

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RYA's remaining Issue of Disagreement within SoCG  
**Date:** 20 March 2020 23:52:29

---

Sir,

References:

- A. NCC/GY3RC/EX/085 (05-Mar-2020), Appendix-K SoCG Applicant/RYA Item-5
- B. pNRA Appendix 12B Flood Risk Assessment, Art. 6.2.43
- C. pNRA Appendix 12B Flood Risk Assessment, Art. 6.2.39

At Reference-A (Matters **Not Agreed**) RYA has still not heard mitigatory assessment neither by Applicant nor Environment Agency regarding the Fluvial (river) Flood Risk due to excessive Pluvial (i.e. rain) events as direct result of the 'necking' introduced at the new crossing with the Scheme in place.

This was first raised during 2018 Consultation, followed by warm reception by EA during January 2019, with indication in July 2019 that this might be a consideration; Applicant appeared not to liaise with EA on this addressing, hence the issue still remains "Not Agreed".

The issue of concern is that while there is submitted evidence that during a Maritime flood-risk event (Tidal Surge) there will be raised water-level to South of the bridge as waters make way to sweep inland, with reduced level to North, the converse is simply not considered:

the RYA's concern for boaters' navigation is that the vast Broads Basin could collect enough rainwater that the 36% 'necking' at the new bridge will Not allow rapid enough emptying into the North Sea; this resulting in potential flooding of upper reaches.

Indeed there was exactly such a "Warning" put out by EA during the week of Inspection Issue-Specific-Hearing of 19-Nov-2019 for potential flooding above Beccles on the River Waveney, and this without the new constriction (i.e. 'necking') in place.

The contra-evidence is presented in for example Reference-B where for a potential incoming flood event from seaward, "... to the south of the Scheme, water levels are anticipated raised by up to 0.12m with the largest increase at the location of the bridge (moderate adverse impact) ...", and at Reference-C that "... some areas [to the north] are moved to a lower hazard category ....

At no stage in the pNRA or subsequent discussion, despite some supportive verbal statements for anticipated consideration, is the cited scenario of concern addressed, viz: ... to the north of the Scheme, water levels are anticipated raised because of the 36% 'necking' at the bridge (restricted ability to empty to seaward) resulting in backup standstill or flooding within the higher reaches of the Broads Basin.

While at this very late stage in Inspection, RYA must assume that all flood risks have been addressed with due rigour, there remains considerable disappointment that this issue repeatedly raised, would appear not to have been explicitly addressed and referred back to RYA as being explicitly satisfactory.

Best regards,  
Ben FALAT

(RYA Appointee)