

BFAP COMPARTMENT 25b – Barsham Marshes		
CONSULTEE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Beccles Caxton Piscatorial Society		
<i>Environment</i>	We believe that the proposals for the gates for the flow of water at the end of Barsham drain are not suitable, the reason for the clubs objection is that we believe that on a very low tide the water would empty from the drain and not refill as it currently does by the tide, thus creating a low water table for the fish stocks, which are numerous. You need to look at the amount of water that runs through the drain to see if this replenishes.	We have looked into this issue and have come up with a possible solution of a small water control structure immediately behind the flapgates. We would like to meet to discuss. The project's primary aim is flood alleviation and this is what we are contractually bound to ensure. Therefore the flap gates must be re-instated to their former working condition and the spillway must be raised to provide an appropriate defence level.
	I would like to see a survey done on Barsham Brook, as we believe that it is so silted up due to flood water and is getting worse. It would be beneficial to all parties if Barsham Brook was dredged to its original depth, allowing flood water to pass through. Please check water levels before renewing gates at bottom of the brook. It would be sad to see this environment ruined due to not the correct survey done.	Maintenance of this stretch of the Brook is the responsibility of the IDB. We will discuss with them their proposed maintenance works. There may be some opportunity for cooperation on de-silting works.
BDS		
<i>Ecology</i>	Having considered these plans carefully, the BDS can once again appreciate the need for work throughout this compartment. However, the River Waveney and surrounding grazing marshes in the vicinity of Barsham are known breeding areas for the endangered Norfolk Hawker, <i>Aeshna isosceles</i> , and for the Scarce Chaser, <i>Libellula fulva</i> . The former species is protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, whilst the latter is a nationally scarce species. The BDS would like to suggest that if such surveys have not already been completed, then comprehensive surveys for both dragonfly species should be carried out prior to any flood defence works. In addition, measures should be taken to safeguard these two species and their breeding habitat, especially in areas adjacent to proposed setback and close to any site access routes. In particular, care should be taken to maintain present water levels and to preserve the clarity and low pollution levels of the grazing marsh dyke system.	In late June/early July BESL Environment staff undertook surveys for dragonflies within the Barsham Marshes, examining flying behavior along both marsh and soke dykes. Individuals of both the Norfolk Hawker and Scarce Chaser were observed during the surveys: Norfolk Hawker: A number of Norfolk Hawker individuals were observed to be flying, copulating and egg-laying on both the marsh and soke dykes in the western half of the compartment. The favoured dykes for breeding activity varied in width between 1.5 and 6 metres. Preference seemed to be based on the associated macrophyte communities - preferred dykes generally had a rich submerged macrophyte community, together with a reasonable cover of emergents, most noticeably branched bur-reed (<i>Sparganium erectum</i>), but also greater bladderwort (<i>Utricularia vulgaris</i>). No specimens of water soldier (<i>Stratiotes aloides</i>) were observed during the survey; it is presumed that branched bur-reed and bladderwort provides an alternative plant for larvae to use for emergence, in dykes of good water quality. Scarce Chaser: A number of males, including those with breeding scars, were observed flying along the dykes. T For both species, observations appeared relatively strongly associated with the submergent dyke end classes of BESL has used the results of the survey to influence its approach to the design of the flood defence works in Cor We are satisfied that the phased approach of the works within the Waveney valley will allow populations of both s BESL will be happy to provide the BDS with a full copy of the survey records.
Broads Authority		
<i>Ecology</i>	As with other compartments we would be keen to walk through this compartment with BESL officers to consider and agree the level of tree/scrub clearance that will be carried out.	A preliminary walk over has been conducted with Robert Savage and Adrian Clarke. They are therefore fully aware of proposals. A specific tree/scrub clearance walkover will be arranged shortly before work commences in November 2006.
	We would be interested to discuss the results of the flora and fauna surveys you propose to carry out and any mitigation measures that will be required. We would also be keen to discuss the potential for enhancements for otters in this compartment.	The results of the ecological surveys are now available and will be summarised in the Environmental Statement. We have also identified potential otter holt creation sites in conjunction with landowners.
<i>Navigation</i>	We would like to agree detailed specifications for all erosion protection works and channel marking with BESL.	Yes, we will be happy to discuss this. EP will be detailed on the planning drawings and it is intended that it will be similar to that constructed between Beccles and Oulton Broad.
<i>Environment</i>	We would like to agree detailed specifications for all piling works with BESL – including fendering, safety features and surfacing.	Yes, we will be happy to discuss this. All Piling ancillary works are now constructed to comply with the BESL Navigation Safety Best Practice note.
	We would be interested to have detailed discussions with BESL on the potential for the use of BA dredgings in the flood defence works in this compartment.	We are unable to use the recently dredged material at Geldeston due to haulage costs.
	We would be particularly keen to explore the possibility of creating a circular walk, linked to the Angles Way Long Distance Path, in the downstream end of the compartment. There is some potential for a route running from the current EA owned car park near Puddingmoor upstream to Barsham Brook. We would like to discuss this in detail with the EA/BESL and feel that there is also some scope for formalising the angling which currently takes place in the compartment upstream of the leisure plots at Puddingmoor.	The angling and permissive path enhancements are both being progressed by BESL, BA and the EA.
Broads Society		
<i>Ecology</i>	As in other parts of the Waveney we would like BESL to do whatever is possible about mink.	There is a recently established Broads Mink Management Project and BESL will be contributing towards its work.
<i>General</i>	We are pleased to note that it is not intended to use gabions and feel that to be (it is) essential; any erosion protection should be marked until there is a good growth of vegetation. There should be no working on Sunday or Bank Holidays.	Comment noted This will be the case.
	Once again we are of the opinion that on the proposed piling the waling, capping and back rail should be recycled plastic, rather than timber; experience throughout Broadland has shown that timber walings do not last so the plastic, although more expensive initially, gives a better return in the long term. Waling on the piling to be retained should be refurbished.	We have looked into recycled plastic capping. However we have had great difficulty in finding a company who could extrude the required shape. Therefore at this stage timber cappings are proposed.
<i>Environment</i>	We are concerned that nothing appears to be considered for the undefended areas on this river, e.g. Beccles and Gillingham, although we understand that proposals for Brundall are well advanced.	Beccles has no properties that are currently 'undefended'. Properties near the river on the Gillingham side are currently under review. The works at Brundall are now underway.
Countryside Agency		
	We wish to rely on the involvement and comments of the Broads Authority staff who are well acquainted with the details of this project, and do not wish to comment ourselves, but thank you for the information and the opportunity to comment.	Comment noted
English Nature		
<i>Ecology</i>	The application site is adjacent to Geldeston Meadows SSSI, a component of Broadland SPA and The Broads SAC. On the basis of the information provided, the proposals do not appear likely to have a significant effect on the features of interest of the designated site, therefore English Nature does not object to these proposals.	Comment noted
Lower Waveney Internal Drainage Board		
<i>Environment</i>	I have two points to make on behalf of the IDB. The first is that the Board wishes to investigate the possibility of re-instating the sluice at 3776 metres. I understand that the question of this sluice was raised in the course of meetings with landowners and that it was made clear that BESL would not pay for the reinstatement/repair but that this was a matter for the IDB. That is understood and I should be grateful if you would please ask Edmund Nuttall Limited if they are prepared to provide a quotation for reinstatement of the sluice as part of the works that will be carried out. I understand that a proposal has been made for a pen stock coupled with the flap door but it may be the cheapest option for this would be for the work to be carried out at the same time as the bank strengthening and if you provide a quotation the Board can then consider whether this would should be done now. It may be that the Board would wish to defer doing this work having fairly recently incurred the expense of installing a new pump and it should be noted that the existing head walls should not be compromised as part of your works in the event the Board decide to re-instate the sluice at a later date. The second point concerns the sluice doors at the end of the Barsham Brook which currently do not work. It is understood that BESL will be renewing these doors so that the Barsham Brook discharges into the river as originally intended rather than the embanked section being tidal as at present. Please confirm this work is to be incorporated into your programme.	The headwalls will be retained as part of the improvement works. We will be happy to provide a quotation for this additional work. Yes, the flap gates at the end of Barsham Brook are to be renewed as part of the improvement works.
Norfolk County Council		
<i>Archaeology</i>	As a point of reference according to the 1st series OS map there was a mill in the area of grid ref: TM 401909. I am just flagging it up so that you are aware in case you come across anything on the ground during works.	We have marked this site on the construction drawings and it will be checked as part of the archaeological watching brief.
Suffolk County Council		
	No issues to raise concerning the proposed works in Compartment 25b	
Waveney Anglers		
<i>Angling</i>	The Environment Agency has an angler's car park still at Puddingmoor for access to Barsham Marshes. Currently the access is for walking is very poor and a deviating route. This could be improved.	The Broads Authority and the Environment Agency have identified an area of riverbank upstream of the Puddingmoor leisure plots as an area for the possible provision of half a dozen angling platforms. In addition, the Broads Authority have identified the need to improve access in general within the Barsham Marshes through the provision of a permissive footpath route along the bank from the car park to the floodbank and then along the bank to the IDB pump house. From here, a permissive route along the embanked Barsham Brook to the Angles Way Long Distance Footpath which would allow for the creation of a circular walk. The proposed flood defence improvement works will contribute towards any future permissive footpath through the provision of a level floodbank crest 2m wide on average which can be easily maintained. Any formalising of access would benefit anglers through opening up further stretches of bank previously unacceptable.
	This water used to host 40 plus/peg matches but is so overgrown now it is largely unfishable. May we hope for half a dozen good places?	See above
<i>Ecology</i>	This will be something like 7 miles of reed loss for nesting birds and all the food it provides around Beccles.	This is not the case. There will only be a temporary loss during construction and existing reed rhizomes will be stockpiled and for use in the new soke dykes or translocated directly. Reeds will soon re-establish whilst suitable habitat is also provided along the rond and within internal dykes unaffected by the works.
<i>General</i>	At no time when attending consultation meetings did you say would be a "black asphalt" look to the banks. This looks appalling at Beccles in anything but high tide although I know the rhizomes are supposed to grow through. No doubt it is strong though.	It is a strong material and initially has a stark black appearance. However, reeds will grow through this and before long it will no longer be visible. It does provide a strong protection to the banks and prevents further loss of rond through erosion.
	Is it not possible that all this water retention in a flash flood will spill over at Beccles Quay, where the level is not being changed, and creep in from behind? A normal high tide now goes over the top here regularly.	Hydraulic modelling has been carried out and this shows no significant water level rise at Beccles due to the bank improvement works.
Waveney District Council		
	No objection	
Mr LH Bannister		
<i>Environmental</i>	In general I welcome the scheme, disappointed that it is only to 1995 levels (1-7 flooding). Barsham level is the first walled and pumped level. When upstream is flooded to a width of at least half a mile the water has to get into the banked river of say 30 metres. This means there is no tidal drop for days, and overtopping may last for days, rather than downstream where overtopping may last for only 1 hour at the top of the tide. It is this long period of overtopping that takes the back out of the wall leading to a breach. I have endeavoured to keep the wall grazed by cattle to encourage a grass sward to delay the effect of overtopping. I would want to see the new wall grassed and grazed as now.	The contract has been set up to provide the 1995 levels of floodbanks. The reason for this is to maintain traditional flooding patterns. However the proposed works will see a significant improvement in bank heights and also will see banks re-shaped to improve their overall stability. Therefore the scheme should have significant beneficial effects for this area. The improved walls will be grassed and light grazing is encouraged to keep the sward healthy.
	I do not like the profile of the proposed soke dykes - shallow and wide - as the dyke bottom would be raw peat and cattle would sink in whilst drinking with little hope of getting out if they cannot swim to areas where they can climb out. It is the practice use the soke dyke as the main drainage channel to the pump, shallow drains would not carry the water quick enough.	Thank you for this comment. This detail has now been changed and we plan to excavate all new soke dykes to the same depth as the existing adjacent dykes
	Large willows need to be removed or pollarded that grow on the wall as they heave and loosen the wall in high winds ("A" in enclosed map).	Trees on the bank will be removed according to the agreed BA/BESL tree clearance note.

	I think the sluice at "B" on enclosed map should be reinstated. The concrete walls and pipes are in good condition, the need is for a penstock and tidal door to release flood water. Barsham has been flooded six times in 15 years (1 in 2 and a half years) the worst of these in 2001 took 6 weeks to pump the water off. Even with 1 in 7 year design, the recent rises in electricity cost to pump would be too much for todays fragile agriculture to bear, I consider this sluice vital for Barshams long term future.	BESL could provide assistance with this refurbishment and new sluice gate installation. However because this is a land drainage issue the provision of the new gates would be an IDB responsibility. Please refer to the comments from the IDB.
Mrs B Suckling		
<i>Environment</i>	The shallow and wide new dykes are dangerous to cattle, especially on our level where the soil is virtually all peat. Cattle can not paddle out of peat and water in which they flounder and get bogged down.	Thankyou for this comment. This detail has now been changed and we plan to excavate all new soke dykes to the same depth as the existing adjacent dykes
	I welcome the scheme but regret that its base is 1995. Flood risks, with global warming surely this is a risky base to start from. From the cross sections shown the new flood bank is barely raised although the precautions against erosion are very welcome. We seem to flood every 2 and a half years and it takes 3-4 days to clear with the pumping station going at full rate.	Although 1995 is used as the base in compartment 25b, level records show that there is 30mm/year settlement rate. As such existing bank levels are significantly lower than they were in 1995. This scheme will not only return the banks to this level but will also build up the banks in order to allow for the settlement which will occur over the next 10 years. (after this date re-leveling will be carried out and topping up will be carried out as necessary)
	The flood banks need to be grazed to hold the peaty soil which would be washed away in a matter of minutes, this could gain us a few hours before low tide for example.	Floodbanks can be grazed once established. We agree that grazing helps maintain the protective sward of grass.
	The set back scheme which concerns me particularly takes away much grazing and ESA payments. Would it be possible to fill in the existing dyke and graze it?	The setback scheme is for long term sustainability. The existing soke dyke will be filled in to allow the setback bank to be built. In most places the new bank will sit over where the existing soke dyke is located. However, there will be a net loss of grazing marsh and compensation will be paid for this.