Dear [Name],

Number two herewith.

Regards,

Gerry Crilly.

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Gerry Crilly
To: [Email Address]
Cc: [Email Address]
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2018 5:21 PM
Subject: Maghull Neighbourhood Plan.

Please read attachments.

Regards,

G. Crilly (Maghull Resident).
To Sefton MBC by e-mail.

Please forward this further communication to the Examiner of Maghull Neighbourhood Plan. I wish to bring to the Examiners attention, Maghull’s drainage infrastructure is totally inadequate for the safe conveyance of current flows and the Land Drainage Act (1991) and Water Industry Act (1991) are already being breached in various parts of our neighbourhood. Residents working with responsible agencies have identified 13 recurrent flooding issues which are entirely due to non compliance with these Acts. The details have been incorporated into Environment Agency Flooding Report for Maghull. This document has been endorsed and authorised for publication by senior executives of Environment Agency, United Utilities and SP Energy Networks. A copy has already been sent for the official’s attention. The intention to connect 1650 houses on Land East of Maghull to existent inadequate infrastructure can only be justified if substantial upgrades are made first. In any case the National Planning Policy Framework clearly states that new developments must not increase flooding elsewhere.

The Maghull Neighbourhood Plan, if approved, will lead to the destruction of our Town and further endanger the lives of my neighbours. Please note official complaints, which are ongoing, have been issued against Sefton Council, Canal & River Trust, Environment Agency and United Utilities because assets owned by them are not fit for purpose.

Attempt by Maghull Town Council to cover up dangers emanating from Leeds And Liverpool Canal in order to gain approval for Maghull Neighbourhood Plan.

You have already been advised about the implementation of a cover up to hide the inadequacies of Maghull’s drainage infrastructure.

Sefton Council is not adhering to its statutory duty to manage flood risk and protect the public from danger. The Council’s strategy is to convince residents that recurrent flooding from main rivers, Leeds and Liverpool Canal, public sewers and blocked off culverts is surface water. It is not surface water; it is canal water, river water and raw untreated infectious sewage running directly into our streets because the infrastructure in place cannot adequately convey flows.

Maghull Flood Committee meetings enabled us to observe cover ups first hand; Sefton FCERM, in order to stifle debate about Canal flooding, removed it from the agenda and forbade attendees to mention the word canal?

The following correspondence between Maghull Town Council and me is a demonstration of Sefton FCERM’s determination to avoid being called to account. Maghull Town Council aided and abetted in the procedure. Judge for yourself!
This was my response, as a Maghull Flood Committee Member, to e-mail received from Maghull Town Council 6th July 2016.

To Maghull Town Council
I have now had time to digest the content of your e-mail which covers a wide and varied number of topics. In order not to get lost in the detail and be allowed to give specific answers, please forgive me for splitting the e-mail into sections.
My comments are in italics.

(Section one).
Thank you for your email. I'm sorry you felt that there was no need to meet yesterday; I think it would have been useful to have had a discussion when agreeing on next steps for the Flood Committee. However, following on from the information given by our partners at Sefton MBC, United Utilities, Environment Agency and the Canals and Rivers Trust and in consultation with the current Chair and Chair elect of the Committee we have decided to concentrate on the civil resilience aspect of the Committee.

We have decided to do this for several reasons. We have spent three meetings and considerable officer and volunteer time fact gathering facts about the flooding issues in Maghull. This has still not resulted in an agreed set of priorities or work plan. This is leading to considerable frustration amongst Committee members who cannot see that the Committee will ever be able to progress. In order to stop the Committee collapsing through inactivity and lack of progress we have had to revisit the original intention and remit of the group.

Comment...
I would suggest that the following publication which has already been distributed to members be used as a work plan.

Residents' Report 14th April 2016. (2). Maghull Flooding Committee Meeting. Major Causes for Flooding in Key Locations Together with Solutions to Provide Cures.

This has already been effective in highlighting a set of priorities. The impact water from the canal which became priority no one for the committee is adequately described under... (5) Hall Lane near to Maghull Baptist Church.
This report can be used as a template to enable the committee to consider what can be done to alleviate recurring flooding problems in the locations identified. I am sure my fellow members will consider this to be a sensible approach from the point of view that all the groundwork has been done and we can focus our attention on Maghull's key issues immediately.

The only fact gathering we have done as a committee is to investigate the cause of flooding in Old Hall Road and Hall Lane. Information gathered, shared and collated by four ordinary members, two town councillors and an officer from Sefton MBC led to the publication and distribution of report no 4 which has been received well and has already been effective in ensuring, in a major way, the future safety of residents, pedestrians and motorists using Hall Lane.
Our chair elect and current chair who both assisted in the investigative tour can be commended for their input towards creating the report. The same commendation applies to the other five team members who volunteered of their time.
Fellow ordinary members who have been diligent in attending all three meetings, so far held, have expressed satisfaction at the progress which has been made.
Residents in Hall Lane, Damfield Lane, and alongside the canal are delighted that, since the formation of the flood committee and its activities, their concerns are at last being addressed. The only frustration being expressed is that discussion about the canal has been suppressed.

Meeting one ...the word canal omitted from the minutes and not entered on the agenda for meeting two despite considerable debate about the canal and the impact it has on flooding in Maghull. Considerable concern about the subject was raised by our chair elect and me at the first meeting.

Meeting two...canal hurriedly added to agenda but not discussed. Report no 1 dismissed as unimportant. Members, including town councillors, who had assisted in its compilation, expressed dismay over this as soon as the meeting came to a close.

Meeting three... Canal although on agenda not discussed and three members named to speak not called.

This is no way to treat volunteers who are seeking to improve the town’s environment by giving of their time. There is no lack of enthusiasm in any of the people I have got to know since joining the committee and the fact that interested residents, keen to join, are being turned away proves there is no prospect of the committee collapsing through inactivity.

(Section Two).
We have accepted the statement from the CRT concerning their assessment of the state of the Canal and their proposed works programme for the near future for it. There is no reason to doubt that they are monitoring the situation or that they will carry out the works planned within the time frame given.
The Committee is not a pressure group trying to make statutory bodies rearrange their work schedules. It is there to provide help and reassurance in practical terms to allow residents to prepare and manage any flood issues. Therefore, the Canal has been taken off the next agenda and will not be addressed in the near future.

Comment...
With all the help and reassurance in the world residents in Hall Lane cannot manage the flood issues which keep plaguing their environment. The management of this particular issue lies elsewhere. In view of the following, as yet, undisclosed information, taking the canal off the next agenda and not allowing debate can only be described as premature and irresponsible.

CRT, although responsible for canal floodwater, is not responsible for its management. This is the responsibility of riparian landowners.
Report no 4 has highlighted the major cause of flooding during storm conditions into Old Hall Road, Hall Lane and Northway.
A culvert of four square metres, after under passing Old Hall Road, has been reduced in size to 60cm dia. This means that water discharged from the canal into the emergency overflow network, during storm conditions, instead of being managed into Whinney Brook is being mismanaged directly into Old Hall Road. CRT, not being the riparian landowner, is not responsible for the adaption made; the riparian landowner is. Whoever this is has a duty to immediately restore throughput by increasing the size of the pipe. This is not an option it is a duty which must be enforced to prevent this happening...
This cannot be allowed to continue and measures must be introduced to ensure that it doesn’t. There has been no opportunity in committee to advise members that on receipt of information provided in report no 4 and due to the obvious risks of electricity and floodwater combining and Ofgem being asked to investigate, Scottish Power, owners of the substation, are taking action, in their own words, as follows...

‘We have engaged Total Flood Solutions (TFS) to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment at the substation. A recommendation, taking account of any reports and information available from the Environment Agency will be produced. Examples of flood mitigation measures may include options for tanking the building, flood proof doors / ducts, etc, however I will keep in touch and let you know when the site assessment has been completed.’

Additional information received today, 15th July, is as follows...
Since my last email to you, I can confirm that the survey has been completed and we have contacted United Utilities to discuss the findings and what works or proposals they have for this area. I will contact you as soon as we have a reply from United Utilities.

Ofgem’s investigatory department is monitoring progress in the matter and ensuring that a satisfactory conclusion will be effected.

It is disturbing to note that Scottish Power were completely unaware of the Boxing Day incident and the extent, frequency and causes of flooding in this location but it is comforting to know remedial action is being taken to protect their substation and lives of residents in the knowledge that future flooding will inevitably occur.

If immediate remedial action is not taken by other agencies future flooding will happen, time and time, again.

(Section three).
In conjunction with Sefton MBC we are looking to hold a working party before the end of July for residents to come and give their views followed by another two in August. Once we have the dates I’ll make sure that you are aware of it. However, our focus will be on producing a community action plan, obtaining and distributing emergency packs, giving help and advice to riparian landowners as to their responsibilities and making sure emergency plans are in place. I trust that
you will continue to help us in these endeavours and continue to help the Committee assist the residents of Maghull.

Comment...
The cure for this ongoing threat from the canal’s emergency overflow network has been highlighted entirely due to an afternoon’s work by the committee. It is essential that measures are put in place immediately to provide a cure. Whether or not this can be regarded within the terms of civil resilience is immaterial, something positive needs to be done without further prevarication. In view of input already made and positive results already achieved I cannot understand why you should suggest such initiatives on my part might discontinue?

I’m happy to discuss any of the matters dealt with above at your convenience.

Comment...
I feel the above details should be expounded in open committee rather than in private so that ordinary members can be made aware that the canal tour has achieved positive results and that by freely giving of their time to attend three meetings the safety, health and wellbeing of Maghull’s residents is top priority.

For the sake of good order and transparency I have copied in our current chair and chair elect to this response.

G.Crilly. 15th July 2016.

Footnote 6th July 2018.
The highlighted sections in the above text were not highlighted originally. These have been coloured to highlight...
(1) The Importance of Environment Agency Flooding Report for Maghull to which Sefton MBC has already attempted to introduce a gagging order!

(2) The gagging of committee members wishing to expose canal induced dangers.

(3) Report number 4 which was produced after four residents and two Town Councillors made a site visit to assess inadequate culverts in Damfield Lane and Hall Lane. A representative from Sefton FCERM advised he would participate, shortly before the investigation commenced. A consensus of approval led to report number 4 being published on Maghull Town Council’s website followed by a report published in Champion Newspaper which described how fully proficient the committee had become at rooting out the facts through engagement with responsible agencies

Sefton FCERM, with all due haste then closed Maghull Flood Committee down.

Sefton Town Council’s cover up, which commenced after meeting one, was accomplished by meeting four.
All details have been extinguished from the website!

A copy of Report number 4 and the Champion article are attached.
Talk about pouring cold water on enthusiasm!!!
The above actions took place sometime before the Maghull Neighbourhood Plan was thrust upon us. We now realise why a cover up is in place. Without upgrades to our existing drainage infrastructure, the Plan is unsustainable. The updated version contains no conditions for developers to upgrade our inadequate drainage infrastructure, despite 347 of us advising Maghull Town Council this is essential.

I trust the Examiner of the Plan will agree with us that the Plan, without upgrades as a necessity, is not only unsustainable, it is highly dangerous.

Regards,

Gerry Crilly (Maghull Resident)
Flood team inspect areas at risk in town

Report by Tom Martin

A TEAM from the Maghull Flood Committee toured the town to examine potential flooding risk areas which have affected the town, in recent years. They arranged a programme of investigatory tours, covering an area stretching from Damfield Lane to Fouracres, took place on April 27.

A team of four residents, two town councillors and an officer from Sefton Council’s Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Department made a tour of Damfield Lane and Hall Lane logging down items of concern emanating from Whinney Brook and Leeds and Liverpool Canal.

A four page report has been issued and distributed to all committee members and to Unite Utilities, the Canal & River Trust, Environment Agency and to Scottish Power whose substation was submerged for days after the Boxing Day floods.

A committee spokesperson said: “These agencies are lending their expertise to local knowledge and the committee is already being effective in obtaining positive results.”
Report No 4.
Leeds and Liverpool Canal.
Inspection and Observations made on 27th April 1916 by Residents and Councillors serving on Maghull Flood Committee.

(All measurements and calculations are approximate).

(1) Entry and exit of Main River into and out of culvert network beneath Damfield Lane.

The Whinney Brook is 2 metres wide at its point of exit from Maricort College into a receiving culvert at Damfield Lane's kerbside. The height of the square receiving culvert, including the depth of the river, is also about 2 metres. This gives a mean area value of 4 square metres to be occupied when the main river is at full flow, as evidenced when water comes over the top of the culvert and deposits itself into Damfield Lane.

We are advised by Canal & River Trust that there are two culverts, each of 60cm dia. conducting Whinney Brook, beneath Damfield Lane, although it is only possible to see one culvert through the inspection grill on the opposite side of Damfield Lane. Giving CRT the benefit of the doubt and assuming there are two culverts, the total mean area for each of these x 2 = 0.6 square metres.

We are also advised by CRT that it does not own these culverts and knows nothing about their condition or maintenance as that responsibility lies with the sub road culvert owners, whoever they may be?

We are also advised by CRT that the only asset it is responsible for in the onward conduction of Whinney Brook beneath the canal is a 900mm dia. metal pipe; the mean area of this is 0.6 square metres.

Here we see, based purely on these calculations, a total reception area of the main river from road to canal being reduced from 4 square metres to 0.6 square metres. This is crude engineering logic but it goes some way to explaining why the river, at full flow, is uncontrollable and finds its way over the boundary wall into Damfield Lane. Major flooding, leading to the closing off of Damfield Lane, occurred in 2011(twice) and again in 2015. Substantial Public sewers from the centre of Damfield Lane connect to the main river before it underpasses the canal increasing culvert 34's incapacity and sending more water into the road.

It is obvious why EA gives regular warnings of flooding to our neighbours in Damfield Lane. On Boxing Day 2015 the road was closed off to traffic by the police as it was twice in 2011. The police aren't always called but the river frequently finds its way over the wall at times when no warnings are given.

The Whinney Brook, after making its restrictive passage under the canal, can be observed through an inspection grill alongside the canal towpath. It shows as a single culvert which splits into two before discharging, once more, into its open aspect behind houses in Hall Lane.

The river tears away Hall Lane's back gardens and backs up at culverts beneath Tommy Gent Way and Alsocot Close, completely swamping Hall Lane's main culvert, making it obsolete despite most of its contents already having been deposited in Damfield Lane.
Hall Lane, already river flooded, then receives a large dose of Canal water from the overflow system which floods into Old Hall Road where the sub road culvert backs up. The overflow system is described in section (2) below...

(2) Canal Emergency overflow system.

This is located on the south side of the swing bridge, at the top of Hall Lane, where the canal is banked up to its highest. The canal at this point is 60ft above sea level and the view from the top of Hall Lane towards Northway indicates just how rapidly the road slopes downwards.

A series of six half eye shaped culverts occupy 50 ft of the towpath to discharge excesses when the canal is at optimum level. The culverts conduct canal water over the top of a stone embankment into a six stepped, downward channel, to reach ground level 6 ft below the level of the canal. After being conducted through a 4ft x 3ft culvert, it enters a 6 ft wide ditch running down the south side of Hall Lane.

Canal & River Trust is only responsible for 20ft of land at the side of the canal, including the towpath; the stone embankment has been built within these limits. A leak of canal water from the base of the stone embankment is increasing in flow on a daily basis. CRT has written and admitted this cannot be cured! Not by design but by pure luck alone, this constant and rapidly increasing flow is being contained by the ditch and conducted into Whinney Brook at the bottom of Hall Lane. Canal & River Trust has confirmed maintenance of the ditch is the responsibility of the riparian landowner, whoever that may be? The ditch was last cleared out in 2013; today it is full of rubbish and choked with weeds.

When the stone embankment and ditch were constructed, 200 years ago, ample provision was made for its safe operation in times of canal overflow. Water entering via the six towpath culverts was conducted along the ditch and underneath Old Hall Road through a 6 ft square culvert. On reaching the other side of Old Hall Road the ditch resumed its open aspect and water from the canal’s overflow system flowed directly into Whinney Brook at the bottom of Hall Lane.

During recent years substantial public sewers have been connected to the ditch, prior to its entry into the Old Hall Road Culvert, taking up much of the available capacity. Furthermore the total capacity of the culvert has been reduced. This is because the open aspect of the ditch has been replaced by a 60 cm dia. clay pipe for discharge into the Whinney Brook. The pipe, because of the strain it has been subjected to, has broken round the edges and collapsed from its base. This is not surprising because a full area outlet of 4 square metres has been reduced by this pipe work to 0.3 square metres. Before this adaptation flooding issues from the canal enjoyed unrestricted flow into the main river; consequently flooding in surrounding streets was never experienced. The calculations are crude and made in the same context as that shown above for Damfield Lane but the result is similar...excessive flooding, from overfilled watercourses, into surrounding roadways because of pipe restrictions.

The safety risks, calculated by canal engineers 200 years ago, have been replaced by dangers to life and limb. The electricity substation, built in comparatively recent years, with its warning signs stating ‘Danger of Death’ was swamped in 2010, 2012 and 2015; sandbags remain in place just in case the canal overflows again soon?

Agencies have abandoned their statutory responsibilities and local residents are concerned.

Excessive flooding takes place because the canal overflow system has practically been eliminated from Maghull’s Flood Defences!!!

When the canal retaining, stone embankment, at the top of Hall Lane, finally does collapse the town will be swamped and lives will be lost.

Canal & River Trust, after touring the site on 4th July 2012, accompanied by six residents, delayed writing its report until 28th September 2012, the canal having overflowed only two days earlier? Read and note Canal & River Trust’s warnings...

(1) The canal is leaking through a 200 year old stone gateway wall and the leak can only be cured by draining the canal which is impractical.
(2) Regular repairs are made but no guarantee can be given that the canal in time will not make a full breach and flood large parts of Maghull.

(3) British Waterways do not own the ditch into which the canal is leaking and are not responsible for the ditch’s maintenance and upkeep.

(4) Whinney Brook Culvert 34 is in three sections. Two of these from Damfield Lane inspection hatch to towpath, and towpath back to brook, are the sole responsibility of British Waterways. Detailed updated records giving material construction, direction, shape, diameter, length and depth are available. Culvert 34 is owned by Canal & River Trust. Previous Principle Inspection information is available. We can confirm the culvert is functioning as required.

(5) Records state the two sections are in fair condition and fit for purpose but the consequence of failure would lead to multiple serious injuries and death.

The third and sub road culvert is not of British Waterways’ ownership and they have no records of its age, material construction, condition, or strength ability to withstand heavy traffic. Whether its collapse would also lead to multiple serious injuries is a question which must be posed to whoever is responsible for its maintenance and upkeep.

***

It is alarming that CRT can make statements about its network and assets and then approve totally false information, presented by a third party, for the purpose of gaining planning permission? Building on Damfield Lane has been allowed to commence without any corrections to the totally incorrect data endorsed by CRT and presented to the local authority on behalf of the developer? Extra loadings to an already overwhelmed infrastructure will lead to disaster for many throughout the neighbourhood.

Those with statutory obligations should take a critical look at what is happening now and restore assets to their original, workable, condition. Infrastructural restoration to original standards is necessary if flooding in the area is to be eliminated.

A start can be made with the canal...refer to the items listed in CRT’s report letter above and action as follows...

(1) Make it a priority to stop the leak by repairing the stone embankment gateway wall even if the canal has to be drained.

(2) Apply repair and maintenance so as to guarantee a full breach cannot occur.

(3) Compel riparian owner to maintain and clear the overflow ditch, four times per year.

(4)(A) Compel CRT to look at its own records before endorsing misinformation as fact. Planning permission should only be awarded when true facts have been presented. Speculation and guesswork cannot replace expert knowledge.

(4)(B) It is obvious that nobody has determined what the exact network is, for conducting the main river below road, canal and towpath?

(5) CRT by referring to two culverts when its only, sub, canal asset is solitary, just demonstrates complacency where strict observance and knowledge should always rule. Any risk assessment predicting ‘multiple serious injuries and death’ must be accompanied by a complete understanding of critical infrastructure. In the case of Leeds and Liverpool Canal within a concentrated area of Maghull, CRT’s knowledge is gravely lacking! This comment also applies to EA, UU and Sefton MBC. Records presented by CRT show that culvert 34, under the canal, was last inspected in 1995, more than 20 years ago. This can hardly be described as regular maintenance. Records show that no one is sure why a serious canal breach in 1994 containing similar elements actually happened?
CRT’s outright dismissal of any responsibility for the sub road portion of the culvert is a further example of complacency. CRT **does** have a duty to know what is connected to the sub, canal culvert from underneath the road and should be posing questions about this, directly, to fellow agencies. The river, the road and the canal must be jointly managed if the whole system is to be safely sustained.

A great deal of complacency rules in this critical area in which main river and canal combine. CRT and its fellow agencies have demonstrated that none of them is aware of what happens when the river goes out of sight at Damfield Lane and yet they are all making planning decisions which can only make matters worse within an area stretching from Damfield Lane to Fouracres. Lives are being risked through mismanagement of the canal from Damfield Lane to Hall Lane; rivers and roads and buildings are being overwhelmed by large doses of river water, at one end, and larger doses of canal water at the other end.

Maghull’s infrastructure is in a mess and nobody seems to care. Accidents are bound to happen if nothing is done to make corrections. This report puts all contributing factors on record for future reference. A site tour to verify these facts was made on 27th April 2016 by a party of four residents, two town councillors and a Flood and Erosion Risk Management Officer from Sefton MBC. To reach a consensus of agreement four items of Whinney Brook infrastructure were inspected using a questionnaire for reference. A further Six items await inspection by the same team A similar questionnaire for four items was used for inspection of the overflow network for Leeds and Liverpool Canal. All four items were inspected by the team and findings have inclusion in this report. Four pertinent questions were posed to the team and in answer to these the team agreed the canal is banked exceptionally high above Hall Lane and that water from the incurable leak is ever increasing.

Opinions about the question asking if a breach were to occur in the towpath opposite 118 where would the water go were varied but the consensus was...It would flood into properties along Hall Lane and if flooding were to reach the cricket field it would have to enter The Whinney Brook first. This is important information because planning approval for building east of Damfield Lane was obtained through CRT’s assertion that a breach at the above property would flood directly into the cricket field. The photograph provided as back up shows property 118 which is nowhere near the cricket field? This misinformation, supplied by CRT in 2112 has not as yet been admitted to.

Misinformation supplied at the same time about culvert 34 was corrected in 2014. CRT refused to correct this with Sefton MBC? So much for residents’ welfare! Mistakes can happen but trained engineers could hardly misinterpret structural items of such vital importance.

Copies of this report will be sent to EA, UU, CRT and Scottish Power whose substation which is near to houses and a busy church is still surrounded by sandbags.

Copies of the questionnaires being used for continuing inspections are available for reference. The attached memo from Capita Symonds to Sefton’s Planning Department states...‘there is no requirement to increase the size of the culvert.’ We are not engineers but our observations and calculations given above totally disprove this statement. Whose interests are being compromised here?

Maghull Flood Committee.
From: Gerry Crilly
Sent: 11 July 2018 13:52
To: Neighbourhoodplanning
Subject: Fw: Maghull Neighbourhood Plan.
Attachments: Comments on updated version of Maghull Neighbourhood Plan.docx;
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY FLOODING REPORT FOR MAGHULL ISSUES.docx

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Gerry Crilly
To: flooding@sefton.gov.uk
Cc: 
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2018 2:39 PM
Subject: Maghull Neighbourhood Plan.

Please read attachments.
Regards,
Gerry Crilly.
To Sefton MBC by e-mail.
Please forward this communication to the Examiner of Maghull Neighbourhood Plan.


We have scanned through the documents, made available for scrutiny at Maghull Library, and have extracted some items for comment. These items, indicating some of the Plan’s aims, have been highlighted for comment...

(1) Promote healthy communities and make the Town a better place for people to live in.

Comment, because the drainage infrastructure, serving our Town, is totally inadequate for the safe conveyance of current flows, Maghull is already an unhealthy and dangerous place to live in. In recent years, Leeds and Liverpool Canal has overflowed into local streets. People, living in and passing by, Hall Lane, are being exposed to electrocution and the probability of being blown up because two interconnected substations get submerged whenever the canal overflows. This happens because Sefton Council has curtailed a culvert which conveys canal overflows into Whinney Brook. Sefton Council is the riparian owner of the culvert and, therefore, is breaching The Land Drainage Act (1991) which places duties on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to convey flows...This is what happens when the Act is ignored and provision not made...

A similar situation keeps reoccurring in Damfield Lane because a culvert in pace to convey Whinney Brook beneath the road is inadequate and causes the river to overtop its banks and flood into the road. Here Again Sefton Council, as riparian owner, is breaching The Land Drainage Act (1991) which places duties on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to convey flows. This is what happens when the Act is ignored and provision not made...
There are few houses in Damfield Lane but 1400 students attend Maricourt High School in Damfield Lane. A gas substation, directly opposite the school entrance, becomes submerged creating the probability of being gassed, blown up, or both.

Also in Hall Lane, foul sewers, belonging to United Utilities, convey raw infectious sewage into the road whenever there is constant rainfall. The company admits this is due to hydraulic inadequacy and substantial funding is required to upgrade the sewers. United Utilities does not consider this recurring issue to be a priority so funding is being withheld. United Utilities is bound by section 94 of the Water Industry Act (1991) to provide adequate infrastructure for the safe conveyance of foul sewage...
This is what happens when the Act is ignored and safe conveyance not provided...

The infrastructure, which conveys foul sewage beneath Hall Lane, is dual purpose which means fresh water conveys foul sewage inside the pipe work. That is why discharges occur whenever it rains. The toxic mix, which pervades Hall Lane, is designated as surface water; this is deceptive and allows the company to avoid its statutory duty to keep infectious sewage out of the public domain. The discharge, pictured above, is flushed into Hall Lane, directly from numerous toilet basins. Schoolchildren are forced to walk through this, disease ridden, human effluent, on their way to Maghull's many schools.
In 2013, Sefton NHS, Officer for public Heath, wrote to United Utilities, warning of the dangers this recurring problem was presenting to distressed residents. In 2018, United Utilities has written to say, nevertheless, funding will not be allocated.

A culvert, owned by Sefton Council, which drains land from school playing fields, alongside Northway, has been blocked off from entering Whinney Brook at Liverpool Road South. This causes the water to back up and flood Northway Service Roads East and West and Glenholm Road. This water mixes with foul sewage which runs out of Hall Lane and spreads disease into all three roads. Residents have complained about water emerging beneath floorboards. This breaches The Land Drainage Act (1991) and Section 94 of the Water Industry Act (1991).
This is what happens when the Acts are ignored and safe conveyance of flows not provided...

(2)Promote the principles of sustainable development to create a healthy Sefton.
Comment, Various ongoing threats to Maghull’s public health and wellbeing, entirely due to unsustainable infrastructure, have been described above, more will be described below.

(3) Manage River Alt which enters into Maghull via large culverts beneath Switch Island.

Comment, In addition to River Alt, Melling Brook also enters Maghull, via Switch Island. River Alt flows in a straight line towards Sefton Church and causes no local flooding. Melling Brook, however, adopts a diagonal course and conjoins with Dovers Brook and Whinney Brook, alongside the Fouracres Estate. Melling Brook is a major river with enormous capacity; the volume it imports from elsewhere overwhelms the two smaller rivers and submerges the Fouracres Estate.

In 2012, emergency services were called out to rescue my neighbours from flooded streets and homes. Similar flooding occurred again in 2015. The infrastructure serving Fouracres does not conform to Land Drainage Act (1991) and Water Industry Act (1991). This means Sefton Council and United Utilities are not observing statutory obligations.

The official report on the 2012 incident, issued by Sefton FERM in 2013, does not identify Melling Brook as the cause and goes out of its way to absolve Sefton, United Utilities, and Environment Agency from blame. It is unbelievable that professionals, with qualifications, failed to name Melling Brook in official documentation. The real cause of the problem was recorded in Environment Agency Flooding Report for Maghull, in 2013, under numbered Issues (11) Fouracres and (13) Main Rivers, after a flood resilience officer surveyed the three rivers and consulted with residents in their homes.

Flooding, due to the same problem, reoccurred in 2015 and a cure will not be found until Melling Brook is diverted away. Meanwhile a dangerous problem persists.

In this picture, Dovers Brook flows behind Fouracres. Note how very small the watercourse is and its closeness to the housing. Further upstream, Melling Brook enters the scene, causing sewer outlets connected to Dovers Brook to feed floodwater water back into the estate. This is a serious breach of the Land Drainage Act (1991) by Sefton Council and the Water Industry Act (1991) by United Utilities. Environment Agency, however, is responsible for the safe management of main rivers and has failed in this duty by allowing developers to make use of a river which cannot safely convey flows.

By failing to identify the obvious consequence of their actions, the developer, Sefton Planning, United Utilities and Environment Agency have created a situation continues to endangers the residents of Fouracres.

Both versions of Maghull Neighbourhood Plan make no reference to Melling Brook which is the major cause of flooding in Fouracres and Sefton Lane. Nor is any reference made to Melling Brook in Sefton FERM’s Official Flooding Report, published in 2013, which purports to address the cause of flooding in both of these locations. This is because Sefton FERM is colluding with its partners to cover up the fact that floodwater, creating dangerous flood risks within the whole of the neighbourhood, is imported from elsewhere. Sefton FERM, in further attempts to cover up this crucial fact has tried to remove from distribution Environment Agency Flooding Report for Maghull which identifies 13 recurrent flooding issues, most of which are caused by imports of floodwater, from elsewhere, entering Maghull’s Totally inadequate drainage infrastructure.
The highly informative document which records details of recurrent flooding issues over a period of seven years carries endorsements for authenticity from senior executives of Environment Agency, United Utilities and SP Energy Networks. A copy is enclosed for the Plan Examiner's perusal.

(4) Ensure new developments proposed in the Plan do not increase the amount of flooding which constantly plagues our exiting built environment.

Comment, The flooding issues, described above, and the dangers they carry are inherent to our Town. The infrastructure needs upgrading to prevent these happening. Most of the existent problems are caused by water imported from elsewhere...Leeds and Liverpool Canal into Hall Lane...Melling Brook into Fouracres...Whinney Brook into Damfield Lane. Connecting another 1650 houses to the same infrastructure will add to the dangers which already exist.

(5) Ensure all necessary works and services are introduced so existing sewers within our neighbourhood are can safely support human activities.

The flooding issues described above and the dangers they carry are inherent to our Town. The infrastructure needs upgrading to prevent these happening. Most of the existent problems are caused by water imported from elsewhere...Leeds and Liverpool Canal into Hall Lane...Melling Brook into Fouracres...Whinney Brook into Damfield Lane. Connecting another 1650 houses to the same infrastructure will add to the dangers which already exist. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states that new developments must not increase flood risk elsewhere. In all of these instances NPPF has been disregarded.

(6) Ensure Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act is fully observed by investigating the impact new proposed developments will have on our Town.

The flooding issues described above and the dangers they carry are inherent to our Town. The infrastructure needs upgrading to prevent these happening. Most of the existent problems are caused by water imported from elsewhere...Leeds and Liverpool Canal into Hall Lane...Melling Brook into Fouracres...Whinney Brook into Damfield Lane. Connecting another 1650 houses to the same infrastructure will add to the dangers which already exist. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states that new developments must not increase flood risk elsewhere. In all of these instances NPPF has been disregarded.

(7) Investigate why Dovers Brook overflowed submerged the Fouracres Estate in 2012.

In addition to River Alt, Melling Brook also enters Maghull, via Switch Island. River Alt flows in a straight line towards Sefton Church and causes no local flooding. Melling Brook, however, adopts a diagonal course and conjoins with Dovers Brook and Whinney Brook, alongside the Fouracres Estate. Melling Brook is a major river with enormous capacity; the volume it imports from elsewhere, overwhelms the two smaller rivers and submerges the Fouracres Estate. In 2012 emergency services were called out to rescue my neighbours from flooded streets and homes. Similar flooding occurred again in 2015. The infrastructure, serving Fouracres, does not conform to Land Drainage Act (1991) and Water Industry Act (1991). This means Sefton Council and United Utilities are not observing statutory obligations. The report on the 2012 incident, issued by Sefton FCERM, in 2013, does not identify Melling Brook as the cause and goes out of its way to absolve Sefton MBC, United Utilities, and Environment Agency from blame. It is unbelievable that
professionals, with qualifications, failed to name Melling Brook as the cause of this tragedy in official, explanatory documentation. The cause of the problem was recorded in Environment Agency Flooding Report for Maghull in 2013, under numbered Issues (11) Fouracres and (13)Main Rivers after a flood resilience officer surveyed the three rivers and consulted with residents in their homes. Flooding, due to the same problem, recurred in 2015 and a cure will not be found until Melling Brook is diverted away. Meanwhile a dangerous problem persists. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states that new developments must not increase flood risk elsewhere. Flooding reoccurs within the Fouracres Estate because the principles of NPPF have been disregarded. Sefton Council, United Utilities, and Environment Agency have shared responsibilities to ensure statutory obligations are implemented. Each of these organisations has failed in its duty! What keeps happening here can hardly be regarded as an oversight. The very fact Melling Brook’s impact, on flooding in Maghull, has been omitted from Sefton FCERM’s official report on the matter and Sefton MBC’s Maghull Neighbourhood Plan, indicates the matter is being covered up. The only Document which identifies the cause and the risk of flooding in Fouracres is, Environment Agency Flooding Report for Maghull. Which Sefton FCERM has tried to suppress. This oppressive behaviour also indicates, crucial evidence, of the causes of flood risk in Maghull, is being covered up.

(8) Announce a swale connected to Whinney Brook as the means of mitigating flooding on the newly built Poppy fields Estate

The swale, or large pond, will be able to contain flows generated within the estate until such time it becomes full. When this happens, uncontrollable excesses will discharge into Whinney Brook which flows to Damfield Lane. The receiving culvert for the river at Damfield Lane, in place to convey Whinney Brook beneath the road, is inadequate and causes the river to overtop its banks and flood into the road. Here again Sefton Council, as riparian owner, is breaching The Land Drainage Act (1991) which places duties on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to convey flows. There are few houses in Damfield Lane but 1400 students attend Mariecourt High School in Damfield Lane. A gas substation, directly opposite the school entrance, becomes submerged, creating the probability of passersby being gassed, blown up, or both. The National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF, clearly states that flooding generated by new developments must not increase flooding elsewhere. The new developments, being built on Land East of Maghull, if connected to Whinney Brook, in any way whatsoever, will increase flooding throughout the neighbourhood of Maghull. There are two alternatives, one, contain run offs in large underground SUDS at developers’ expense, or two, upgrade Maghull’s Drainage Infrastructure at developers’ expense. Anything else will be destructive, dangerous, and life threatening. On receipt of Maghull Town Council’s Draft Proposal in 2017, 347 residents sent the following message to the Leader of Maghull Town Council which reads... We, the undersigned, request the specific issue of unsustainable drainage infrastructure and its necessary upgrading be incorporated into the Draft Plan before it is finalised. Copies were e-mailed to Environment Agency, United Utilities, Canal & River Trust, SP Energy Networks and Sefton Planning. Our request has been ignored!

The decision taken to exclude the necessity for essential upgrading of Maghull’s drainage infrastructure, as a condition for the Plan’s acceptance, is a serious omission. There is a difference in not knowing the facts or choosing not to know the facts. We have demonstrated the latter option has been adopted by the Plan’s authors, in an attempt to deceive residents into believing, houses built elsewhere will not adversely impact on our wellbeing.
Statutory obligations are formulated to ensure communities, everywhere, are protected from harm. In Maghull the rules are being ignored and people are being harmed. So much for the promotion of healthy communities and making Maghull a better place to live in!!!

The updated version of Maghull Neighbourhood Plan, if approved without essential upgrading of Maghull’s drainage infrastructure, as a condition for the Plan’s acceptance, will destroy our existing built environment. The document is in need of serious revision.

I trust the Examiner of the Plan will understand, although this letter and its contents are signed off by one individual, the facts within it, as presented, are informed by consultation with local residents and responsible organisations. Many of the 347 residents, who have already signed the message requesting essential upgrades to drainage infrastructure, live in key areas where excessive flooding is recurrent and dangerous...namely, Damfield Lane, Hall Lane, Northway, Glenholm Road and Fouracres.

Regards, Gerry Crilly (Maghull Resident).

The following data has been collated from information gathered from site inspections, during which a number of residents, at risk of flooding in key locations, were visited and their observations noted. During the past five years various Flood Resilience Officers from Environment Agency have offered help to Maghull...

First visit, one EA representative, 17th May 2012...Second visit, one EA representative, 17th July 2012...Third visit, two EA representatives, 23rd April 2013...Fourth visit, one EA representative, 5th July 2013...Fifth visit, one EA representative, 23rd June 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Location in which problematic flooding keeps occurring.</th>
<th>Issues as defined by residents with experience of localised flooding issues caused by infrastructural deficiencies.</th>
<th>Leads = Agencies with responsibility to provide solutions.</th>
<th>Suggested Way Forward from visits made by EA 17/5/2012, 17/7/2012, 23/4/2013, 5/7/2013 and 23/6/2016.</th>
<th>Updates made by EA 24th July 2013, 26th April 2016, 20th July 2016, 4th December 2016 as under...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Damfield Lane/ A59 Roadways. EA Site visits... 17th May 2012, 23rd April 2013, 21st August 2016.</td>
<td>Flooding on Road. Culvert wall very low. Used to be a debris screen in place but this disappeared sometime in 2011. Sefton MBC reports... Where Whinney Brook crosses Damfield Lane there have been two major incidents of flooding reported in 2011 alone, due to blockages and incapacity of the culverts carrying the brook under the road. Residents say that water comes over wall and up into lane via culvert inspection hatch. Further major incident with all above flooding elements, December 2015. Road under water and closed to traffic by police. The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows.</td>
<td>SEFTON EA CRT</td>
<td>Keep Drains Cleared. Do not allow run offs from new development to enter Whinney Brook. The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows.</td>
<td>Culvert was inspected in 2013. CRT’s culvert was shown to be partially blocked where Whinney Brook enters cricket field. Sefton MBC subsequently jetted the culvert. EA reckons flooding may be caused by surface water rather than the brook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Damfield Lane Development land.</td>
<td>EA’s inspector was first alerted on site visit during May 2012, to sewage coming up through manholes, and down the slope into Whinney Brook. Photograph taken showing overloaded system discharging foul sewage from manhole. UU looking at introducing cess pit. UU advises blockages have been cleared and pre-existing issues repaired.</td>
<td>SEFTON UU EA CRT</td>
<td>Look at drainage options that are being considered for new development.</td>
<td>Work on new development has been allowed to commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Whinney Brook Culvert at Damfield Lane.</td>
<td>Capacity overflowed twice in 2011 as reported by Sefton MBC. Culvert wall very low. Used to be a debris screen in place but this disappeared sometime in 2011. Residents say water comes over wall and up into the road through culvert inspection hatch. The 900mm dia. metal pipe which runs below canal and is a wholly owned asset of CRT cannot adequately convey combined flows of drains and Whinney Brook at full flow. Canal &amp; River Trust has stated that The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to contain flows. CRT’s receiving 900mm metal pipe is woefully inadequate to contain both Whinney Brook and drains.</td>
<td>SEFTON. EA. CRT.</td>
<td>Look to clear the brook, investigate if culvert may be blocked. Ensure general maintenance along brook is performed regularly. Install debris screen which was intentionally removed by contractors in 2011. Screen has recently been replaced to cater for new development.</td>
<td>EA did not remove debris screen, which presumably was removed prior to management becoming EA’s responsibility. EA currently looking into getting screen reinstalled at its original position protecting culvert running beneath Damfield Lane and further on under Leeds and Liverpool Canal. CCTV inspection revealed CRT culvert in cricket field to be 40% blocked – Jet clearance planned for August 2013. Whinney Brook cleared with Weed bucket in March /April 2013. Hand maintenance carried out August 2013. If more enhanced maintenance required (desilting), this will need to be justified via survey and modelling. Contractors carried out routine maintenance on Dovers and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whinney Brooks during Autumn 2013. Walkthroughs and debris removal, ongoing as part of maintenance programme, detailed above. EA will continue to maintain this section of Whinney Brook as part of rolling maintenance programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Canal Bridge. EA Site visits... 17\textsuperscript{th} May 2012. 23\textsuperscript{rd} April 2013. 23\textsuperscript{rd} June 2016.</td>
<td>Canal is currently leaking into overflow ditch running alongside the road. The overflow ditch is in place to cater for exceptional discharges which occur whenever the canal reaches optimal level and massive amounts of water cannot be contained within the canal basin. Because culvert has been dramatically reduced in size at Old Hall Road, overflows can no longer access Whinney Brook. Overflows from the canal currently discharge into properties in Old Hall Road, Hall Lane and Northway. Roads and houses and an electrical substation were submerged in 2015 similar flooding occurred in 2010 and 2012.</td>
<td>CRT. SEFTON. OFWAT EA to find out who is responsible for the overflow drain. Need to understand risk of failure- what has been done? What measures are in place? EA to make sure CRT is aware of current leaking canal. CRT is aware of the leaking canal which is being monitored on a regular basis. The leak is containable but overflows can no longer be contained because of riparian curtailments at Hall Lane to what was originally a faultless and workable system constructed by British Waterways engineers. The system originally prevented canal overflow water being discharged into roadways, homes and properties including the electrical substation in Hall Lane. The risk of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A spokesman for CRT has stated, it is clear there is a problem with water from the canal overflowing into local streets. He has also stressed, The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows. He also affirms, once canal water flows onto adjoining land, owned by Sefton Council, Canal & River Trust’s responsibility comes to an end.

<p>| Cricket / Football Fields. | Back garden walls and fences of properties in Hall Lane are on the verge of collapse into Whinney Brook. Debris is building up. Trash Screen removed by contractors during 2011 from culvert under road = (Tommy Gent Way) at rear of 21 Hall Lane. On Boxing Day 2015 water from Whinney Brook overflowed the culvert and ran along Tommy Gent Way into Hall Lane to submerge homes. The electrical substation nearby was also submerged and lives were put at risk. The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows. The receiving culvert at Tommy Gent Way cannot contain Whinney Brook at full flow. | Make sure residents know about riparian ownership. Look at maintenance schedule Find out why the trash screen removed? Agree responsibility for erosion causing gardens to disintegrate with walls and fences falling into watercourse. | EA did not remove screen which was removed before EA took over brook. New Debris screen scheduled for 2014 has not yet been installed. EA advise there are now no plans in 2016 to have screen reinstalled. One of Hall Lane’s residents has rebuilt back garden wall to excellent standard. Whinney Brook which flows within cricket field erodes gardens away causing fences and walls to collapse into river. The Boxing Day incident produced further erosion causing fences to collapse and trees to be uprooted near to where screen was removed. EA has been informed and is investigating. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outlet stream from Canal. EA Site visits 17th May 2012 23rd April 2013 23rd June 2016.</th>
<th>Chopped trees blocking the watercourse which was constructed to cater for overflows from Leeds and Liverpool canal. Watercourse bed is significantly higher than original level through mismanagement and neglect. Capacity to contain overflows has been significantly reduced. Canal &amp; River Trust’s only responsibility is to maintain a wholly owned asset of five sub towpath culverts and a stepped stone embankment situated within its own land which includes little more than the towpath. A spokesman for CRT has stated, It is clear there is a problem with water from the canal overflowing into local streets. Canal &amp; River Trust has stated it has no continuing responsibility for water which flows out of the canal and onto the land belonging to other landowners. This is not a policy decision by Canal &amp; River Trust, but what the law says. Canal &amp; River Trust has also stated that the Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows. Once canal water flows onto adjoining land, owned by Sefton Council, Canal &amp; River Trust’s responsibility comes to an end.</th>
<th>CRT SEFTON. Find out who has responsibility for the stream and maintenance/clearance. CRT has stressed that the Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows.</th>
<th>SEFTON cleared the debris in 2011. Matter referred to SEFTON during Making Space for water meetings. Maintenance of the overflow ditch has been abandoned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A59 Northway (east) Service</td>
<td>Service road floods outside 172 Northway when rainfall is heavy. Floodwater drains from the school</td>
<td>SEFTON EA to query if Sefton have investigated the flooding problem? CCTV?</td>
<td>SEFTON currently looking into the culverts around this road. Culvert which conducts flow beneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Road. EA Site visits...</strong>&lt;br&gt;17(^{th}) May 2012. 23(^{rd}) April 2013.</td>
<td>playing fields. Culvert beneath A59 backs up from from115 Northway directly opposite and floods service roads both sides of A59. The problem emanates from the blocking off of the watercourse beneath Liverpool Road South, thereby denying access of floodwater to Whinney Brook. The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows.</td>
<td>Liverpool Road South has been blocked off and water within the system can no longer access Whinney Brook alongside Meadows Hotel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>A59 Northway (west) Service Road. Other side of A59 EA Site visits...</strong>&lt;br&gt;17(^{th}) May 2012. 23(^{rd}) April 2013.</td>
<td>Service road floods during heavy rainfall around house no 115. There is a pipe blocked around the back of the house. All houses have water under the floorboards. Water has nowhere to go because culvert conducting water beneath Liverpool Road South into Whinney Brook has been blocked off at Meadows Hotel and this is the cause of both issues (7) and (8). Full access to the river must be restored because The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows.</td>
<td>SEFTON&lt;br&gt;EA to query if Sefton have investigated the flooding problem? CCTV?&lt;br&gt;EA to query with UU and SEFTON Highways about suggested solutions to this flooding. Surface water issue. Sefton MBC has been made aware of problem at various Making Space for Water meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Hall Lane EA Site visits...</strong>&lt;br&gt;17(^{th}) May 2012. 23(^{rd}) April 2013.</td>
<td>Road floods up to a couple of feet in foul sewage water. UU say this is due to hydraulic inadequacy which cannot be cured without capital investment. Such expenditure needs to be prioritised but UU advises there are no current plans for work in the area. Ref (AMP) 2015-</td>
<td>SEFTON&lt;br&gt;UU&lt;br&gt;Taken forward to SEFTON at Making Space for Water meeting. Matter has been raised again and again with SEFTON and UU at Making Space for Water meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020. Contamination from contact with foul sewage is a public health issue. Such contamination places pedestrians, particularly schoolchildren at risk of disease.</td>
<td>Proposed housing development. Residents are concerned that run offs from the estate will cause flooding issues similar to those experienced in 2015 and in 2011 (twice) when Damfield Lane was closed to traffic. Inadequate metal 900mm dia. culvert below canal cannot contain combined throughput from three highway drainage runs and Whinney Brook. The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows.</td>
<td>SEFTON PLANNING.</td>
<td>Update sought on planning decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damfield Lane</td>
<td>Water backing up through outfalls during high river flows. Maintenance required along watercourse.</td>
<td>UU EA</td>
<td>What were EA’s recommendations for the planning approval? Planning documents showed surface water discharge rates are to be limited. No grounds to object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Site visits... 17\textsuperscript{th} May 2012. 23\textsuperscript{rd} April 2013.</td>
<td>Serious flooding to substation. Walls of building swamped on Boxing Day 2015. Culvert conducting canal overflows beneath Old Hall Road into Whinney</td>
<td>CRT. EA. SEFTON SP Energy Networks</td>
<td>EA walks Dovers Brook twice per year and flails it with a weed bucket once per year. Dovers Brook when overwhelmed with excesses from Melling Brook acts as a feed into Fouracres by overtopping flap valves and submerging gardens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouracres EA Site visits... 23\textsuperscript{rd} April 2013 5\textsuperscript{th} July 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding, similar to Boxing Day 2015 incident, occurred in 2010 and 2012 because of reduction in capacity of culvert at Old Hall Road. Properties will remain at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12) | **EA Site visit...**  
23rd April 2013.  
23rd June 2016.  

Brook reduced from catchment of 4 square metres to a mere 60cm dia. beneath Hall Lane. Restriction denies adequate access for overflows into main river causing canal water to flow directly into Old Hall Road, Hall Lane (East) and Northway.  
Flooding is further augmented by surface water being piped from Glentworth Close into same culvert. Surface water from this housing estate combines with canal overflows and floods into Hall Lane/Northway and Old Hall Road. United Utilities advise none of its assets contribute to flooding in Hall Lane. |
| | their primary substation in accordance with ENA (Energy Networks Association) guidelines in document ETR 138 (Engineering Technical Report) 138)  
SP Energy Networks contacted UU and EA. (20th July 2016) in regard to what actions each were taking in respect to the independent survey. (20th August 2016). EA to conduct further survey with Sefton following contact by SP Energy Networks.  
Risk until culvert’s outlet is restored to its original capacity of four square metres. Following site surveys SP Energy Networks instigated plans to install flood mitigation measures at their primary substation in accordance with ETR 138 guidelines. Agencies/riparian owners with connected assets will need to take similar, prompt, positive remedial action to protect Old Hall Road, Hall Lane and Northway from preventable flooding. People are being subjected to unnecessary risks.  
SP Energy Networks also contacted Sefton Council CEO in regard to flooding risks from the canal and Whinney Brook United Utilities inspected the overflow network on behalf of residents and issued a report dated 27th October 2016 confirming culverts to be cause of canal water flooding for which riparian owners are responsible.  
The Land Drainage Act (1991) places duties and responsibilities on riparian owners, one of which is to make provision to adequately convey flows. The only flows being adequately |
| 13) | **Configuration and naming of main rivers and the effects they have on large areas of Maghull.**  
Maps provided by Defra to EA show Whinney flowing into Dovers Brook and onwards to Sefton Lane. The same map |
|   | **EA SEFTON DEFRA** |
|   | **It was noted during a site visit with EA that Melling Brook far exceeds, in width, depth and total capacity, other brooks to which it is conjoined. In times of** |
|   | **EA SEFTON DEFRA** |
| 13) | EA Site visits...  
23rd April 2013.  
5th July 2013. | shows Melling Brook flowing into Old Alt Brook and disappearing as if it never existed. Residents are unaware of the existence of Old Alt Brook. Melling Brook may have disappeared but the water it imports submerges Fouracres on a regular basis. Maps produced by Capita Symonds and Google do not show Old Alt Brook as an entity and no distinction was evident during EA's site visit. Melling Brook was observed as one continuous watercourse flowing from beyond Switch Island directly to Fouracres where it meets up with Dovers brook and Whinney Brook. | fullness Melling Brook discharges into all other connected brooks causing backups and overflows into Fouracres and Sefton Lane. Floodwater imported from outside of the neighbourhood into Maghull, via Melling Brook, swamps into the Town's two brooks which once comfortably managed to drain the whole of Maghull. Maghull's two main rivers are Dovers Brook and Whinney Brook. | conveyed are those which are imported from out of town. These flows should be diverted into River Alt at Switch Island where Melling Brook and River Alt enter the region side by side. |

Key to Lead Column abbreviations...
DEFRA...Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

OFWAT...Water Services Regulation Authority.


SP Energy Networks References approved 8th May 2017.
Total Flood Solutions...Total Flood Solutions.
OFGEM...Office of Gas and Electricity Markets.

SEFTON...Sefton MBC.