williamson (Technical Officer) and Ms A Eastwood (Finance & Rating Officer).

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Cllr S Blair (DDC) and Cllr W Scobie (TDC) to their first meeting of the Board. He further welcomed the following EA Officers: Ms D Thompson (Field Team Leader, Stour Team), Dr D Price (Technical Advisor, Asset Performance Team), Mr I Nunn (Operations Manager), Mr R Tournay (Stour & Swale Team Leader Asset Performance Team) and Mr B Morris (Beaver Technical Specialist, Southeast).

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr A Buchanan, Mr D M Botting, Cllr R Carnac, Mr P S Dunn, Mr D J Fuller, Cllr A Hicks, Mr G Holdstock, Cllr D Ledger, Cllr G Meaden, Cllr M Moorhouse, Cllr N Ovenden and Mr P Williams. Further apologies were received from Mr D Godden (Rhino Plant Hire).

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Ms N Dyas declared an interest on any item relating to the Minster and Monkton Marshes.

PRESENTATION ON LOCAL BEAVER ACTIVITY & FUTURE MANAGEMENT

Mr Morris stated that he covers Kent, London and East Anglia but the vast majority of his work is in Kent where beavers can currently be found.

Beavers were previously a native species, made extinct around 200 to 300 years ago; they feed on a broad range of vegetation throughout the summer but mostly on trees during the winter. They are fiercely territorial and once they reach an optimum population, they manage their own numbers. They were given native species status in October 2022 and are a protected species in England. Therefore, any action likely to impair their ability to survive, breed or rear their young counts as a disturbance. Actions can be taken when burrows and dams are causing problems, but they will have to be done under licences. There have been known established wild populations in the Hacklinge area for approx. 15-20 years but their behaviour within the Stour Catchment differs from what was expected, making it difficult to plan.

Beavers can provide a broad range of benefits such as increase in biodiversity, mitigate flooding & drought, improve water quality and create more climate change resilient landscapes but there are also some risks. Burrowing can cause substantial damage to railway lines; damage to crops and trees; damage to foot and bridal paths, which may lead to people and animal injuries; digging channels between watercourses may cause scouring and breaches.

Ms Dyas stated that these Eurasian Beavers only build dams to retain a good depth of water, so not so much of an issue on the marsh systems, but their burrowing and channelling is a concern. Burrows contain chambers above the water level and create soft ground above surface where machinery and cattle can sink, causing damage and injury. They destroy the integrity of the riverbank and tunnel into fields, which will lead to further flooding during spring tides.

Mr Morris stated that the fact that the beavers have been present in the region for 20 years but only now have become protected has made it a difficult situation to manage. The EA and Natural England need to ensure that legislation is adhered to. The recent survey identified beavers all over the Hacklinge Marshes and on the main Lower Stour, but no signs on the Monkton Marshes and Ash Level Marshes yet.

Mr Morris stated that when the beavers make it upstream of Ashford, like the East Stour, we may start to see more problems with damming, and it would be good for the advisory group to talk to landowners there.

Management works requiring a Licence: any work to do with lodges and burrows as they are protected features. The Clerk & Engineer commented that is reassuring that problems are currently being jointly dealt with without too many problems. Mr Morris stated that the licencing process is quite simple with a 5-day turnover, just fill out the form online with all the details required, submit it, and should hear back within a week.

Management works not requiring a Licence: work to damaged banks and channels where it is visible that there is no animal, clay bunds to stop any burrowing and work on the watercourse right up to any lodge as long as it does not impact the structure.

The Clerk & Engineer highlighted the risk of the Grove walls breaching, which would allow water from the Lower Stour to flow into the Stodmarsh NNR. Mr Morris informed that he is due to meet with Natural England to discuss management options.

Ms Dyas asked if the EA has an emergency plan, if there are high tides with spring floods. Mr Nunn replied that these would be dealt with under existing arrangements. Ms Thompson reported that the EA is building a clay store near the Sarre Pumping Station, so clay is readily available for emergency works.

Mr Morris requested that any beaver activity be reported to himself and the EKBAG as this will aid planning for future management and engagement. He restated that he is always happy to assist and advise on any beaver related matter.

The Chairman thanked Mr Morris for his presentation on this important subject.

APPOINTMENT OF A VICE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman stated that as a consequence of the local elections the Board lost some members and currently has no Vice Chairman or Deputy Vice Chairman. He further stated that the latter position can be filled in November but the Board should ideally agree on a Vice Chairman.

The Chairman proposed Cllr A Hicks – in her absence – for the position of Vice Chairman, this was seconded by Cllr W Scobie, there being no other nominations it was agreed that Cllr A Hicks be elected as Vice Chairman until the November 2023 meeting of the Board. All present agreed.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON MONDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2023

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on Thursday 9 February 2023 were received. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms A Lynch and resolved that the minutes be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a true record of the proceedings at that meeting.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTESPRESENTATION BY SOUTHERN WATER

The Chairman asked Ms Dyas if Mr Buxton had been in touch with regards to the discharge information from Southern Water's discharge pipe from the Weatherlees site into the river Stour. Ms Dyas stated that she has not received any information. **Action: Clerk & Engineer to chase.**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FINANCE, GENERAL PURPOSES AND WORKS COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 22 MAY 2023

The minutes of the meeting of the Finance, General Purposes & Works Committee held on Monday 22 May 2023 were received. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Mr M Wilkinson and resolved that these minutes be received.

MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTESRef: F1-8 Fixed Assets Register

The Chairman reported that the newly acquired assets below are to be disclosed on the Assets Register and depreciated annually.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Insurance Value</u>
Tractor powered pump & attachments	£25,000	£50,000
30ft storage container	£ 3,780	£ 4,000
Trailer	£ 4,539	£ 4,600

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Dyas and resolved that these items be valued as above for insurance purposes and depreciated on a straight-line basis over 10 years for the tractor powered pump and the storage container and 20 years for the trailer, with salvage values of £1,000, £500 and £500 respectively.

Ref: F1-2a Final Internal Audit Inspection of the 2022-23 Accounts

The Chairman reported that the Board's Internal Auditor, Mr David Griffiths, carried out his inspection of the Board's 2022-23 accounts and accounting records on 11 May 2023. The Chairman stated that the report is indicative of an extremely well-run office, and he thanked the staff for this.

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded Ms Lynch and resolved that Final Internal Audit Report be received and approved.

Ref: F1-2b Review of the Internal Control and Internal Audit Arrangements 2022-23

The Chairman reported that the Board's Internal Audit Team for 2022-23, consisting of Mr P S Dunn, Mr G Holdstock and Mr M P Wilkinson, carried out the inspection of the Board's accounts and accounting records for 2022-23 on 11th May with Mr Griffiths assisting. Mr Wilkinson stated that the Team completed their review and there were no matters arising. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Cllr Scobie and resolved that this report be received and approved.

Ref: F1-5a Annual Governance and Accountability Return 2022-23 (AGAR)

The Chairman reported that the AGAR 2022-23 was completed with 3 documents to be received and approved by the Board in the correct sequence. The first one of these being the Annual Internal Audit Report 2022-23 (page 3 of the AGAR) which was completed and signed by the Internal Auditor.

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Lynch and resolved that the Annual Internal Audit Report 2022-23 be received and approved.

Ref: F1-5b Accounts for Financial Year Ended 31st March 2023

The Chairman presented the completed Board's accounts for the year ended 31st March 2023 and asked for any comments or queries. There being no queries it was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Dyas, and resolved that the accounts for the Financial Year ended 31 March 2023 be received and approved.

Ref: F1-5c Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) – SECTION 1 (Annual Governance Statement 2022-23)

The Chairman reported that the requirement to review the effectiveness of the system of internal control as per Section 1 of the AGAR (page 4) was accomplished by the Final Internal Audit carried out by Mr D Griffiths which enabled him to complete page 3 of the AGAR (Annual Internal Audit Report 2022-23) and the review of the Internal Control and Internal Audit Arrangements by the Internal Audit Team, both carried out on 11 May 2023. This section (page 4 of the AGAR) was completed by the Clerk & Engineer to the Board and considered by the Board, there being no comments it was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Lynch and resolved that the Annual Governance Statement 2022-23 be received and approved by the Board and signed by the Clerk & Engineer and the Chairman.

Ref: F1-5d Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) – SECTION 2 (Accounting Statement 2022-23)

The Chairman presented Section 2 of the AGAR (page 5), the Accounting Statements 2022-23 which was prepared, signed and dated by the Finance & Rating Officer – Responsible Financial Officer – and checked by the Internal Auditor. This document was considered by the Board and it was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Lynch and resolved that the Accounting Statements 2022-23 be approved and signed by the Chairman.

Ref: F1-5e Notice of Public Rights and Publication of Unaudited Annual Return Accounts for the Financial Year Ended 31st March 2023

The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 require the accounting records for the financial year to which the audit relates and all books, deeds, contracts, bills, vouchers, receipts and other documents relating to those records to be made available for inspection by any person interested, during a period of 30 working days set by the Board. It is proposed that the dates for the period of exercise of public rights be set as follows:

- Commencing on Monday 12 June 2023
- Ending on Friday 21 July 2023

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Dyas and resolved that the above dates be set as the period for the Exercise of Public Rights and published on the Board's website and on the Board's outdoor noticeboard.

Ref: F6-1 Environment Agency Precept

Mr Nunn explained that the EA receives an annual precept from the IDB which is part of the Treasury funding rules around Internal Drainage Boards and the Environment Agency because they are so interlinked within the catchment – it is effectively a payment for the benefits that the IDB receives from the works carried out by the EA within the district. This fund will normally subsidise works that are not fully funded by the Treasury, works in low consequence systems (where there isn't a significant risk of flooding to property but where there is a significant impact on agricultural land or businesses).

Dr Price stated that there is also a Public Sector Cooperation Agreement (PSCA) between the EA and the IDB which is a procurement tool that allows the EA to use the IDB as a partner to deliver work in the areas where the IDB has local knowledge and expertise achieving a shared goal.

The Environment Agency's Precept Report confirms final allocations for 2022-23 and proposed allocations for 2023-24. PSCA works carried out by the Board on behalf of the EA amounted to £132,600 and the Board's Precept of £95,836 for 2022-23 was spent on various projects detailed in the report.

Mr Nunn stated that the IDB and the local EA Officers agree what the precept is, this is then put to the Regional Flood Defence Committee (covering the whole of South-East) for their agreement. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Mr Wilkinson and resolved that the EA's Precept Report be received and approved.

Ref: F8-6 Development Control Charges and Fees

The Chairman reported that the Water Management Alliance (WMA) increased their rates by 14.2% to reflect the RPI from October 2022 – the Board has in the past agreed to reflect any changes made by the WMA to their schedule of fees for the Surface Water Development Contribution.

Cllr Scobie asked what the scale of these charges and fees is, the Chairman replied that it is difficult to evaluate in terms of the Board's overall budget because it depends what developments arise that flow into the IDB district, but it has the potential to generate significant amounts. The Clerk & Engineer commented that in the past, development has gone ahead and discharged into watercourses that are otherwise unmaintained, so this contribution is to enable us to carry out some maintenance on watercourses which otherwise would be unmaintained and potentially problematic. The contribution is calculated from the areas of hardstanding and rates/volumes of discharge, in most cases even if they can restrict the rate to less pre-development there is usually an increase in volume.

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Mr Howard that the Board continue to mirror the WMA fees and increase our own rates accordingly.

Ref: A3-1Members Code of Conduct

The Chairman reported that the Members Code of Conduct has been reviewed and updated. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Cllr Scobie and resolved that the updated Members Code of Conduct be received and approved.

Ref: A3-1.1Employees Code of Conduct

The Chairman reported that the Employees Code of Conduct has been reviewed and updated. Cllr Scobie referred to point 2.4 about the requirement of employees working additional hours, stating that there are statutory limits on working hours. The Clerk & Engineer welcomed this point and will add it to the code before issuing. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Cllr Scobie and resolved that the reviewed Employees Code of Conduct, subject to the addition of the mentioned point, be received and approved.

Ref: A3-1.7General Data Protection Policy (GDPR)

The Chairman reported that documents relating to GDPR were reviewed including the Privacy Notice, Data Sharing Code of Practice and Data Sharing Protocol. It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Lynch and resolved that these documents be received and approved.

Report for the period January to April 2023Ref: W4/WSR Rainfall & River Flow Data

The Clerk & Engineer reported that rainfall across the across the Stour catchment in January ranged from 48.4mm at Broadstairs to 92.4mm at Barham and averaged 69.6mm (102% of the Long-Term Average). February was extremely dry, with just 6.2mm at Broadstairs to 9.7mm at Bybrook, producing an average of 7.6mm (17% of the LTA). A very wet March with some intense storms recorded rainfall amounts ranging from 79.4mm at Broadstairs to 131.4mm at Canterbury, averaging 102.4mm (187% of the LTA). April's rainfall ranged from 50.6mm in Broadstairs to 95.9mm at Bybrook, producing an average of 74.9mm (150% of the LTA).

Apart from the very dry February, river flows have remained substantially above average throughout this period. At the end of April, groundwater levels ranged from above normal to notably high at key indicators sites, and groundwater levels have increased sharply. Levels at most of the reservoirs remained unchanged since the end of March, and levels at all reservoirs were 97% or above at the end of April.

Ref: W7IDB Programme of Works (Including works carried out under PSCA)Weed Cutting

The Clerk & Engineer reported that this year's weed cutting programme is scheduled to commence in mid-July as usual. Joint IDB-EA land entry notices have been issued to all landowners/occupiers. Details of works to be carried out on behalf of the Environment Agency and DDC under PSCAs have been reviewed and a substantial amount of additional routine Main River maintenance has been included. This will enable more efficient working and will also allow the EA Operations Team to focus on high-risk systems and assets.

De-silting

The Clerk & Engineer reported that the 2022-23 de-silting programme, after some alterations, totalled 18km. This included work on Kimberley Dyke (IDB9), Bliby Wood Dyke (IDB26), Flood Street Dyke (IDB28), Swanton Mill Dyke (IDB29), Shalmsford Street Dyke (IDB31), Fordwich Main Stream (IDB38), Preston & Deerson Main Stream (incl. feed) (IDB52), Supperton Dyke (IDB86), Wantsum Siphon Link (IDB117), Hog & Donkey Dyke (IDB129), Twelve Foot Dyke (IDB136), Wantsum Lees Dyke (IDB190), Westmarsh Drove Lead Dyke (IDB202), Guston Farm Dyke (IDB209), Minster Stream Lead Dyke (IDB217), St John's Sewer (IDB267), Ring Sewer (IDB268), Maison Dieu (IDB287), Saffrey Sewer (IDB289) and Deal Town Dyke Lower (IDB296).

The 2023-24 de-silting programme is as previously reported (18,566m) and will be checked and confirmed over the summer.

Tree & Shrub Maintenance

The Clerk & Engineer reported that a substantial amount of work was carried out over the winter, with works completed on the following watercourses: Hart Dyke (IDB1), Bliby Wood Dyke (IDB26), Flood Street Dyke (IDB28), Fordwich Main Stream (IDB38), Upper Wickham Stream (IDB48), Preston & Deerson Main Stream (IDB52), Supperton Dyke (IDB86), Blackhole Dyke (IDB110), Wademarsh Stream (IDB114) and Island Road Dyke (IDB137).

A substantial amount of work was also completed on behalf of the EA under the PSCA, on the Sarre Penn, Wingham River, Whitewater Dyke and Ruckinge Dyke.

This year's tree maintenance programme will be developed over the summer, initially focussed on watercourses to be de-silted but also based on information received from Rhino staff.

Structures Maintenance

It was reported that the Supperton Stop (IDB86) was renewed in 2022 in order to maintain upstream water levels and the redundant Stickell Stop (IDB202) was removed due to its deteriorating and unsafe condition.

Minor repairs and improvements were carried out on the following IDB structures: Baxter Feed (IDB114), Broadley Stop (IDB114), Hogwell Siphon Stop (IDB133), Fowler's Feed (IDB143), Coleman Stop (IDB169), Fry Dam (IDB271), Maison Dieu Stop (IDB287), Saffrey Stop (IDB289), Hogwell Siphon (IDB307), Minster Siphon (IDB310) and Richborough Siphon (IDB311). Minor repairs to Steed Stop (IDB266) and the upstream side of Hogwell Siphon (IDB307) were delayed due to difficult access and will be added to this year's programme of works.

Obstruction Clearance

It was reported that routine inspections continue to be carried out and obstructions cleared as necessary, particularly in the Ashford area.

Water Level Control

It was reported that all water levels have been raised to normal summer levels.

Ref: A4-3

Biodiversity

The updates below, against each of the BAP main headings, were provided by Mr Martin Thomas of KSCP:

1. Surveying:

Processed data from 2022 surveys. Post-desilt surveys of Supperton Dyke (IDB86) and Westmarsh Drove Lead Dyke (IDB202). Exploring how to digitise and streamline the process for 2023.

2. Management Prescriptions:

Updated management sheets for Golden Ball Dyke (IDB24), Bliby Wood Dyke (IDB26), Swanton Mill Dyke (IDB29), Shalmsford Street Dyke (IDB31), Supperton Dyke (IDB86), Lope Dyke (IDB88), Redrow Lead Dyke (IDB127), Hog & Donkey Lead Dyke (IDB129), Ash Level Feed Dyke (IDB207) and Ring Sewer (IDB268). Creating list of follow-up actions in parallel, covering landowner engagement, priority and invasive species follow-up surveys, water quality issues, etc.

3. Enhancement Projects:

Further investigations and engagement regarding the possible enhancement of Long Reaches (IDB30). Engaged with land manager for installing cattle drinks on Buxford Dyke (IDB25). Investigations and implementation of in-channel enhancements on Shalmsford Street Dyke (IDB31). Further survey of Wademarsh Stream (IDB114) for parrot's feather ahead of this year's works.

The faggoting and de-silting of a section of the Delf Stream has been completed, and planting with bankside plants is to be carried out in the coming days.

4. Engagement with Landowners and External Organisations:

Set up a meeting at Wingham Wildlife Park to discuss breeding programme for White Clawed Crayfish and the potential for future releases into suitable habitats.

5. Communication and training:

Collating data from summer 2022 surveys for Kent Biological Records Centre submission.

Ref: A10-21 Beavers

The Clerk & Engineer reported that a collapsed beaver burrow was discovered on the bank of the South Stream at Hacklinge. A meeting took place with the EA, NE, KCC, RSPB and IDB and it was agreed that KCC would fund repairs, due to it being on a public footpath. Further details will be reported in due course.

Ref: W7G Environment Agency Works

The following summary of EA activities was reported:

Work delivered January to March 2023:

- Meica asset maintenance / repairs
- Pioneering work completed (field team and via IDB PSCA)
- Desilting programme on Wantsum, North Stream and Wingham completed
- Moles Hole – structure repairs – now fully completed following issues in November 2022
- Ashford reservoirs – access improvements
- Stourmouth pumping station – pump refurbishment – pump 2 reinstalled, pump 3 now out for repairs
- Northern Sea Wall – wall and path repairs near Coldharbour Lagoon
- Delf desilting and faggoting – upstream of the railway line (via IDB PSCA)
- Hacklinge pumping station – Delf stream discharge point outfall flap installation (via IDB PSCA)

Dr Price provided the following 2023-2024 Project list and updates:

- Brewery Sluice refurbishment – outfall flap to be completed by the end of June
- Brewery Sluice refurbishment – debris screen should be completed in July
- Minster pumping station – pump replacement has been delayed due to rising costs from the preferred supplier placing costs above spending cap (£500k). Tender process being reopened seeking costs below £500k, also a bid has been placed under a different funding stream for £650k in case costs cannot be kept below that cap.
- Black Sluice automatic weed rake – new culvert installation expected Autumn 2023
- Black Sluice eel pass – pump upgrade to take place late summer, early autumn
- Boiling Spot – structure repairs to take place late summer, early autumn
- Hacklinge pumping station – pump refurbishment may be delayed till next year
- Hacklinge pumping station – track repairs
- Monks Wall TFRA – erosion repairs and structure maintenance to be done late summer
- Pumping station emergency lighting installation
- Rippers Cross and Paddocks Farm pumping stations – panel upgrades and pump refurbishments
- Rippers Cross and Paddocks Farm pumping stations – steps replacement
- Pumping station repainting and repointing – various locations
- Lower Stour bathymetry survey – repeat annual survey
- Debris screen replacement programme
- Annual maintenance programme across the Stour catchment (including via IDB PSCA)
- Grass maintenance at reservoirs and embankments across the Stour catchment
- Desilting – watercourses to be determined
- Tree pioneering work – locations to be determined (including via IDB PSCA)

The above list may be subject to change during the year, depending on staff resource, contractor availability, incident response activities, flood risk priorities and budget position. The projects listed may not all be completed in 2023/24 and some of the more complex repairs are likely to extend into 2024/25.

Incident response:

- Aldington FSR impounded between 01/01/23 – 04/01/23, 16/01/23 – 17/01/23 and 24/03/23. Staff from the Stour Asset Performance and Operations Delivery teams inspected the embankment each day during impounding events
- Hothfield FSR impounded between 01/01/23 – 04/01/23. Staff from the Stour Asset Performance and Operations Delivery teams inspected the embankment each day during impounding events
- Stonar Cut was operated between 02/01/23 – 03/01/23 (two tides) and 18/01/23 – 19/01/23 (three tides)

Staff updates:

- Mr Rich Tournay was appointed the permanent Team Leader of the Stour & Swale Asset Performance team after covering this position on an assignment basis for the past year.
- Mr Alex Eden was promoted to an advisor position within the Romney & Rother field teams and is leaving in June 2023, recruitment is ongoing for a number of officer and advisor positions within the AP team.
- Mr Rob Ehren was promoted from Specialist Team Member in the Stour field team to an advisor position within the Stour & Swale field teams. Recruitment will take place to fill his STM post in the coming months.

- Mr Tony Baker is retiring from the Stour field team as Lead Team Member at the end of May 2023. Recruitment to fill his post has taken place and the successful candidate will be starting in the coming months.

Ref: W5 Planning Applications

The Technical Officer stated that since the implementation of our Policy on the requirement for a Surface Water Development Contribution to be paid to the RSIDB for any new discharge of surface water (or treated foul effluent) into any watercourse within our district, we have made representations on Planning Applications to inform the LPA/applicant accordingly. If a development is outside of our Drainage District but still intends to discharge to the wider catchment of the Stour, our Byelaw 3 still applies.

To avoid repetition in this report, we have simply stated ‘*Byelaw 3 applies*’ for any application where we have made a representation to the LPA with the following content (or similar):

“Under the RSIDB’s Byelaw 3, there is a requirement for the payment of a Surface Water Development Contribution if the proposals result in any increase in the rate or volume of runoff being directed into our district from the development.”

Our Byelaw 3 states: “Control of Introduction of Water and Increase in Flow or Volume of Water – No person shall as a result of development (within the meaning of section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (“the 1990 Act”)) (whether or not such development is authorised by the 1990 Act or any regulation or order whatsoever or none of them) for any purpose by means of any channel, siphon, pipeline or sluice or by any other means whatsoever introduce any water into any watercourse in the District so as to directly or indirectly increase the flow or volume of water in any watercourse in the District (without the previous consent of the Board).”

Any such contribution will be a one-off payment, and will serve to facilitate the management of the increased flow rate or volume resulting from the development into our District. We also note that the site is to be served by an upgraded private foul treatment plant with a permanent discharge to the fluvial network. As with the surface water discharge, our Consent will be required for any new discharge and the rate/volume of flow should be assessed and provided in support of any application.

It is requested that any permissions issued make clear reference to the above, preferably by formal condition, to ensure that the correct procedure is followed and local flood risk is not exacerbated.”

Ashford Borough Council

PA/2022/2669 Land off Norman Road and Romney Marsh Road, Ashford, Kent TN24 0SD Development of 90 one and two bedroom apartments in three buildings, new vehicular and pedestrian access, internal access road, footpaths and car parking, earthworks, creation of a new section of active floodplain and floodplain compensation for the development, sustainable drainage systems, parkland open space and hard and soft landscaping.

We were reconsulted on this application and its associated and amended drainage/floodplain arrangements; these were submitted in response to objections from ourselves and the Environment Agency, raised as result of concerns over the functionality of the floodplain and the SuDS design. Unfortunately, the revisions hadn’t dealt with the fundamental issues we had previously raised, so we were unable to withdraw our opposition.

“We have reviewed the amended Flood Risk Assessment and we are unfortunately unable to remove our outstanding objection to this development.

While the applicant’s consultant has progressed the Surface Water Management Scheme to a certain extent, there are still significant issues within that need to be addressed for us to be able to confirm the proposed dwellings will be safe without exacerbating the flood risk to the surrounding area.

We would ordinarily expect to see a summary of the fluvial flood height for a series of Return Periods (to ODN) in relation to the pre and post-development scenarios, taking into account existing and proposed land-levels. This information has not been presented in the report or in the appendices. Given the extensive land-lowering proposed to compensate for the flood storage volume lost, we would wish to see an analysis of the likely Return Period event (both with and without a climate change adjustment) that will likely see the site inundated.

The proposed SuDS scheme is going to be largely situated in an area of the site that is already classified as FZ3. The area proposed is intended to be lowered, with the attenuation basins then sunk into this space. It is very possible that, with the proposed lowering of the land, the part of the site in-question will become FZ3b – functional floodplain (if it isn’t already), and we do not consider this to be a safe or sustainable area for a SuDS scheme. If allowed, this area will be already flooded during prolonged, extreme or successive rainfall events when a fully functional SuDS scheme is essential to protect the areas downstream.

We also do not consider the introduction of pumps to theoretically discharge the attenuation basins is a viable option. As above, the site and the SuDS ponds are likely to already be inundated during a combined heavy rainfall and extreme fluvial event; the pumps will be recirculating floodwater with no benefit.

We are further concerned that the minimum discharge rate from the site is seemingly set at the present day 1 in 30yr rate. This should not be the case. As discussed with the applicant’s consultant during our latest discussions, there should be no discharge from the site for the first 5mm rainfall event (to account for the ‘first flush’ principle). All rainfall events between the 1 and 30yr storms should be limited to the 1yr rate; storms with a return period between 30 and 100yrs should be limited to the 30yr rate, with events of 100yrs and over (inc climate change) being limited to the present day 100yr rate.

It should be noted that Functional Floodplain (FZ3b) is now considered to be land having a 3.3% or greater annual probability of flooding, with any existing flood risk management infrastructure operating effectively. This is a change from the previously used 5% AEP flood previously used and will see a larger area being deemed functional floodplain (in which ‘more vulnerable’ development should not be permitted). There should be an analysis of this in the FRA, with the proposed post-development land-levels shown.

We would be grateful if we can be reconsulted on any additional information related to flood risk or drainage is submitted.”

The Technical Officer reported that he has received the new flood risk assessment that says that the site will flood present day 1 in 50yr event which makes it even less appropriate, but he will keep the Board updated.

PA/2023/0393 Wetlands West of Sewage Works at junction of Branch Road and, Ashford Road, Chilham
Construction of engineered wetland with landscaping.

This application is for another nutrient removing wetland area, similar to that approved in Conningbrook. Water from the Stour is proposed to be pumped from the river into reedbed basins in an attempt to remove the excess nutrients from the water to help alleviate the known issues in the SSSI at Stodmarsh downstream. At the moment, most development upstream of the SSSI is opposed by Natural England as the additional loading on the area's wastewater treatment works could lead to a worsening of the condition of the fluvial network. The construction of these wetlands is intended to release some of the otherwise stalled development in the area.

“This site sits entirely within the River Stour (Kent) Internal Drainage Board’s (RSIDB) Drainage District and is bounded to the north by an IDB maintained watercourse (IDB30 – Long Reaches); this proposal therefore has a potential to affect its interests, in particular drainage and downstream flood risk

The Environment Agency should be consulted on the proposed floodplain compensation strategy to ensure that they are satisfied that during any flood event (including all lower-order events, not just the extreme flood), there will be no increased off-site flood risk and that level-for-level, volume-for-volume compensation is provided for all modelled flood events. Their formal written Consent will be required for all works affecting, or within 8m of the River Stour, a Main River. They should also confirm that they are content with the operating parameters, particularly during periods of high flow in the river. It should be ensured that the outflow rate does not exceed the inflow when flooding could be experienced downstream.

If the Environment Agency are conditionally satisfied with the proposals, we would request that an informative is added to the Decision Notice to remind the applicant that the RSIDB’s prior written consent will be required for any works which fall within 8m of any watercourse on this site, in accordance with the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the IDB’s own Byelaws (please see <https://rsidb.org.uk/consents-byelaws/>). Such works may include any fencing, planting, access roads, culverts or excavations. These proposals may also be subject to our Surface Water Development Contribution charge – please see our website (as above) for further information.”

PA/2023/0338 Land at Orchard Farm, Canterbury Road, Kennington
Approval of layout, scale, landscaping, internal access arrangements and appearance for the erection of 25 dwellings pursuant to outline planning permission 19/00834/AS.

This is a development on a site that lies outside of our Drainage District, but is accompanied by a drainage strategy that intends to discharge its attenuated runoff into our area. We have advised that our Land Drainage Consent will be required under Byelaw 3 for any increase in rate or volume of discharge.

“Whilst we haven’t been formally consulted on the above-referenced development proposal, we would request the following comments are recorded.

Although this site lies outside of our IDB Drainage District, the surface water strategy submitted with this application states that the runoff will be discharged ultimately to an existing boundary ditch via an attenuation scheme.

*Given the site's location, it is likely that any watercourse on this site will form part of the wider drainage network that discharges to our District. We would therefore request that a Condition is attached to any permission granted to ensure that a **detailed** drainage strategy is submitted and that any such strategy establishes the off-site implications for the proposed discharge to the boundary ditch. It must be ensured that this feature forms part of a contiguous network and is not a 'blind' feature with no onward connectivity.*

*If it can be demonstrated that water can be effectively conveyed from the point of discharge to a wider receiving network, the applicant will need Land Drainage Consent from Kent County Council for any works that has the potential to affect flow in any ditch or watercourse on the site. Land Drainage Consent will also be required from ourselves under our Byelaw 3, specifically with regard to seeking a Surface Water Development Contribution for any increase in **rates/volumes** of discharge that may be directed into our District."*

Byelaw 3 applies.

**PA/2022/2312 Land to the south of Chart Leacon Depot, Leacon Road, Ashford
Installation of perimeter fence and laying of hardstanding in connection with the use of the site for a flexible open storage.**

This is another development on a site that lies outside of our Drainage District, but is accompanied by a drainage strategy that intends to discharge its attenuated runoff into our area. We have advised that our Land Drainage Consent will be required under Byelaw 3 for any increase in rate or volume of discharge.

"Although this site lies outside of our IDB Drainage District, the surface water strategy submitted with this application states that the surface water from this development will not be able to be disposed of via infiltration or directed to a surface water sewer; it further states that it will be discharged ultimately to an existing boundary ditch via an attenuation scheme.

*Given the site's location, it is likely that any watercourse on this site will form part of the wider drainage network that discharges to our District. We would therefore request that a Condition is attached to any permission granted to ensure that a **detailed** drainage strategy is submitted and that any such strategy establishes the off-site implications for the proposed discharge to the boundary ditch. It must be ensured that this feature forms part of a contiguous network and is not a 'blind' feature with no onward connectivity.*

*If it can be demonstrated that water can be effectively conveyed from the point of discharge to a wider receiving network, the applicant will need Land Drainage Consent from Kent County Council for any works that has the potential to affect flow in any ditch or watercourse on the site. Land Drainage Consent will also be required from ourselves under our Byelaw 3, specifically with regard to seeking a Surface Water Development Contribution for any increase in **rates/volumes** of discharge that may be directed into our District."*

Byelaw 3 applies.

**21/01595/AS Waterbrook Park, Waterbrook Avenue, Sevington, Kent
Reserved matters application to consider access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to outline planning permission 18/00098/AS for the development of 364 dwellings, a convenience/farm shop/ café building, wetland area, landscaping, open space, drainage, parking and other associated infrastructure.**

We were reconsulted on the above-referenced application; although there appeared to be no material change that affected our interests, the applicant has yet to acknowledge our previously raised issues.

We have reviewed the recently submitted supporting information and we can unfortunately find no reference from the applicant to our previously submitted comments. We would be grateful if the applicant or their consultants are advised to contact us at their earliest convenience to discuss the requirement for Land Drainage Consent under the terms of the Land Drainage Act (1991) and our associated byelaws. For ease of reference, our previous comments were as follows:

“As previously stated (from Dec 21), this site sits largely within the River Stour (Kent) Internal Drainage Board’s (RSIDB) Drainage District; this proposal therefore has a potential to affect our interests, in particular drainage and downstream flood risk. The applicant should be reminded that the IDB’s prior written consent will be required for any works which will affect any ditch or watercourse on this site, in accordance with the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the RSIDB’s own Byelaws (please see <https://rsidb.org.uk/consents-byelaws/>).

We would also draw your attention again to the requirement for the payment of a Surface Water Development Contribution to the Board if the proposals result in any increase in the rate *or volume* of runoff being directed into our district from the development as a whole, and any peak/seasonal discharge from the proposed wetland.

For the avoidance of ambiguity, our Consent is required for any off-site discharge, as well as for any works to/affecting any watercourse or ditch on site.

Byelaw 3 applies.

Canterbury City Council

CA/21/01797 Land Off Cockerling Road, Thanington Without, Canterbury Application for the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to CA//18/00346/VAR.

This is an application for the approval of reserved matters associated with a previously approved outline scheme. Although it sits largely outside of our district, the proposed discharge of surface water from the site to the Stour via a new sewer has the potential to affect our interests.

*“With regard to the above-referenced Planning Application, the River Stour Internal Drainage Board (RSIDB) has **no objection** to the development proposed but would request that the following comments are registered (although we appear to have not been formally consulted):*

Whilst this site sits predominantly outside of the River Stour (Kent) Internal Drainage Board’s (RSIDB) Drainage District, much of the surface water from the newly created impermeable areas will be directed to our District via a SuDS scheme, ultimately with an outfall to the Stour via a new sewer; this proposal therefore has a potential to affect our interests, in particular drainage and downstream flood risk.

We have reviewed the submitted Drainage Strategy, and are generally satisfied with the level of detail provided. As one of the applications seeks to discharge the Drainage related Conditions, we would anticipate that the Surface Water Management Strategy is unlikely to be subject to further amendment; we would therefore request that that the applicant is made aware of the requirement

for our Land Drainage Consent (under Byelaw 3) if the development results in any increase in the rate or volume of runoff being directed into our district.”

Byelaw 3 applies.

Dover District Council

We have received no new planning consultations from DDC, other than for minor development that is either outside of our area, or where there are no foreseeable consequences as far as our land drainage and flood risk management interests are concerned.

Folkestone and Hythe District Council

**23/0389/FH/CON Land Rear Rhodes House, Main Road, Sellindge
Approval of details pursuant to conditions 16 (surface water drainage) and 19 (biodiversity)
of planning permission Y16/1122/SH.**

We have previously made representations on this development but have yet to be approached by the developer or their consultants. We have reiterated our previous concerns in response to the latest submission.

*“As previously stated, although this site lies outside of our IDB Drainage District, the surface water discharged from the site appears to **flow towards and into our district**. The applicant will need Land Drainage Consent from Kent County Council for any works that has the potential to affect flow in any ditch or watercourse on or bordering the site. They will **also** need Land Drainage Consent from ourselves under our Byelaw 3.*

We will be looking to your Authority and KCC to work with us to ensure this requirement is met, specifically with regard to seeking a Surface Water Development Contribution for any increase in rates/volumes of discharge that may be directed into our District. This requirement is reflected in your Authority’s draft F&H SFRA (Section 6.59). We are disappointed to see this requirement omitted from the latest drainage submission. Although the rate of discharge is being kept to an acceptable rate, the contribution is required for the ongoing management of the additional volume of water entering the Stour Catchment.”

Maidstone Borough Council (MBC)

We have received no new planning consultations from MBC, other than for minor development that is either outside of our area, or where there are no foreseeable consequences as far as our land drainage and flood risk management interests are concerned.

Thanet District Council (TDC)

**F/TH/23/0170 Land adjacent to Southern Waste Water Treatment Site, Jutes Lane, Ramsgate, Kent, CT12 5FH
Grid Stability Facility.**

This application is for an energy infrastructure site adjacent to the WWTW at Jutes Lane. We have had several meetings with the applicant and have managed to secure an 8m setback from the Minster Stream for the perimeter fencing and have made them aware of our requirements related to maintenance and the need for Land Drainage Consent for the watercourse crossings (both

vehicular access and the subterranean cable route), the ordinary watercourse diversion and the need to pay the SWDC for the increased rate/volume of runoff being discharged from the impermeable areas.

“We have reviewed the submitted documentation and have read the comments provided by KCC’s SuDS team and the response to these from the developer’s consultant. I have also seen the suggested wording of the drainage and SuDS related Condition.

Given the discussions we have had with the applicant and their consultants, we are content with the application of the recommended Condition, and are satisfied that they are aware of the need for Land Drainage Consent for all relevant aspects of the scheme. Should permission be granted, we would anticipate that an application for our Consent would be duly submitted to provide any outstanding detail we would require.

Accordingly, the RSIDB have no objection to the application or recommended Conditions, but we would request that an informative is added to the Decision Notice to remind the applicant (or successors in title) that Land Drainage Consent is required.”

**F/TH/20/0648 Stonelees Golf Course Ebbsfleet Lane Ramsgate Kent CT12 5DJ
Erection of 10 No. detached and 10 No. semi-detached 2-storey holiday homes together with single storey site office/reception building, parking and landscaping.**

We were contacted directly by the Thanet DC planning officer responsible for this application regarding our previous objection to this proposal. Although we haven’t been able to discuss our position with the applicant, we have advised the officer that we wouldn’t wish to be the sole reason for refusal, provided it is made clear to the applicant that Land Drainage Consent is required and that we will have to be satisfied with the detailed design and that the potential impacts on IDB173 (Stonelees Main Stream) are minimised and fully considered.

“Although we have not been contacted directly by the applicant since we submitted our representation last year, we may be able to deal with the outstanding issues by way of Land Drainage Consent if you are otherwise likely to grant permission to the development proposed. We still have concerns about the construction of accommodation immediately on top of the culverted section of watercourse to the south of the site, but we have reviewed the wider situation and are generally content that we will still be able to undertake maintenance from the eastern side of the watercourse. The applicant’s FRA states that the applicant is willing to install a weed-screen on the upstream end of the culvert, which should provide a degree of protection to the site by reducing the risk from a blockage inside the culvert. We will need to see details of any foundations that may potentially affect the structural integrity of the culverted section of watercourse.

We would hope that you could inform the applicant of the legal requirement to obtain Land Drainage Consent from us for any works whatsoever within 8m of the banks of IDB173 (Stonelees Main Stream – the watercourse that flows south through the site), along with any other works to any other watercourse or ditch on site. As previously mentioned, there will also be a requirement to pay a Surface Water Development Contribution to the Board for any new discharge of runoff from the newly created impermeable areas to the fluvial network.

I hope this is helpful and allows you to make an informed decision on the proposed development.”

**F/TH/23/0085 Land Rear Of 78 To 108 Monkton Road Minster Kent
Erection of 95 dwellings (2 one bed, 29 two bed, 45 three bed, 16 four bed and 3 five bed) with associated access, parking and landscaping.**

This is a development on a site that lies outside of our Drainage District, but is accompanied by a drainage strategy that intends to discharge its attenuated runoff into our area. We have advised that our Land Drainage Consent will be required under Byelaw 3 for any increase in rate or volume of discharge.

“Although this site lies outside of our IDB Drainage District, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment’s surface water management strategy states that the surface water from this development will not be able to be disposed of via infiltration or directed to a surface water sewer; it further states that it will be discharged ultimately to an existing watercourse to the south of the site via an attenuation scheme.

*Given the site’s location, any watercourse adjacent to this site will form part of the wider drainage network that discharges to our District. We would therefore request that a Condition is attached to any permission granted to ensure that a **detailed** drainage strategy is submitted and that any such strategy establishes the off-site implications for the proposed discharge to the receiving network. It must be ensured that any initial connection is to a part of a contiguous network and not into a ‘blind’ feature with no onward connectivity.*

*If it can be demonstrated that water can be effectively conveyed from the point of discharge to a wider receiving network, the applicant will need Land Drainage Consent from Kent County Council for any works that has the potential to affect flow in any ditch or watercourse on the site. Land Drainage Consent will also be required from ourselves under our Byelaw 3, specifically with regard to seeking a Surface Water Development Contribution for any increase in **rates/volumes** of discharge that may be directed into our District.”*

Byelaw 3 applies.

**F/TH/23/0299 Land to The Rear Of 146 To 150 Monkton Street Monkton Kent
Erection of 1no. 5bed detached dwelling with detached car port.**

This is an application for a large detached dwelling. We have raised an objection to the proposal owing to the proposed rate of runoff from the site being significantly higher than the greenfield rate; there is also no information on the receiving ditch network so we are not able to determine whether the increased runoff will cause or exacerbate flooding.

*“Although we haven’t been formally consulted on the above referenced development, we request that the following **OBJECTION** be recorded against this application.*

This site sits entirely within the River Stour (Kent) Internal Drainage Board’s (RSIDB) Drainage District this proposal therefore has a potential to affect its interests, in particular drainage and downstream flood risk.

The Surface Water Management Strategy (SWMS) submitted to accompany the application proposes a SuDS scheme which outfalls to the ditch to the west of the site via an attenuation basin that sits outside of the red-line boundary of the development proposed.

The SWMS further states that the present day ‘1 in 100yr’ runoff rate from the proposed newly created 0.11Ha of impermeable are is 1.1l/s’; however, it goes on to state that the discharge rate

from the development will be 2l/s for all rainfall events, some 82% more than the existing 100yr greenfield rate. We do not consider this to be appropriate or acceptable.

Although we understand that it can be difficult to restrict the rate of runoff, this should not be used to justify significant increases in surface water discharges, even for small developments.

We would expect the developer to reduce the rate of runoff to better reflect the QBar rate for the impermeable area (0.3l/s). As it stands, the pro-rata rate proposed is 18l/s/ha; this is significantly higher than we would allow.

We are also concerned that the point of discharge will be to a ditch where there is no obvious onward connection to the wider receiving watercourse network. At the very beginning of any design process, it should be adequately demonstrated that any receiving ditch forms part of a contiguous network that is capable of accommodating any proposed increase in rate/volume of discharge.

The applicant should also be aware that the RSIDB's prior written consent will be required for any works which fall within 8m of any watercourse on this site, in accordance with the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the IDB's own Byelaws (please see <https://rsidb.org.uk/consents-byelaws/>). Such works may include the proposed outfall, along with any fencing, planting, access roads, culverts or excavations. We will not grant Consent to any new outfall that may cause or exacerbate the risk from surface water flooding.

These proposals will also be subject to our Surface Water Development Contribution charge – please see our website (as above) for further information. It should be noted that a pro-rate discharge of 18l/s/ha will attract a fee that is significantly higher than the 2.7l/s/ha QBar rate.

We would recommend that this application be refused unless the applicant significantly amends the proposed SWMS to reflect the above concerns.”

Ref: W15 Applications for Consent

23 ST 01

Location: Land rear of The Quaives, Wickhambreaux

Proposal: Retrospective application for the retention of noise/light attenuation bunding alongside upper reaches of IDBs 110 & 106.

The applicant is seeking Planning Permission for the use of land behind the bunding to be used for seasonal ‘glamping’ use, and the erection of up to 20 bell tents and associated facilities (CA/22/01530 refers). The bunding in question is to provide an element of noise and light attenuation to reduce disturbance to the inhabitants of the nearby village from the future users of the site.

The Board’s Operations Officer has attended the site and reviewed the position of the bunding in relation to the watercourses and the established vegetation. He is content that the structure will not impede our ability to maintain the stretches of the watercourses for which we are responsible and the landowner has confirmed he is aware of his riparian responsibilities; the upstream areas will be monitored and attended as required. Access is readily available to the reaches of watercourse downstream from the bunding and maintenance will not be affected by the bund or the future use of the site.

ADMINISTRATION

Ref: A3-6 Health & Safety – Training

It was reported that the Board's Technical Officer and Water Level Controller attended an off-road driving safety awareness training day. The Clerk & Engineer and Rating and Finance Officer have also attended Emergency First Aid at Work refresher training. Water Safety training is also planned for later this year. The availability and relevance of formal Enforcement and Hostile Site training is also still being explored.

Ref: A8-1 Association of Drainage Authorities – Events

Flood & Water Live 2023, exploring all aspects of river and waterway maintenance with live working demonstrations, the latest innovations, technology and services, is scheduled to take place at Carrington, Lincolnshire PE22 7JD on 5th & 6th July. Further details and registration can be found at www.floodandwater.co.uk.

ADA's AGM is to take place online on 27th September 2023.

The **ADA's Annual Water Management Conference** is booked to take place at One Great George Street, Westminster on 21st November 2023, bringing together leading flood and water level management practitioners from across the UK to hear from a line-up of prominent political, policy, and technical speakers and discuss key policy topics of the moment. Details will be issued in due course.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr Howard asked if there is any regular testing being done in the Stour to check for nitrate levels, he further stated that if the water was to be regularly tested either side of the sewer's works it would reveal where most of the pollution is originating from. Mr Nunn stated that there is a whole range of partners working together on this and the issue is not so much where it is coming from, but he will check and suggest that more targeted testing is carried out if possible. He further stated that Southern Water are part of this group and there is a lot of discussion of what they can about the sewerage overflows.

The Clerk & Engineer stated that this has been discussed at the Catchment Partnership meetings and they talk about water quality failings that is based on old data sources. It needs to be re-assessed to obtain more accurate and up to date results.

ELECTION TO THE FINANCE, GENERAL PURPOSES & WORKS COMMITTEE

The Chairman stated that the FGP&W Committee normally has 9 members and mainly looks at the finances and expenditure with 4 meetings a year which precede the Board meetings. Due to the financing structure of the Board, with a majority of funding coming from Special Levies, we aim to mirror the Board in the Committee's composition: 5 Appointed Members (2 ABC, 1 CCC, 1 DDC, 1 TDC) and 4 Elected Members.

With Cllr Hicks (ABC) already appointed as Vice Chair earlier in the meeting we are further seeking 1 representative each from ABC, CCC, DDC and TDC to sit on this committee until November 2023, when there will be a formal re-appointment of this committee. The Chairman

proposed that Cllr W Scobie (TDC) and Cllr S Blair (DDC) be appointed to the FGP&W Committee. This was seconded by Mr Wilkinson and the Chairman thanked Cllr Blair and Cllr Scobie for agreeing to join the Committee.

The Clerk & Engineer stated that to complete the committee the Board needs to appoint another member from ABC and 1 member from CCC and if the Board agreed this could be done via email prior to the next FGP&W Committee meeting on 24 July – this was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Ms Lynch and agreed by all present. **Action: Clerk & Engineer to progress.**

MEETING CLOSED

There being no other business the Chairman thanked all for their attendance and declared the meeting closed.