

Sileby Meeting Responses

No	Question	Answer
1	<p>I recently stumbled upon this article and wondered if you could ask if it has any bearing on the situation within Sileby and the surrounding areas regarding the flooding. As I read and understand it all works that had been completed ended with Pillings Lock and not carried on through to Cossington as the original plan.</p> <p>I may have read it completely wrong, but would this work have been carried on and not stopped would it have made a big difference to Sileby? As barrow upon Soar copes well with flooding now compared to quite a few years back.</p> <p><a href="http://www.environmentdata.org/archive/ealit:2390/OBJ/20000936.pdf">http://www.environmentdata.org/archive/ealit:2390/OBJ/20000936.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>EA</b></p> <p>The computer simulated hydraulic Modelling for the Soar Valley Improvement Scheme showed that no further works were required upstream of Quorn itself and the first radial gate structure was only required at Pillings and not at Cossington as initially thought, this was because the river valley is very wide upstream of Pillings and there is lots of natural active floodplain land to take the flood flows adequately.</p> <p>There is little impact on the flood risk to Sileby from the River Soar itself and this small impact will only occur when the River Soar is in lager floods greater than 1:50yr as the river Soar will hold some water back in the Joint flood plain area of the River Soar and Sileby Brook which is mainly downstream of the properties in the village on the farmland and Sileby is therefore really only at major flood risk from the Sileby Brook itself. The location of the interaction area of the two watercourses will de dependant of the gradient of the channel beds.</p>
2	<p>Is there a commitment to ensuring that any mitigation solutions are sustainable and that where possible natural resources and long-term solutions will be implemented?</p>	<p><b>Charnwood Borough Council (CBC)</b>  A natural flood risk management scheme is under consideration. This would require significant cooperation from local landowners. EA to provide more details on this.</p> <p><b>Leicester City Council (LCC) Flood Risk Team</b>  When engaging in schemes, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) will always recommend that sustainable and natural solutions are used over hard engineering or resource intensive options. While there is very limited legislation to enforce this standpoint, we engage with stakeholders where we can.</p> <p><b>Please also see NFM comments in the answer to Q13 below.</b></p>

3	<p>Will solutions be looked at that may not be reside in the area of Sileby, but in the wider catchment areas i.e. tributaries upstream of the Soar, the Wreake and Rothley Brook</p>	<p>EA to respond. No as the River Wreake and Rothley Brook are in separate catchment area's there is no flood impact created by these separate catchments, however as part of our ongoing commitment to Natural Flood Risk solutions they may be looked at as part of their flood risk for instigating such measures.</p> <p><b>LCC Flood Risk Team</b> This may involve ordinary watercourses; we would work in support of the Environment Agency as the lead if a catchment management plan was instigated.</p>
4	<p>About school buses as, unlike public transport generally, there isn't an option for children to "get an earlier bus" if there's only the one school bus on your route each morning. Wreake Valley Academy are setting up a school bus from September, route: Mountsorrel &gt; Rothley &gt; Sileby &gt; East Goscote &gt; Syston. I've asked how the provider will manage their timetable to get the kids to school on time around regular flooding (the roads on this route have been flooded for 3 of the past 8 school weeks). The school are "consulting with the provider". My concern is that, if you're in Mountsorrel and Rothley, there is no means of public transport to this school so if they can't find a way to make the school bus work around the floods, there will be children who can't get to this school. Kids in Sileby can take the train and Arriva bus, but at a much greater cost, so there'll be families for whom this is not viable. If this bus can't be made to be financially viable, specifically because the route is subject to recurrent flooding, children's choices of secondary school will have been adversely affected solely because of the floods. Our catchment secondary school is currently in a poor state, so it is important that we don't close down options for children to attend other schools if they're a better fit for the child. What solutions can they suggest? Diverting from Rothley via the A6 and A46 to Sileby adds 30 - 40 minutes to your journey in rush hour.</p>	<p><b>LCC Highways</b> The bus operators are best placed to answer his as they are responsible for scheduling and routes.</p>
5	<p>Accepting that there has been a climate change what do the authorities think are the local issues that have caused such a build-up of the flood waters that don't appear to suddenly want to drain away?</p>	<p><b>LCC Highways –</b> More intense rainfall falling over a shorter period as experienced in the recent events does cause a short-term issue for highway</p>

		<p>infrastructure such as road gullies at their outfalls become overwhelmed.</p> <p><b>LCC Flood Risk Team</b>  Climate change has almost certainly had an impact and will continue to have an increased impact in the future. This particular flooding event has been exacerbated by a long period of wet weather from June until December. This led to much of the ground being completely saturated with water and unable to drain the rainfall in October and November. This long period of wet weather also kept water levels in the rivers high which consequentially reduced the ability for the tributary watercourses to drain.</p> <p>This is important to note in relation to the rainfall events which occurred in October, as it explains why these less intense rainfall events had such a significant impact on flooding when compared to much more intense events over the previous two (significantly drier) years. While there may be some specific instances which affected the flooding (a particular ditch or drain being blocked, for example) these would not likely have had a great influence over the resulting flooding.</p>
6	<p>What can be done to prevent or minimise such flooding in the future to protect residents, their homes/businesses and the surrounding wildlife and environment?</p>	<p><b>EA</b>  The current 6 year flood and coastal erosion risk management (FCERM) investment programme, which is aimed at reduce flood risk to people and property, runs from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2021. The Environment Agency regularly reviews the programme to take into account changes such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• serious flooding</li> <li>• local partnership funding contributions</li> <li>• new flood risk information</li> </ul> <p>Local authorities, internal drainage boards, the Environment Agency, and local communities work together to develop projects</p>

		<p>to reduce the risk of flooding and to provide wider environmental benefits.</p> <p>There is a project on the future programme for Sileby and to support development of it we have secured funding to develop a river model of Sileby Brook. This allows detailed analysis of the number of properties at flood risk which in turn can be used to provide an indication of the amount of capital funding that the area could attract under Defra's Partnership Funding rules. It is likely, given the number of properties at risk that there would a significant funding deficit with any capital scheme which would require third party contributions to make up the shortfall. We will explore capital scheme options when the river model output is available.</p> <p>In some cases it may be that capital flood risk management investment is not viable and we would continue with focussed maintenance operations and advise the community on resilience and resistance measures.</p>
7	<p>In 1999, Sileby Village and our houses 1 and 3 Brook Street were flooded three times, including Christmas Day and Good Friday.</p> <p>The day after a residents meeting was held, our MP Andy Reed and Councillor John Astill joined the Residents' Action Group and the brook was cleaned out and widened, bridges were built and raised at a cost of one million pounds.</p> <p>The brook was supposed to be cleaned out every three years and maintained. This has not been done since the brook was cleaned out 19 years ago. The brook from Dudley Bridge to the River Soar is silted and overgrown with Japanese Knotweed.</p>	<p><b>EA</b></p> <p>The work post 1999 flooding was undertaken by Charnwood Borough Council as head of main river at that time was the Cossington Road (Dudley Bridge) and upstream of there was under the permissive powers of the council not the EA.</p> <p>I not aware of this meeting Between MP Andy Reed and Councillor Astill or any agreement to clear the brook every 3 years We are aware the brook has got a lot of Himalayan Balsam growing on its banks. Invasive species like this are generally the responsibility of the riparian owner of the land. We are monitoring some isolated silt berms on the D/S end of the brook these will be removed our future programs of work.</p>

	<p>I have taken pictures and sent these to our MP Nicky Morgan but heard nothing back.</p> <p>Can you please tell me why the brook has not been cleared out and why no one is listening to us?</p>	<p>The work undertaken was to regrade the section of the brook downstream of the concrete apron section below Cossington Road (Dudley Bridge) and widen flow restriction structures (Bridges) that were causing a restriction to flow in the lower section of the brook. Charnwood BC should be able to provide more detail of their scheme to reduce flood risk at that time.</p> <p>Our maintenance regimes are focussed on reducing flood risk to residents in flood risk areas and we have undertaken works to desilt the concrete sections of the brook through the village and manage vegetation over the years- due to the gradient of the bed of the brook as it enters the quite level land in the joint River Soar flood plain downstream of the concrete section of the brook, high levels of maintenance work here would not necessarily reduce floor risk upstream in the village. We carry out tree and works and regular debris clearance. Flood flows here up to and upstream of Swan Street in larger flood events do exceed the current channel capacity even though it has been heavily engineered over the years to try to reduce this flood risk to the village. We do listen to residents' and the Parish Council concerns and have over the years had meetings with both to discuss flood risk and our planned maintenance regime for the village,</p>
8	<p>The Sileby Neighbourhood Plan states that Sileby needs to take 4.72% of Charnwood's growth in housing. The target seems to be calculated on existing housing and population but does not seem to adequately take into account the very large supply of housing that Sileby has contributed to Charnwood in the last 20 years.</p> <p>It is blindingly obvious to most of the residents of Sileby that the resultant "displacement" and more importantly "run off", is causing severe flooding issues in the village. What is being done to remedy this, and guard against future problems that will inevitably arise, with the latest swathes of</p>	<p><b>LCC Flood Risk Team</b></p> <p>Modern developments are legally required to ensure that the run off from the site is no greater than the 'greenfield rate'. The greenfield rate is the speed at which surface water would naturally drain from a site. The LLFA is a statutory consultee (since 2015) on major planning applications and as such we comment on every major application submitted. We check all applications to ensure that the surface water drainage meets legislation and National</p>

concrete and tarmac that are to be built on Ratcliffe road and Seagrave road? And what is being done to safeguard against “run off” heading this way, from the Leicester City training complex in Seagrave?  
Surely The Soar valley villages have done enough already and it is now the turn of other villages in the borough, who do not have to suffer the resultant flood risk!

Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirements and provide this technical guidance to the Local Planning Authority.

This means that new development is unlikely to increase flooding directly. However, as we know this is a great area of concern the LLFA has agreed to meet Sileby Parish Council to discuss this and other specific local issues relevant to our role as the LLFA.

Please note: as a Statutory Consultee we have no influence over the final decision to approve or refuse a planning application. This decision remained wholly within the remit of a Local Planning Authority.

**CBC Comments**

***Sileby Neighbourhood Plan takes 4.72% of Charnwood’s growth in housing, previous provision over last 20 years not taken into account***

The Borough Council is currently preparing a new Local Plan for Charnwood. The housing over the previous twenty years has been taken into account in the process of preparing the development strategy for the Borough. However, the amount of development previously accommodated is only one consideration amongst many when deciding where development should go, for example potential impacts on landscape or ecology, access to services and avoiding land at risk of flooding.

Notes:

- The Sileby Neighbourhood Plan, produced by the Parish Council, recognises that the population of Sileby is 4.72% of the total population of Charnwood.
- A new Local Plan for Charnwood is currently under production and out for consultation.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft local plan was not at an advanced enough stage to allocate a specific housing requirement for Sileby to inform the Neighbourhood Plan preparation.</li> <li>• The neighbourhood plan therefore used the known overall housing requirement for the Borough and considered a proportionate scale of growth for Sileby based on the population.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Displacement and run-off flooding from new development and Leicester City training complex</i></b></p> <p>Planning policy states that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities must ensure that flood risk is not increased. Applications must be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment where appropriate and this must demonstrate how water will be managed on the site to ensure surface water runoff is not increased.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For greenfield sites the run-off rates from development should not be any greater than those rates for the greenfield;</li> <li>• This is usually achieved by sustainable drainage systems which are designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and mimic natural drainage as closely as possible.</li> <li>• The application for the above was subject of an Environmental Impact Statement and this includes a flood risk assessment and informed the planning decision.</li> <li>• The Lead Local Flood Authority (Leicestershire County Council) is consulted on all relevant applications.</li> </ul>
9	I am concerned with the significant increase in flooding we are experiencing here on our land specifically from the Gypsum solar farm on Barrow Rd, LE12 7LR. Neighbours and I who own land are being deluged by large volumes of water, which are coming directly from the solar farm. This is resulting in flash floods for some of us on a regular basis, and for others, our	<p><b>CBC Comments</b></p> <p><b><i>Solar farm and run-off</i></b></p> <p>See the previous answer above.</p>

land is staying flooded for much longer than normal. We are also seeing flooding on Barrow rd itself near to Rat Race motors on Sibley/Barrow Rd. Slash lane has been under water for many weeks now and the water that is overflowing from the Solar Farm ends up on this location which is adding to the problem, therefore affecting road users.

We had our concerns and voiced them when the application was made for the construction of the solar farm as the site was known to occasionally flood badly. The Desk survey was incorrect in stating that the flood plain and solar farm site were not hydrologically connected, because they most certainly are. The site and position of the solar panels on 2 hills (one being steep) means that all the run off and surface water goes to the lowest point, that being towards the bridle path (accessible under Bridge 52 , Barrow Rd LE12 7LR) and in times of sustained rain causing floods, the existing ditches do not cope and the bridle path becomes a river of water that runs along the railway embankment and ends up coming out near Rat race motors and onto land rented by Lisa Ringrose...This water ends up at Slash lane. I cannot emphasise enough, just how much water is gushing from that Solar farm. Recently the bridle path has been flooded and flowing for weeks on end. The surface of the bridle path has been extensively damaged by the force of the water resulting in large holes and furrows which is dangerous for its users.

During the planning process there was much talk about "flood prevention" measures being put in place. I believe that none of this was done. From what we could see, the existing ditches have not been touched nor anything added to prevent flooding. The Solar panels were put up, along with security fences and the builders left. Perhaps someone can investigate exactly what flood prevention measures were put in place if any? Surely the council would have inspected the site and please explain why it was said that the solar farm is not hydrologically linked to land on barrow Rd, and the flood plain, when this is not the case, and it is adding substantially to the flooding we are experiencing.

There were no specific mitigation measures proposed as part of this proposal, the panels contain drip facilities to allow draining and the area below the panels is retained vegetation and therefore would drain into the soil as per existing run off from the site would do.

The Environment Agency was consulted and concluded that the proposed surface water drainage proposals are adequate and would not result in additional detrimental effects on run off from the site. Flooding may well still occur at times of significant and excessive rainfall events, but the solar panels are not considered to exacerbate these events.



<p>10</p>	<p>The climate is changing bringing more intense weather patterns. Hard surfaces drive water quickly into channels rather than soaking slowly through undeveloped ground. Can it be explained how building more houses in/close to a flood plain does NOT affect the flood risk for Sileby.</p> <p>The transport links are affected more often than before. Why then is more building allowed given that the traffic in and out of the village is severely affected over a longer period, possibly now Late Sept to April? More vehicle will aggravate an already congested road network.</p>	<p><b><i>Transport links in and out of the village severely affected, why more building</i></b></p> <p>Charnwood Borough Council consult the highway authority, Leicestershire County Council regarding the impact of any development in transport terms.</p> <p>National policy states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. This is a high threshold which the highway authority do not consider to have been breached by recent developments permitted.</p> <p>Transport modelling is being used to inform the preparation of the Charnwood Local Plan in consultation with the County and City Highways Authorities and Highways England.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Could a raised road be considered to avoid the flooded areas on Mountsorrel Lane?</p> <p>As Slash Lane has been closed due to flooding for at least 6 weeks have you thought about a) raising the level of the road,b) cleaning the ditches out and maybe making them wider and deeper.</p> <p>Stop more building until some improvements have been made to the roads including widening Mountsorrel Lane near the Church BUT don't knock the Church wall down!!</p>	<p><b>LCC Flood Risk Management Team</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A raised road has been considered in the past and may cause flooding elsewhere. However, the cost of doing this is extremely prohibitive. The cost is likely above the entire LCC Highways program budget.</li> <li>• In regard to Slash Lane, we are currently working with the landowners to improve the ditches and natural drainage. Some of the roadside ditches have been dug out already. However, the impacts of any drainage improvements will be limited in the larger events.</li> <li>• A question for the Local Highways Authority.</li> </ul> <p><b>LCC Highways</b></p> <p>Slash Lane is constructed on a flood plain. The cost of reconstructing and raising the road is prohibitive, as would be the</p>

		displacement of any water that the roads currently attenuates in times of flooding.
12	Is it fair to say the drainage in the village is outdated? The rainfall is now more intense and extreme, so the road gulleys and drains simply can't cope with how the climate has changed since they were installed many years ago.	<p><b>LCC Highways</b> The highway drainage in the village has evolved over a number of years during various phases of development, as with all locations. Gulleys can cope in most conditions but all infrastructure is tested in times of extreme rainfall.</p> <p><b>LCC Flood Risk Management Team</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A raised road has been considered in the past and may cause flooding elsewhere. However, the cost of doing this is extremely prohibitive. The cost is likely above the entire LCC Highways program budget.</li> <li>• In regard to Slash Lane, we are currently working with the landowners to improve the ditches and natural drainage. Some of the roadside ditches have been dug out already. However, the impacts of any drainage improvements will be limited in the larger events.</li> <li>• A question for the Local Highways Authority.</li> </ul>
13	The Green Place has responded in a small way by funding tree planting at Cossington Meadows. So far with the help of Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust, 200 saplings have been planted with another 400 going in this winter. We believe that careful planting can help soak up some of the rainfall as well as capturing carbon. Could a mass of tree planting on the flood plain help long term?	<p><b>EA</b> Natural flood management (NFM) is an increasingly important part of how we manage flood risk by protecting, restoring and emulating the natural regulating function of catchments - where rain and groundwater collect and flow into rivers – floodplains, rivers and coasts. Examples of interventions include grip blocking, peat land restoration, installing leaky woody structures, river restoration, tree planting, forest management and tidal salt marsh. They can be installed as interventions in their own right, or as part of a more traditional, engineered project, and may help mitigate the impact of climate change.</p>

		<p>In many instances, NFM measures will complement other more traditional flood defences, so it may not always be possible to identify accurately the effect of the NFM in isolation and this would be the case with the tree planting example mentioned. However, NFM is not appropriate in every case. Without careful planning right from the start it can actually make things worse. That is why it should be considered on a catchment scale, so we can tackle problems at source. Where NFM approaches can also provide other benefits, there may be good opportunities to build funding partnerships to implement, operate and maintain them.</p> <p>NFM options will be explored along with other capital interventions once we have output from the river modelling exercise.</p>
14	Were flood gates closed further downstream to protect Loughborough which added to the flooding in Sileby?	No
15	Can bridge at Barrow be made into two way? Current traffic levels during flooding is having a huge detrimental effect, and cost, on our business due to not being able to get out or back into our premises efficiently. The simple widening / strengthening of this bridge will allow traffic to flow easily in both directions.	<p><b>LCC Highways</b></p> <p>The bridge is a listed structure and was reduced to one lane to limit outward pressure on the structure. In theory anything can be possible in engineering terms, the required strengthening and widening measures required to open it to two-way traffic and incorporate either inclusive or separate footways is likely to be cost prohibitive.</p>
16	Have the ditches / rivers been dredged this year and drains cleared. Barrow / Sileby Road now floods near JB Stones on a regular basis during heavy rain. This never used to occur so is something blocked?	<p>Road gullies have been cleared and are maintained on a 10 month or 20-month frequency dependent upon their location. Ditches are generally the responsibility of the adjacent landowners.</p> <p><b>LCC Flood Risk Management Team</b></p> <p>While we have powers to enforce landowners to maintain watercourses. Please report any ditches or watercourses of concern to us at <a href="mailto:Flooding@leics.gov.uk">Flooding@leics.gov.uk</a>. While this may not</p>

		necessarily result in enforcement action. We do engage landowners where required.
17	Is it true that Lafarge / Bretts offered to build up Slash Lane to alleviate flooding risks and help with traffic but this was refused by Sileby Parish council?	Highways – no knowledge of this proposal.
18	Sileby drains do not appear to be able to cope with the increase number of housing being built? Is something being done?	<p><b>LCC Highways</b></p> <p>The highway drainage in the village has evolved over a number of years during various phases of development, as with all locations. Gulleys can cope in most conditions but all infrastructure is tested in times of extreme rainfall.</p>
19	<p>The village has seen substantial and sustained expansion from “windfall” properties and larger developments. This has inevitably placed a greater strain on both sewerage collection (as evidenced by drain covers lifting during heavy rain and human waste escaping), and in the overflow of water no longer able to escape into the soil because of the building activity. The River Soar is badly silted, both where it flows through the village and further downstream which exacerbates the problem.</p> <p>Does the council agree that there should be a ABSOLUTE block on any further development within Sileby until these basic, fundamental issues have been resolved? (and saying its being addressed as part of the S106 costs on developments, its being looked at by Severn Trent etc, does not constitute an acceptable answer!!)</p>	<p><b>CBC</b></p> <p>Sileby Neighbourhood Plan takes 4.72% of Charnwood’s growth in housing, previous provision over last 20 years not taken into account</p> <p>The Borough Council is currently preparing a new Local Plan for Charnwood. The housing over the previous twenty years has been taken into account in the process of preparing the development strategy for the Borough. However, the amount of development previously accommodated is only one consideration amongst many when deciding where development should go, for example potential impacts on landscape or ecology, access to services and avoiding land at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sileby Neighbourhood Plan, produced by the Parish Council, recognises that the population of Sileby is 4.72% of the total population of Charnwood.</li> <li>• A new Local Plan for Charnwood is currently under production and out for consultation.</li> <li>• The draft local plan was not at an advanced enough stage to allocate a specific housing requirement for Sileby to inform the Neighbourhood Plan preparation.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The neighbourhood plan therefore used the known overall housing requirement for the Borough and considered a proportionate scale of growth for Sileby based on the population.</li></ul> <p>Displacement and run-off flooding from new development and Leicester City training complex</p> <p>Planning policy states that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities must ensure that flood risk is not increased. Applications must be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment where appropriate and this must demonstrate how water will be managed on the site to ensure surface water runoff is not increased.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For greenfield sites the run-off rates from development should not be any greater than those rates for the greenfield;</li><li>• This is usually achieved by sustainable drainage systems which are designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and mimic natural drainage as closely as possible.</li><li>• The application for the above was subject of an Environmental Impact Statement and this includes a flood risk assessment and informed the planning decision.</li><li>• The Lead Local Flood Authority (Leicestershire County Council) is consulted on all relevant applications.</li></ul> <p><b>LCC Flood Risk Management Team</b></p> <p>This question appears to attribute a large number of issues with the new development which is not strictly related.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the LLFA has no influence over planning decisions and cannot prohibit or refuse development. However as stated before in regard to surface water drainage these standards will not</p>
--	--	--

		<p>increase flooding. We always recommend a development which has not met these standards is refused.</p> <p>The LLFA is not a statutory consultee in relation to minor planning applications.</p>
20	<p>As the area manager for Domino's pizza, I have seen the huge impact the floods have on our business as we are predominantly a delivery service. A service we cannot achieve to standard due to insufficient flood drainage and management.</p> <p>We have also lost sales due to having to close off certain postcodes where we cannot deliver to.</p> <p>As I'm sure this is an issue with other businesses in the area. What is the plan going forward to support us?</p>	<p><b>EA</b></p> <p>The Local Authority or Leicester City Council Flood Risk Management team would be better to answer this question.</p>
21	<p>"Why are the drains not cleared out prior to and during the autumn / winter months? surely good housekeeping standards prior to the troublesome months would go some way to try and minimise disruption when those months arrive.</p> <p>Why are the ditches along the flood prone roads not cleared out every year , this used to be done very regularly in years gone by and although it wouldn't stop flooding completely cleared out, rubbish free ditches , would provide a little extra wriggle room before the water overflowed out of them.</p> <p>It has become glaringly obvious that we need an easier on / off access to the bypass, maybe one that starts and stops on Barrow road around the slash lane area, taking traffic up and over slash lane and Mountsorrel lane directly to the bypass making life so much easier for Sileby and barrow, the traffic volumes travelling through our villages during times of flooding are quite horrendous and with all the new houses being built in Sileby this will</p>	<p><b>LCC Highways</b></p> <p>Highway gullies are cleared periodically on either a 10- or 20-month frequency. It is not possible to programme all for the autumn/winter months, there are 136000 throughout the county that are cleansed periodically through the year.</p> <p><b>LCC Food Risk Management Team</b></p> <p>Ditches are predominantly the responsibility of the adjacent landowners.</p> <p>Maintenance of the roadside ditches (in many cases) are the responsibility of the adjacent landowner to maintain and keep clear. As stated in question 16, any ditches of concern should be raised with us at <a href="mailto:Flooding@leics.gov.uk">Flooding@leics.gov.uk</a> to investigate.</p>

	only increase to a ridiculous amount causing more commuter misery in the very near future.	
22	It has become glaringly obvious that we need an easier on / off access to the bypass, maybe one that starts and stops on Barrow road around the slash lane area, taking traffic up and over slash lane and Mountsorrel lane directly to the bypass making life so much easier for Sileby and barrow, the traffic volumes travelling through our villages during times of flooding are quite horrendous and with all the new houses being built in Sileby this will only increase to a ridiculous amount causing more commuter misery in the very near future.	<p><b>LCC Highways</b></p> <p>Slash Lane is constructed on a flood plain. The cost of reconstructing and raising the road is prohibitive, as would be the displacement of any water that the roads currently attenuates in times of flooding.</p>
23	Can the Environment Agency provide some information on future predicted flooding and whether similar ran patterns prior to 1st October will result in similar flooding events	<p><b>EA</b></p> <p>In January 2016, Defra announced that the UK Climate Projections will have a major upgrade to make sure decision-makers have the most up-to-date information on the future of our climate. The UKCP18 project has built upon UKCP09 to provide crucial information about how we can expect our climate to change over future decades. This information will help decision-makers to assess the full range of risks from the changing climate and consider how to increase their resilience to those changes.</p> <p>Climate change allowances are predictions of anticipated change for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• peak river flow</li> <li>• peak rainfall intensity</li> <li>• sea level rise</li> <li>• offshore wind speed and extreme wave height</li> </ul> <p>They are based on UK climate change projections. There are different allowances for different epochs or periods of time over the next century.</p> <p>The impact of climate change is considered in river models to provide an understanding of flood risk today and into the</p>

		<p>future. We have secured funding for development of a river model of Sileby Brook in 2020/21 and this will include climate change scenarios.</p> <p>Given the range of variables associated with a specific flood event it is difficult to compare one event, or one rainfall event, with another. The river model will be calibrated against the recent flood events to ensure that the results it provides are benchmarked against known flooding.</p>
24	How much has been spent on the maintenance of the Brook since 1999	<p><b>EA</b></p> <p>This figure is part of a much wider scheme. Should you wish to pursue an exact figure for maintenance of the brook specifically, please contact us at EMDEnquiries who will request that the relevant teams look into this.</p>
25	Can a decision be made on whether a 'hard closure' of Slash Lane is possible or other measures to encourage drivers not to attempt driving through flood waters?	<p><b>Highways</b> There is no plan for a hard closure, revised signing arrangements are still under investigation.</p>
26	Can you provide Out of Hours number for LCC Highways and Charnwood BC?	<p>LCC Highways Out of Hours Highway Emergencies 07860 569136. CBC Out of Hours: 01509 634565</p>
27		
28		
29		
30		