

## MINUTES OF MEETING OF HUGHENDEN VALLEY DIG

Hughenden Parish Council's meeting rooms, The Common, Great Kingshill, High Wycombe P15 6EN

**Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2015 at 09.00**

### **Attendees:**

#### **Thames Water (TW):**

Jason Major, (JM) Field Operational Specialist (*Network*)

Donna Jackson, (DJ) Sewer Flooding Compliance Manager / Asset Planner (*North Provinces Network*)

Andrew Boulton, (ABo) Catchment Analyst (*Network*)

Tyrone Spencer, (TS) Customer Liaison Representative

#### **Environment Agency (EA):**

Helen Page, (HP) Environment Management Team Leader

#### **Bucks County Council (BCC):**

Alex Back, (AB) Bucks C.C. Flood Management Officer

#### **Representative of David Liddington:**

Marcos Gold, (MG) Case Worker for the Rt. Hon David Lidington, MP for Aylesbury

#### **Hughenden Parish Council (HPC):**

Cllr Brian Swain (BS)

#### **HVDIG:**

Dave & Debbie White (DW/DAW)

Paul & Carolyn Woodford (PW/CW)

Deborah Lemon (DL)

Martin Hall (MH)

Steve Kirkpatrick, (SK) National Trust Ranger

John Gladwin, (JG) Chiltern District Councillor & Chiltern Society

---

*Apologies: Sarah Mustapha, David Carroll, Simon Cooke, Warren Whyte, Simon Cook, Angus Idle, Matt Hopkins, Sam Morrison*

### **Agenda:**

- Agencies reports/ responses to questions
- Next Agencies Meeting
- AOB

		Action
1.0	<b>Chairman's Welcome Reason for Meeting – Agencies Current Status on Program, and Forward Planning. Introductions.</b>	
2.0	<b>Thames Water</b>	
2.1	<b>What is the status of the Thames Water Infiltration Reduction Plan for Hughenden Valley?</b>	
	<p><b>DJ</b> - Infiltration Reduction Plan in draft status currently is waiting for approval at higher level – complete by end of June. Then 12 week consultation period – once comments received from stake holders incorporated then it will be available to the public. Hughenden Valley a priority catchment from 2013-2014. Action plan is in process, including those already declared</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• permanent depth monitoring</li> <li>• Mobile treatment plants – 5 deployed to Cirencester Aldbourne/Lambourne). 5 at Marlow and 2 permanently allocated to Hughenden Valley.</li> </ul> <p><b>BS</b> – asked on a catchment level can Little Marlow cope with future development as it is reported that based on current demand the treatment plant is running at 94%, then with 700 houses due to be built what room is there for extra capacity? <b>DW</b> explained this is emergency contingency.</p> <p><b>DJ</b> explained that TW are constantly reviewing new development and prioritising catchments that require accommodation for growth both from a network and treatment perspective for AMP6 and beyond. It was discussed that this was a topic for future parish meetings rather than the HVDIG forum.</p> <p><b>HP</b> - EA like the 'drainage catchment' format for the Drainage Strategies/Infiltration Reduction Plans as it focuses on locating the problems. There is also a long term strategy plan in place re preventing and managing surface water and ground water in the TW systems. TW do the plan and then EA are allowed to see it early on for comment before reaching public domain. EA will see it before end of June. HV in a positive stage with TW.</p>	
2.2	<b>What process will be used in the mobile sewage treatment works at Valley Road and Boss Lane and how clean will the processed water be that is discharged into the Hughenden Stream?</b>	
	<p><b>JM</b> – with the mobile plant treatment won't be as good as at a full sewage processing works. Reduces bacteria by an est. 40% and adds oxygen. Relies on the flow to get the media working and there will be a filter which will have 2 daily checks.</p> <p><b>DW</b> – what's EA's view?</p> <p><b>HP</b> – fine. It's an improvement. Beneficial additional treatment.</p> <p><b>DJ</b> - Property Level Mitigations – WERM mitigation consultants have conducted all mitigation exercises and installations are near completion if not complete</p>	

	<p>already.</p> <p><b>SK</b> – how does it affect those not flooded due to the installation of Non Return Valves (NRV) and therefore a maximum capacity of sewage?</p> <p><b>DJ</b> – managing the flow is priority and mitigation is not a permanent solution. Where owners have protected themselves however NRV's not generally recommended by TW (unless a last resort) due to limiting ability and self-flooding risk.</p> <p><b>DW</b> – for the record. Feedback on WERM. Their understanding of what happened showed lack of knowledge and information. Their suggestions were often irrelevant and impractical as a result. HVDIG happy to help TW in providing information on mitigation.</p>	
<b>2.3</b>	<p><b>Is there a formal process in place between Bucks CC and Thames Water to manage their responsibilities in Hughenden Valley under 2010 Water Management Act and other relevant legislature?</b></p>	
	<p><b>DJ</b> - Regarding the 2010 Water Management Act there is no formal process in place between TW and BCC. Local flood risk management handled by Bucks County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority to manage an integrated approach with all stakeholders There is no specific TW mention in relation to HV in the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy on line however TW are expected to and do assist and co-operate with BCC at strategic flood groups and with sharing information as required.</p> <p><b>JG</b> – commented re no formal relationship purely to be in touch with each other.</p> <p><b>AB</b> – BCC is just updating an action plan for flooding.</p> <p><b>JG</b> – there should be a requirement to have a proper communication protocol between TW and BCC – responsibility is shared.</p> <p><b>HP</b> – there has to be a relationship as there is an association between river flooding and ground water flooding. As in the risk of river flooding a tactical plan needs to be agreed between TW, Bucks CC and the EA for responding to future groundwater/sewage flooding events in Hughenden Valley.</p> <p>TW, BCC and EA agreed to pursue this.</p>	<p>TBA by TW, BCC and EA</p>
<b>2.4</b>	<p><b>What is the anticipated time lapse between reporting of sewage outflow and installation of the mobile sewage treatment equipment given the equipment available to Thames Water?</b></p>	
	<p><b>JM</b> - The mobile treatment works can be in place within days. They will use the information from the EA groundwater monitoring and the depth monitors in their network to inform of a likely event where the plants may need to be deployed. Plants will be prepared in advance as 2 weeks is required to 'prime' them – they will get water readings to indicate if they are required. They can still be effective if not fully primed in terms of screening the flow but may not be up</p>	

	<p>to full biological treatment capacity.</p> <p><b>DW</b> – evident that perhaps excessive pumping was used – can this be regulated to minimise the take-out? (i.e. take the tops off of the flow to treat rather than passing all flow through the treatment plant and pumping it to river).</p> <p><b>JM</b> – they rely on the flow to make the pumps work, but the revs could be regulated perhaps? This way minimising the removal of sewage into the river</p> <p><b>SK</b> – NT as a landowner would prefer a margin retained. Concern at the constant TW presence along by Hughenden Lodge – what work is being undertaken here?</p> <p><b>JM</b> confirmed a recent blockage. All cleaning/ roots removed/ manhole covers fixed and completed</p> <p><b>DW</b> – regarding the Infiltration Reduction Plan document – Is there a commitment from TW that they have a responsibility for dealing with and responding to future groundwater sewer flooding events?</p> <p><b>JM</b> and <b>DJ</b> both affirmed. TW are responsible for flooding emanating from TW owned FW and SW systems as a result of ingress from groundwater or surface water inundation. Flooding to properties purely caused by groundwater, river flooding or surface water run-off is not the responsibility of TW.</p>	<b>JM</b>
<b>2.5</b>	<p><b>A supplementary discussion ensued at the meeting regarding future planning and Thames Water’s sewage network and treatment capacity in the Hughenden area.</b></p>	
	<p><b>BS</b> – concern regarding the continual development in the district and impact on infrastructure. Insufficient capacity in the future. Can forward planning be adjusted to include ‘Windfall’ (where developers bring forward their planned developments)? With increased capacity 92% rises to 95% indicates a too small a margin.</p> <p><b>DJ</b> – <b>TW</b> has hydraulic modelling being conducted regarding new developments in general in TW, but Hughenden Valley has a ‘warning flag’ which means that impact studies are done for even small developments. There is a 5 year funding plan for the business (AMP period) agreed with Ofwat. When LA has planning applications submitted – TW identify if area is a catchment area so they can identify key areas to pursue the investment process. Various solutions are considered – storage etc. They look at risk register as part of this process – Hughenden Valley is on it.</p> <p><b>HP</b> – they can flag up in a local area. EA responses are all on the local authority planning website.</p> <p><b>DW</b> and <b>BS</b> – Capacity of Marlow Treatment Works. TW are looking at supplementing the works. Princes Risborough almost at capacity. Infrastructure is of main concern due to development.</p> <p><b>JM</b> confirmed he is Network area of TW as opposed to treatment – TW are currently carrying out inspections for Marlow area and are building a tunnel to</p>	

	<p>recycle water back to the River Wye. There are also large storage tanks in reserve.</p> <p><b>HP</b> affirmed after a recent visit that Marlow is working well and during the River Thames flooding events of 2014 coped with treating and containing sewage as required by the EA.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>3.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>What is the status of the Thames Water Infiltration Reduction Plan for Hughenden Valley?</b>	
	<p>See 2.1 above. <b>HP</b> provided the following response to HVDIG in her 6<sup>th</sup> June e-mail prior to the meeting:</p> <p>“We have not received a plan for Hughenden Valley from Thames Water for us to consider and approve so you may wish to ask the question of Thames Water also. Thames Water is using the drainage strategy format to deal with their sewerage catchments that suffer with problems in wet weather. Information on these is available here:</p> <p><a href="http://www.ofwat.gov.uk/future/sustainable/drainage/rpt_com201305drainagestrategy.pdf">http://www.ofwat.gov.uk/future/sustainable/drainage/rpt_com201305drainagestrategy.pdf</a></p> <p>We have received 23 of these so far. I attach the list of catchments Thames Water has advised us they are producing plans for – you will see Hughenden is on there. (This is attached as Annex 1). Not all of these are plans are being produced as Infiltration Reduction Plans (IRP) to meet the requirements of our regulatory position statement. Where they are, Thames Water is making this explicit in the document and we have confirmed this format is sufficient to meet the criteria for an IRP.</p> <p>I appreciate the DIG is eager to see a plan soon, as are we. We are aware that Thames Water has been doing work in the area and trust that what is learnt from this will inform the detail of the plan we are expecting them to produce. We are not able to compel Thames Water to produce an IRP but will continue to use the influence we have. Ultimately, it is for Thames Water to decide if and when they want to produce an IRP to protect them from enforcement action should sewer discharges and over pumping happen again.</p> <p>In October 2014 we issued a formal warning to Thames Water for the sewer discharges and over pumping into the Hughenden stream between 26 February and 05 June 2014. This activity was a contravention of Regulation 12 and 38 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, causing polluting matter to enter the Hughenden Stream, namely sewage. “</p>	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>The EA provided an update on groundwater conditions in the area.</b>	
	<b>HP</b> - Groundwater levels are normal for this time of year unlike last year when they were very high. EA use borehole at Piddington as monitors for the Hughenden Valley area.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Bucks County Council</b>	
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Is there a formal process in place between Bucks CC and Thames Water to manage their responsibilities in Hughenden Valley under 2010 Water Management Act and other relevant legislature?</b>	

	See 2.3 above.	
<b>4.2</b>	<b>What is the breakdown of how Bucks CC allocates it's funding – including any extra funding received from DEFRA and other sources - and manpower to their responsibility for surface and groundwater management and how this will change in future years?</b>	
	<p><b>DW</b> – This question had been put to Martin Tett in DW's 26<sup>th</sup> May 2015 e-mail and a response promised by 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015. There is an open invitation to Warren Whyte, Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment to come and talk to HVDIG at a convenient date.</p> <p><b>AB</b> – Funding for surface water management comes from Transport For Bucks (TFB). Ringway Jacobs (not BCC employees) carry out the maintenance. BCC owns the asset. TFB local area technicians maintain the assets but not the big assets e.g. bridges, culverts over 900mm diameter these are maintained by the TFB Assets Team. Very difficult contract, due to lack of flexibility and a lack of strategic planning and BCC are in the process of trying to change this. TFB have local area technicians with limited funding and are reactionary. In the event of road flooding this is a strategic situation which is BCC's responsibility and they have to then negotiate internally with TFB who have limited funding. BCC is Cabinet member led not officer led.</p>	
<b>4.3</b>	<b>How does Bucks CC propose to manage the potential conflict of interest of "policing" the Riparian duties of the Hughenden Stream when the main culverting of it has been done by Bucks CC?</b>	
	<p><b>DW</b> – This question had been put to Martin Tett in HVDIG's 26<sup>th</sup> May 2015 e-mail and an initial response provided (Annex 2). <b>DW</b> has requested that BCC's position on this be clarified to HVDIG in writing from BCC Chief Executive Chris Williams.</p> <p><b>AB</b> - Key problem for BCC is the small pipe running under the garage of bungalow in Boss Lane. BCC are in the process of evaluating a number of options to address this issue and also the capacity of the Hughenden Stream in the gardens of the properties in Valley Road upstream from there. HVDIG offered to arrange meetings with AB and willing property owners to take further measurements and assess any remedial work deemed necessary.</p> <p><b>DW</b> asked BCC to provide HVDIG with data and evidence they have in evaluating the potential flooding risk in Hughenden Valley if the Hughenden Stream is allowed to run at full capacity. <b>AB</b> agreed to look into this.</p>	<p><b>BCC</b></p> <p><b>DW/AB</b></p> <p><b>AB</b></p>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>When will the identified investigative/remedial work be completed on the culverted section of the Hughenden Stream in Boss Lane and the surface water system under/adjacent to Valley Road?</b>	
	<b>AB</b> confirmed that the soakaway referred to in Karen Fisher's response (Annex 2) is not related to the problems with the drainage system under Valley Road. He confirmed the study has been done November '14 and work identified yet had	

	<p>no explanation why the work has not been done. He will action this as a VIP to Customer Complaint.</p> <p><b>DW</b> – HVDIG asked about progress on this work in the e-mail sent to Martin Tett who passed it to Wayne who passed it to Karen – it is clear there is no-one in charge of the problem. Several residents have reports in to BCC advising of surface water problem in Valley Road. Councillor David Carroll has supplied an exchange of e-mails with Wayne Pickford (TFB) asking for work to be carried out in April 2015.</p> <p><b>MH</b> – showed the meeting photos of one “event” and email contact with BCC about it.</p> <p><b>AB</b> explained more about the structure within TFB and advised HVDIG and affected residents to raise issues with John Gibbons – Operations Manager at TFB (mob: 07793658488 e-mail: c-jogibbons@buckscc.gov.uk).</p> <p><b>BS</b> – asked for details of the issues in Valley Road and offered to include this topic in the agenda of the HPC meeting with TFB on 17th June as they also have outstanding issues.</p>	<p><b>AB</b></p> <p><b>BS</b></p>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>What is the current status of the Hughenden Valley Flooding Procedure document and has it been amended to cover where residents with no access to the Hughenden Stream pump surcharged sewer discharges if their neighbours don't allow them access?</b>	
	<b>AB</b> – The procedure is on the BCC website and he will provide HVDIG with the link. He will look into amending it to give appropriate advice for residents with no access to the Hughenden Stream.	<b>AB</b>
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Have all relevant residents/businesses in Hughenden Valley been notified of their Riparian responsibility to keep their part of the Hughenden Stream clear?</b>	
	<b>AB</b> confirmed no further Riparian Duties letters have been sent to other residents of Hughenden Valley. He will action them to be sent to other residents/landowners with Riparian duties for the Hughenden Stream where BCC are Lead Authority.	<b>AB</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>In summary</b>	
	It was agreed to have been a successful and positive meeting. It was agreed that going forward an annual Agencies meeting would work best with June a suitable date. Smaller meetings with specific Agencies could take place if necessary and it was suggested a 6 monthly update from all agencies via email would be beneficial.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	None	