

At s.5ii of 7.62 <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR010065/TR010065-001004-National%20Highways%20-%207.62%20Comments%20on%20submissions%20received%20at%20the%20previous%20deadline.pdf>. It is stated that 'The Applicant confirms enhancement of the existing drainage system on land East of the A617 is not considered necessary. Maintenance of the existing assets is all that is required for FCA functionality. FCA operation is partly achieved by the preexisting flood flow mechanism across the land east of the A617, not just the ditch itself. This is evidenced in Section 3.3 of Appendix 13.2 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the Environmental Statement Appendices [APP-177]';

We disagree, we consider the culvert near the Haha does need enhancing. We have reviewed the evidence below:-

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR010065/TR010065-000267-TR010065_A46%20Newark%20Bypass_6.3%20Appendix%2013.2%20Flood%20Risk%20Assessment.pdf states;

Section 3.3.17 The existing Kelham Hall Field Ditch between the River Trent and the A617, adjacent to the Kelham Hall boundary wall. Sections of this ditch are constrained by other local features including an access road from the field into Kelham Hall land. The ditch channel itself would need to be cleared of vegetation obstructions to improve flow conveyance, where this does not interfere with the boundary wall. Due to risks relating to use of the existing Kelham Hall Field Ditch as a drain-down feature, land is to be acquired by the Applicant within the Order Limits for this ditch to be maintained. Section 8.7 of this FRA describes the residual risk related to maintenance of this channel in more detail.

Section 8.7.2 There is a residual risk of increased flooding due to overgrown vegetation in the existing Kelham Hall Field Ditch between the River Trent and the A617, adjacent to the Kelham Hall boundary wall. Throughout, the ditch channel itself may need to be cleared of vegetation obstructions to improve flow conveyance, where this does not interfere with the boundary wall. The text contradicts itself in saying the ditch needs clearing to fulfil FCA function and as such the land is to be acquired by the Applicant, yet the works exclude any part which interferes with Boundary wall (and by inference, the culvert thereby).

The greatest restriction to flow on that ditch is the small culvert at the Haha crossing.

If an additional several thousand cuM volume of water is to be transported to and from the FCA via that route, at least some of that excess will need to pass through the ditch and culvert as water levels will, at lower flood stages, be below the existing field ground level and unable to use the fields as a flow path.

Having owned the land for over 20 years my client has seen that the Haha culvert blocks frequently due to detritus from Trent floods flowing back up the ditch and needs manually cleaning to facilitate discharge trapped water after almost every flood, which my client has previously undertaken.

My client wants to know how the Applicant proposes to manage this given it recognises the ditch to be a critical part of FCA function but does not propose to alter the culvert design ? If the Applicant sees the ditch as a requirement for FCA function and the ditch needs cleaning for FCA to work, so does the culvert need upgrading to facilitate discharge.