



# Loxwood Parish Council

Clerk: Jane Bromley

Tel: 01403 791323

email: [clerk@loxwood-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@loxwood-pc.gov.uk)

---

## **LOXWOOD PARISH COUNCIL FLOOD FORUM Meeting 11.30am 13<sup>th</sup> November 2019, Mursell Room, North Hall.**

**Attendees:** David Mardon (Water Environment); Kevin Macknay and Sue Furlong (WSCC); Kaylass Ramlagan (Southern Water) (arrived during 3.III); Dom Henley (Chichester District Council, Flood Engineer); Loxwood Parish Councillors: Tony Colling; Chris Agar; Rick Kelsey; Roger Newman; Simon Bates and 15 members of the public.

Chairman of the meeting: Parish Councillor, Tony Colling. (left during 3.II) Rick Kelsey (took over as Chair at 3.III)

Clerk: Jane Bromley, Clerk, Loxwood Parish Council

- 1. The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and introduced the attendees.**
- 2. Apologies. Simon Sharp (Southern Water).**
- 3. Review of Hydrological Study results.** David Mardon from Water Environment presented. (The presentation is attached in a separate document)
  - I. **Headline overview on progress to date and purpose of presentation.****

The data collected in March and April this year had been added to the model and mapped as presented. The presentation was made with an aim to establish on the ground options for flood mitigation.
  - II. **Presentation of the hydraulic model, what it does, what it can assess and what it can't.****

The model was based on a loam soil which would be corrected to clay, although this was not expected to impact the results significantly.  
Two catchment areas and the Lox Stream had been modelled. The watercourse was modelled 1D and 2D. Run off was also modelled but the impact of individual residences fences and brick walls was not modelled.
  - III. **Presentation of baseline (existing) results and key findings for various areas and IV. **Presentation of potential mitigation options, how they were included in the model and any potential issues.******

**7 Options were presented**

    - 1.) Upstream Flow rate mitigation by wooden structures placed in the stream and storage pond construction.
    - 2.) Spy/Merryfield Lane Field Options-Collecting pond in field and drains to Stream.
    - 3.) Guildford Road/Pound Close- Widen culverts.
    - 4.) Pond Close- Remove/replace with rails property brick walls and possibly increase culvert size.
    - 5.) Oak Grove- Five options for this area

- Desilt culverts;
- Widen stream downstream;
- Remove property brick walls
- Widen culverts
- Add a new culvert at Trehenny

6.) Station Road- Increase culvert size and additional pipe to take flow.

7.) Burley Close – Four options for this area

- Ditch along school field and pipe to stream
- Ditch in front of No. 3 and pipe to stream
- Raise Road entrance;
- Defense at river bank.

**V. Presentation of optioneering results and key findings.**

See presentation slide.

**4. Discussion of baseline and option results.**

A summary of the work in order of benefit to the Parish was to be provided by DM after a re modelling to account for a clay soil. **ACTION DM**

Operation Watershed representative commented upon the presentation and brought everyone up to speed on how funding from Operation Watershed was achieved for projects based on certain criteria. This website provides further information [www.westsussex.gov.uk/watershed](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/watershed) It contains a copy of the application evaluation matrix that they can refer to which helps explain how funding is allocated. A question was asked around if 'Risk to life' is considered as part of the application process. SF explained though 'risk to life' does concern WSCC it does not form part of the evaluation process due to the type of project Operation Watershed would support. These projects are normally considered smaller scale, that they may not be eligible to access other funding like the EA for various reasons, including not financially viable/criteria to take enough homes out of flood risk, or around responsibilities e.g. riparian requirements and if PCs wish to fast track a project that is considered as a low priority for an authority.

The enactment of Options would require further funding and this would need to be discussed with the Parish Council once priorities were established although funding may well be part of the eventual prioritisation process.

**5. Agreement regarding which options should be focussed on for a combined scheme model.**

A further meeting with Water Environment; WSCC and the Parish Council would be held to discuss the summary to be prepared by DM.

**6. Any other business.** None.