

Infiltration Reduction Plan Lower Nailbourne

August 2021
Version 3.1



from
**Southern
Water** 

Contents

Contents	1
Document Control	1
Glossary	3
1. Background	4
2. Groundwater Infiltration at Nailbourne	6
2.1. The significance of groundwater infiltration at Nailbourne.	6
3. Investigation & repairs	8
3.1. Outline Plans to Investigate Sources of Infiltration	8
3.2. Investigation and Repairs in the Newnham Valley	8
4. Over-pumping	10
4.1. Circumstances that lead to over-pumping	10
4.2. Steps to prevent discharges and alternatives to over-pumping	11
4.3. Over-pumping arrangements (flow rates and minimisation of effect on watercourse)	11
4.4. Steps to minimise the volume and duration of over-pumping	12
4.4.1. Tankering	12
4.4.2. Over-pumping	12
4.5. 3rd Party Communications about over-pumping	13
4.6. Monitoring quality of the downstream watercourse	13
5. OPTIONS TO REDUCE INFILTRATION	14
5.2. Property Level Protection	14
5.3. Local Flow Control	14
5.4. Pumping Stations	14
5.5. Control Structure	14
5.6. Monitoring	15
6. ACTION PLANS	17
Appendix	26

Document Control

Format	Version	Date	Prepared by (Author)	Reviewed by	Approved by
Full Nailbourne	D1	Sept 2013	MWH	Graham Purvis	Graham Purvis
Full Nailbourne	2	6 January 2014	Richard Andrews	Graham Purvis	Martin Banks
Full Nailbourne	2.1	21 February 2014	P Kent		
Full Nailbourne	3.0	24 March 2014	André Bougard	Paul Kent	Richard Andrews
Full Nailbourne	4.0	August 2014	André Bougard	Paul Kent	Graham Purvis
Full Nailbourne	5.0	8 October 2014	Richard Andrews	André Bougard	Paul Kent
Full Nailbourne	6.0	21 November 2014	Richard Andrews	André Bougard	Paul Kent
Full Nailbourne	6.1	4 December 2014	Richard Andrews	Paul Kent	Mark Thompson
Full Nailbourne	6.2	8 December 2014	Richard Andrews	Paul Kent	Mark Thompson
Full Nailbourne	7.0	10 February 2016	Matthew Sadie	Richard Andrews	Paul Kent
Full Nailbourne	7.1	February 2017	Richard Andrews	Mike James	Graham Purvis
Full Nailbourne	8.0	January 2020	Keith Savage	Kaylass Ramlagan	Andrew Adams
Lower Nailbourne	1.0	June 2021	Richard Dow	Keith Savage	Andrew Adams
Lower Nailbourne	2.0	July 2021	Richard Dow	Keith Savage	Andrew Adams
Lower Nailbourne	3.0	August 2021	Richard Dow	Keith Savage	Andrew Adams

Glossary

AMP – Asset Management Programme
CCTV - Closed-circuit television
EA - Environment Agency
GW – Ground Water
IRP - Infiltration Reduction Plans
l/s - litres per second
MH – Manhole
RPS - Regulatory Position Statement
SW – Southern Water
WaSC - Water and Sewerage Companies
WC – Water Closet
WPS - Wastewater Pumping Station
WTW - Wastewater Treatment Works

1. Background

This Infiltration Reduction Plan (IRP) for Lower Nailbourne in the Newnham Valley catchment has been prepared in response to the Environment Agency's (EA) Regulatory Position Statement (RPS). SW has been carrying out work for many years to survey and repair sources of infiltration in the catchment for Newnham Valley Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) in Kent.

Figure 1 shows flows to Newnham Valley WTW. In this area flows from Barham gravitate northwards through Kingston, Bishopsbourne, and Bridge. The resultant flow gravitates in a north-easterly direction to School Lane WPS in Bekesbourne from where it is pumped to Newnham Valley Works.

Flows from Littlebourne gravitate to Nargate St WPS from where it is pumped to join the gravity flow downstream of the rising main from School Lane WPS. The resultant flow gravitates in a north-easterly direction to Newnham Valley WTW in Preston. Sewage flows from adjacent sub-catchments to the north and east are also received by Newnham Valley WTW.

The repairs carried out by SW improve the integrity of the sewerage system. SW has been working with the following organisations and is dependent on their support to achieve the objective of reducing non-sewage flows into the sewers.

- Environment Agency,
- Kent County Council,
- Canterbury City Council
- Shepway District Council
- Little Stour & Nailbourne River Management Group

Southern Water has consulted with representatives of these parties in the meetings of the Little Stour & Nailbourne Multi-Agency Group and also, through the river management group, with all of the local parish councils.




Figure 1 - Representation of the sewerage system for the Nailbourne in the Newnham Valley WTW catchment

2. Groundwater Infiltration at Nailbourne

2.1. The significance of groundwater infiltration at Nailbourne.

Nailbourne is one of a number of areas in Southern Water's operating area where, during excessively wet winters, customers have been inconvenienced by the effects of groundwater infiltration into sewers. Such effects can include flooding and restricted toilet use (RTU).

Southern Water strives to maintain services for customers by a programme of investigation, repair, maintenance and mitigation. Mitigation measures include the use of tankers and over-pumping. Such mitigation measures are not sustainable. Since 2013 SW has invested £1.65m carrying out major improvements to the integrity of the sewers and manholes in the vicinity of the Nailbourne in order to minimise the occasions on which over-pumping is required.

2.2. What would happen if Southern Water did not take action?

Despite the significant groundwater flow through the valley during these conditions, incidents of sewer flooding have been relatively infrequent. Table 2.1 below show reported incidents of sewer flooding since April 2000.

A hydraulic model of the Newnham Valley was developed in 2014 to understand the performance of the system and determine options to address risks. However, SW is aware from historical reports of the villages and properties which are likely to be the first to suffer from the effects of flooding.

Table 2.1 shows that there has been three reported instances of internal sewer flooding since 2009, all of which occurred in winter 2013/14 - the wettest winter on record. Incidents of External Flooding and Restricted Toilet Use (RTU) occurred more frequently; external flooding has been reported on 32 occasions since April 2000 and restricted toilet use, 17 times. Again, it can be seen that most of these incidents occurred in the winter of 2013/14. The groundwater levels in 2020/21 were comparable to those that occurred in 2013/14 and it is noted that 7 properties reported restricted toilet use during this period. However, far fewer incidents of flooding and RTU were reported overall in 20/21 compared to 13/14 which does suggest that the sewer sealing work undertaken to date continues to be effective.

Table 2.1 – Reported Flooding Incidents by Category, in Newnham Valley Catchment

Year	External Flooding	Internal Flooding	Restricted Toilet Use	Total
2009_2010	1	0	0	1
2010_2011	1	0	2	3
2011_2012	0	0	0	0
2012_2013	4	0	0	4
2013_2014	19	3	14	36
2014_2015	2	0	1	3
2015_2016	1	0	0	1
2016_2017	0	0	0	0
2017_2018	0	0	0	0
2018_2019	0	0	0	0
2019_2020	2	0	0	2
2020_2021	3	0	7	10
Totals	33	3	24	60

3. Investigation & repairs

3.1. Outline Plans to Investigate Sources of Infiltration

The Generic Plan describes Southern Water's Infiltration Reduction process. The specifics of the investigations and repairs at Nailbourne are captured in Section 3.2 below, and includes the following elements:

- Manhole Inspections and CCTV Surveys
- Flow Monitoring Surveys
- Manhole and Sewer Repairs
- Follow-Up Surveys and Repairs

3.2. Investigation and Repairs in the Newnham Valley

Groundwater infiltration into sewers has been a long-running issue for the villages by the Nailbourne. SW has been making significant investments over many years to minimise infiltration and the need for over-pumping.

SW recently completed a major programme of survey and repairs to the sewers in the Nailbourne catchment. The investigations and repairs followed the process set out in the Generic Plan. The timing and status of each step is in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 – Summary of Survey and Repairs at Nailbourne Villages and Environs

Step.	Description	Approx Date	Status
1.	Manhole lifting followed by CCTV Investigation	Spring 2013	Completed
3.	Determination of required repairs	Spring/ Summer 2013	Completed
5a.	Dry Weather Flow Survey	July 2013 – August 2013	Completed
4.	Repairs – [refer to plans in Appendix A]	September 2013 - January 2014	Complete
5b.	Wet Weather Flow Survey	May 2014 – June 2014	Completed
7a.	Property Level Protection	October 2014	Completed
6.	Targeted follow up survey (Bishopsbourne)	Spring 2014	Complete
7b.	Targeted Repairs (Bishopsbourne)	Autumn 2014	Complete
6a.	Further Targeted Survey	April 2015	Complete
7c.	Further Targeted Repairs: repair of sewers at Bourne Cottages, Bishopsbourne & relining of sewers at Brewery Lane, Bridge	December 2015/ April 2016/Autumn 2019	Complete

Step.	Description	Approx Date	Status
8.	Long term system winter monitoring	Commences each year	Ongoing
9.	Further surveys and subsequent repairs	Summer 2021 – Spring 2022	Planned

Since the conception of the infiltration reduction plan CCTV surveys of 10.7km of public sewer have been completed and in excess of 250 manholes inspected. Repairs to sewers and manholes where infiltration was found to be occurring have been sealed. This amounted 3.6km of sewer and 10 manholes. Root cutting also took place to maintain appropriate flow along the sewage network.

In addition to physical investigations on site, SW has instigated a programme of monitoring flows in critical catchments, including the Nailbourne catchment. Further details are given in Section 5.6.

Flow monitoring (Step 5 in Figure 3.1 of the Generic Plan document) was carried out both in dry weather conditions (18th July to 15th August 2013) to establish baseline flows, and in wet weather conditions (21st May to 18th June 2014). Good data was obtained from these surveys which was subsequently used for validation of a hydraulic model of the Nailbourne catchment.

4. Over-pumping

4.1. Circumstances that lead to over-pumping

Since 2013, SW has made significant investment to reduce infiltration and to protect specific properties at risk of flooding, with the objective of reducing the frequency of discharges to watercourses.

In January 2013, prior to the start of the major reinstatement work, pumps needed to be turned on when the groundwater level measured at Little Bucket reached 78.5m. In January 2014, after completion of major repairs, over-pumps were only required when the groundwater level reached 81.3m. In February 2015, when the level reached 84.7m, tankers needed to be deployed at Bishopsbourne, but over pumps were not required despite the Little Bucket groundwater level being more than 5m higher than when pumps were required in Jan 2013 and over 3m higher than when pumps were required in Jan 2014. This demonstrates the effectiveness of SW's investment to reduce infiltration and thus to reduce the requirement for discharges.

However, despite the investment, following prolonged wet weather, to maintain services and avoid significant spills, SW expects that there will continue to be an occasional need to remove excess flow from the network. This goes to show the difficulty in fully resolving infiltrating sewers due to the scale, complexity and ownership of the different parts of the holistic network.

Based on experience in 2014 and 2015, over-pumping could be expected to be required when the groundwater level at Little Bucket borehole exceeds 85m (in Feb/ March 2015, groundwater levels peaked at 85.0m and over-pumping was not required). However, to allow time for investigation and preparation, SW has historically retained a 'trigger level' of 78.5m in the winter planning report.

Due to the success of the repairs, tankering and/or overpumping is now only required at higher groundwater levels, therefore the trigger level has been raised to 80.0m. Whilst SW would not expect to start physical measures such as tankers or pumps at that level, the purpose of the 'trigger level' is to trigger actions to prepare for an appropriate response. Refer to Section 4.2 below - 'Steps to prevent discharges and alternatives to over-pumping'.

Figure 4.1 shows the groundwater levels recorded at Little Bucket since 2012. Pumping was required in 2012/13 and 2013/14, and tankering in 2014/15 with some repair activities in 2013/14 and 2014/15. Tankering was used for one day in February 2016, but only as a precautionary measure. From February 2016 to end 2019 the groundwater levels did not rise above circa 75m AOD and no tankering was required. However in both winter/spring 2020 and 2021 the groundwater levels recorded at Little Bucket peaked at around 87mAOD and tankering was required. The peaks recorded in these two groundwater seasons are the highest cumulative recordings in the time that infiltration has been tracked to this level of detail.




Figure 4.1 - Groundwater levels from 2012 to 2021

The details of where tankering and over-pumping has been necessary in the past are given in Appendix B. The repairs carried out, combined with the winter preparation checks, are expected to minimise the number of locations where over-pumping would be required. However, as a consequence of repairs and potentially other factors outside SW’s control (such as the severity of the weather), the hydraulics may dictate that over-pumps are required at other locations either in place of, or in addition to, the sites described in Appendix B.

4.2. Steps to prevent discharges and alternatives to over-pumping

Since 2013, SW has undertaken extensive surveys and repaired sewers and manholes where infiltration had been found (the extent of the work is shown in Appendix A, and summarised in Section 3.2). This built on the repairs that had been carried out in previous years (listed at the end of Appendix A).

Following the main repairs, property level protection was installed in 2014, and further targeted repairs were completed. In addition to this work, SW also carries out other activities to minimise the requirement for discharges to watercourses.

4.3. Over-pumping arrangements (flow rates and minimisation of effect on watercourse)

A typical arrangement of an over-pumping setup is provided in Appendix A of the Generic Plan.

The locations where tankering and over-pumping has been used in recent years are shown in Appendix B. These locations were effective in restoring service to customers and are the default locations should the situation re-present itself. Dates of historic tankering and over-pumping are also provided in Appendix B.

In addition to the measures described above to remove solid matter, SW invested in ten portable biological treatment units in January 2014 for use at flooded areas throughout its area. Units were used in the Newnham Valley. They were trialled to enhance the quality of the water discharged to the watercourse at the following locations:

- Nargate Street WPS, Littlebourne
- School Lane WPS, Bekesbourne
- Valley Road, Barham

The main benefit of the biological treatment units was that the dilute effluent was aerated, thus reducing the biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) on the receiving water.

4.4. Steps to minimise the volume and duration of over-pumping

The Generic Plan outlines a detailed rationale behind the use of tankers and over-pumping, and summarises the generic benefits and disadvantages. Some specific issues in relation to the Nailbourne catchment are captured below.

4.4.1. Tankering

Benefits:

- See Generic Plan.

Disadvantages

- The flow rate is low (approx. 2l/s per tanker over a 24 hour period). *Tankers operating at Bishopsbourne discharge at School Lane WPS and Canterbury WTW - round trips of an average of approximately 2 hours including loading and discharging.

4.4.2. Over-pumping

Benefits:

- Typical pump fuel consumption is 20% of the fuel that one tanker would use in a day.
- The discharge rate is significantly greater. A 150mm (6 inch) pump will discharge typically 50 to 80l/s; the equivalent of a fleet of 24 tankers.

Disadvantages

- Visual impact of over-pumping equipment in the Kent Downs Area of Natural Beauty

The graph in Figure 4.2 shows the estimated carbon emission per m³ of dilute effluent removed by tanker and by pump. In this example, data has been used for tankers and the 6 inch pump at Bishopsbourne in 2014. Data for the tankers is taken as an average of the 2,000 gallon and 3,000 gallon tankers used.




Figure 4.2 – Carbon Footprint figures for Tankers and Over-pumps per m³ of effluent removed.

4.5. 3rd Party Communications about over-pumping

Since the start of the Infiltration Reduction Programme in 2013, Southern Water has been proactive in communicating with stakeholders and customers in the Newnham Valley about planned and completed work to improve the integrity of the sewerage system. Stakeholders have been kept informed of progress on survey and sealing work via emails and or face-to-face meetings.

SW attends and convenes meetings with a number of local groups. In particular the Multi-Agency Group was influential in helping to shape the IRP. During the flooding of 2013/14 SW had representatives on site who visited affected customers to help them. The latest version of the IRP approved by the EA, will be published on SW's website.

Despite the work being undertaken, if over-pumping is required, the location of advisory signs near the over-pumps is also provided in Appendix B. The Generic Plan provides more detailed arrangements around over-pumping.

From time to time, SW updates stakeholders about completed and planned work. The most recent meeting was held in October 2019 with the chair of the Nailbourne Flood Action Group.

4.6. Monitoring quality of the downstream watercourse

The Generic Plan provides details of water quality monitoring that will be undertaken, should over-pumping be required.

5. OPTIONS TO REDUCE INFILTRATION

5.1. Sewer Rehabilitation Programme

SW acknowledges that infiltration reduction is an on-going process. Since 2013, SW has invested £1.65 million in surveys and repairs at Nailbourne. The major repair work was completed in 2013, property level protection and pump replacement at School Lane WPS was completed in 2014 and in December 2015 to April 2016 further targeted repairs were completed. However, on a company-wide basis, to ensure that benefit continues to be gained from the work that has been done, SW is continuing the programme of infiltration reduction investment. Additional localised repairs have been completed in Elham and Bishopsbourne in 2017 to 2019. No known repairs identified from historical surveys are outstanding.

5.2. Property Level Protection

During 2014, SW installed six non-return valves protecting seven properties. There are no plans currently to install any more NRVs, but the potential benefit of further property level protection will be considered if it is considered to be required for any further vulnerable properties.

5.3. Local Flow Control

As noted in Section 4.1 despite groundwater levels having risen higher in early 2015, than they had in early 2013, overpumping was not required. Localised tankering was required in February and March 2015 to remove the groundwater from the sewer at Bishopsbourne to protect services for a few customers. SW has identified that whilst the sewers in Bishopsbourne were significantly surcharged, levels in manholes further upstream were not. Consequently SW fabricated, and fitted, a throttle upstream of Bishopsbourne village. This was fitted during March 2016; levels in the sewer in Bishopsbourne fell sufficiently that within a few days tankering could be stopped. As expected, upstream of the throttle, sewer levels rose, but did not cause any problems. The throttle was removed when levels returned to normal.

5.4. Pumping Stations

Pump refurbishments were completed in October 2014 at School Lane WPS in Bekesbourne, the largest pumping station in the Newnham Valley catchment. This will help to ensure that the design discharge continues to be reliably delivered.

5.5. Control Structure

SW is committed to reducing the frequency with which over-pumping will be required. The work carried out since 2013 has improved the resilience of the sewerage system, making it less susceptible to the effects of high groundwater levels. SW is minimising the flow into the sewers through its rehabilitation programme, ensuring that the pumping stations deliver the design flows and that vulnerable properties are protected. Despite these measures, there will still be occasions during severe weather when the flow into the sewerage system exceeds its capacity. On those occasions, the surplus has to be disposed of.

If tankers are not adequate to remove the excess flow, discharges to the watercourse will be required.

Southern Water accepts the need to reduce the frequency of over-pumping, so investigated other options to reduce the need to tanker and to eliminate overpumping directly to the stream. One option considered was a bio retention pond. The objective was to remove dilute effluent at a critical location if flow in the sewer exceeds a set 'pass forward' rate. Proposals were developed for this option in 2018. The objective was to ensure that during times of unusually high levels of groundwater infiltration, customers would be able to retain use of their sewerage facilities, whilst also ensuring that the effluent did not cause detriment to the watercourse. The option was developed through outline design stage and the concept was for overpumping from the sewer to a bio-retention pond where dilute flow would infiltrate into the ground. However, on wider stakeholder discussion the location of the bio retention pond would need to be sited quite a distance from the watercourse. This caused the installation cost to increase significantly to a point where the option was no longer viable. The current plan is to therefore continue to address the root cause of the issue by surveying and sealing the public sewer network whilst identifying other potential methods of reducing the reliance on tankering.

5.6. Monitoring

The Nailbourne catchment is one of ten locations, where groundwater levels have been monitored via electronic data since January 2015. This monitoring helps inform SW's response, in terms of when tankering and over-pumping are required. The Generic Plan has more detail on the overall monitoring strategy.

The graph below, in Figure 5.1, is an example of those used for predicting the earliest, average, and latest dates for when the trigger levels are forecast to be breached. This graph shows groundwater levels and an indication of flows.




Figure 5.1 – Forecasting of Trigger Dates

In addition to the groundwater flooding forecasts explained above, SW is also looking at longer-term trends to monitor the effectiveness of the completed rehabilitation work.

Figure 5.2 shows the groundwater levels at Little Bucket Farm borehole plotted against flows to Newnham Valley WTW. Note that Newnham Valley WTW is located in the Nailbourne catchment, downstream of the

major repair works. However, it also processes sewage discharged from two adjacent sub-catchments. (Refer to the Background Section for a description of the catchments feeding Newnham Valley WTW). Thus the flows from the Nailbourne sub-catchment, form a part of the total flows to Newnham Valley WTW.

Figure 5.2 quantitatively illustrates how flow varies with groundwater levels. It is reasonable that as groundwater levels increase, the rate of infiltration increases. Data points prior to the major repairs are plotted in blue: (Dec 2009 – Aug 2013). The data points for the period after major repairs (Jan 2014 – Jun 2021) are plotted in orange. Linear regression lines are also included for each set of data. These give an indication of the difference between average conditions for 'before' and 'after' repairs.




Figure 5.2 – Long Term Monitoring (Dec 2009 to Feb 2021)

The difference in groundwater level between the lines is approximately 1.5 - 3m. In other words, for a given groundwater level, the corresponding flow is lower after the repairs. This confirms that the repair work has been effective.

For the period Dec 2009 to Feb 2021, the graph shows that groundwater levels rose higher after the repairs than they had before. This was due to natural variations in the weather. The maximum groundwater level before the repairs was 81.9 mAOD. After the repairs, groundwater levels at Little Bucket reached 87.2m. Despite these higher groundwater levels, flows to Newnham Valley WTW generally did not increase. Indeed, for the period of time after the repair works, the groundwater levels have been higher than 81.9 mAOD for approximately 18% of the time, yet flows have remained in a similar range to that which existed before.

The analyses outlined above is supported by the information displayed in Figure 4.1. During the winter of 2013/14, over-pumping only had to commence at a groundwater level of 81.3 mAOD. In the winter of 2014/15 over-pumping was not required, and tankering only had to start when the groundwater level reached 84.5 mAOD. In February 2016 tankering was used at Bishopsbourne when the groundwater level reached a level of 78m, but this was only for one day and only as a precautionary measure.

6. ACTION PLANS

A significant amount has been achieved in the Nailbourne catchment in the last seven years. Some actions are ongoing which reflects the continuous improvement process for dealing with infiltration due to groundwater. To make it easy to track progress, the following tables set out the actions to reduce infiltration and also to mitigate the effects of it, if the infiltration cannot be controlled at economic cost. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 cover the actions by SW and by other parties, respectively, to reduce infiltration. Tables 6.3 and 6.4 cover mitigation of the effects of flooding (Communication and other activities).

SW is committed to continuing to pursue infiltration to reduce the frequency of tankering and over-pumping. This IRP describes the work that has been done by SW to improve the situation. In addition, it describes what is being done to monitor flows, the 'winter preparation' work to be carried out to ensure assets are operating correctly, and the work to be developed with other agencies to improve an integrated plan to address flooding.

Colour coding of actions in tables:

- Green – completed
- Orange – imminent action required
- Red – overdue
- White – on-going actions with no specific end dates.

Table 6.1. Southern Water Current Activities to Reduce Groundwater Infiltration

Ref.	Item	Actions	Timescale and Status	Outcomes
1.1	Develop an approach for reduction of infiltration and maintenance of reduced levels of infiltration.	Refer to Section 1 above and the report in Appendix A.	Summer 2013, Complete	The steps are being followed to deliver results.
1.2	'Dry weather' flow surveys (to measure background levels of infiltration during low groundwater periods)	Identify suitable measurement points, carry out survey over four week period in Summer, match rainfall records with flow data.	July/ August 2013 - Complete	Groundwater infiltration is greater than would be expected for summer conditions.
1.3	'Wet weather' flow surveys (to identify remaining areas of infiltration following initial sewer rehabilitation/repair).	Identify suitable measurement points, carry out survey over four week period, match rainfall records with flow data.	May/ June 2014 – Survey complete Analysis - complete	Wet Weather and Dry Weather flow monitoring data used in hydraulic model completed in December 2014.
1.4	CCTV etc survey of sewers	Identify Strategic Manholes, survey manholes to identify clear flow and infiltration. Carry out CCTV survey where clear flow was identified.	<u>Barham to Bekesbourne</u> Summer 2013 – Complete	Identify major sources of infiltration to determine scope of rehabilitation work.

Ref.	Item	Actions	Timescale and Status	Outcomes
1.5	Carry out sewer rehabilitation work	Use various techniques to seal infiltration points in manholes and sewers	Barham to Bokesbourne Autumn 2013 – Complete Bishopsbourne Spring 2017 - Complete	Structural integrity of sewers restored.
1.6	Further surveys (CCTV or alternative techniques), if required, where 'wet weather' flow surveys show areas of high infiltration remaining	Further surveys in areas where high infiltration flows remain.	2015 – Completed Spring 2015 after Tankering at Bishopsbourne	Determine scope and carry out further rehabilitation if identified as required from the survey results.
1.7	Further sewer rehabilitation work, if required, in areas where surveys carried out.	As above, use various techniques to seal infiltration points in manholes and sewers	Summer/Autumn 2015 - Completed work in Bishopsbourne. and Bridge. - [Refer Section 3.2]	Reduced infiltration, leading to reduced requirement for tankers.
1.8	Maintain IRP as a live document	Review text of the IRP and update if appropriate to describe work carried out and/or developments	Annually	To be issued by 30 September each year
1.8a	Maintain IRP as a live document	Review Tables 6.1 to 6.5 and as appropriate amend to show progress on individual activities.	Quarterly	Up to date tables of Actions. To be issued every 3 months following the annual update. End each December, March, June, September
1.9	Consider alternative solutions that involve some risk	Investigate unconventional options such as vacuum sewers or consider conventional combined sewer overflows	2020	Ongoing.

Ref.	Item	Actions	Timescale and Status	Outcomes
1.10	Install Property Level Protection to Vulnerable properties.	Survey and install NRVs at vulnerable properties.	Autumn 2014 - Complete	The aim is that protection to vulnerable properties restricts tankering to those properties only as opposed to more significant sewer pumping.
1.11	Over-pumping Sites: improve effluent quality	Investigate potential for improved screening and basic treatment at points of discharge into watercourse.	SW, Summer/Autumn 2014	Improved arrangements for discharges when required.
1.12	Over-pumping Sites: minimise flow	Add level control to pumps to reduce durations for pumping	SW, 2014, Complete	Establish whether seasonal discharge (s) will be necessary in order to maintain use of sewerage services for customers during periods of very high groundwater levels.
1.12	Standards for emergency discharges	SW to discuss with EA about best practice set up for over-pumping arrangements.	SW, 2014, included in this IRP	Agree with EA acceptable treatment for discharges and acceptable flow rates.
1.13	Flow, location, screening arrangements for emergency discharges	Determine potential flow rates and screening arrangements and most appropriate locations,	SW, included in this IRP	Agree with EA, Canterbury CC, Shepway DC and local Parish Councils acceptable arrangements for future emergency discharges.
1.14	Action Plans	Develop SW action plans documenting set up of pumps, tankers, etc. for emergency situations.	SW, Summer 2014- Complete	Action Plan available for planning sessions with other authorities in preparation for repeat flooding events. Engagement with the local community about the potential arrangements for dealing with excess flows into sewers to mitigate disruption to customers.

Ref.	Item	Actions	Timescale and Status	Outcomes
1.15	Further survey and sealing work proposed for the public sewerage system	SW to gain approval to undertake necessary work	July 2021	Investment paper to be discussed on July 21 st 2021
1.16	Identification of lengths of sewer to survey or resurvey in the period 2021-25	Review sewer records with available ground water profile data	Summer 2021	In progress
1.17	Surveys by cctv or electroscan lengths of sewer potentially at risk	Compare historical survey coverage with results of 1.15 and produce a survey schedule.	Summer/Autumn 2021	Planned dependent on approval in 1.15
1.18	Survey result review	Review results of surveys undertaken in 1.16 to determine sewer sealing work.	Autumn/winter 2021	Planned dependent on approval in 1.15
1.19	Undertake required sewer sealing	Seal sewers and manholes by most appropriate technique	From Autumn 2021 as conditions allow	Planned dependent on approval in 1.15
1.20	Review effectiveness of any sealing work	Analyse monitoring data and groundwater data to determine benefit of investment	From winter 2021	Planned dependent on approval in 1.15

Table 6.2. Multi-Agency Activities to Reduce Groundwater Infiltration

Ref.	Item	Actions	Owner, Timescale and Status	Outcomes
2.1	Strategy for infiltration via private drains	Southern Water to propose a strategy for dealing with infiltration via private drains*	SW supported by EA and local Parish Councils, Summer/Autumn 2014. Completed 2014.	Southern Water objective is to improve awareness of the significance of infiltration into private drains and the importance for customers to ensure infiltration is repaired when it is discovered.
2.1a	Long-term Monitoring	SW will monitor sewer flow to identify significant increases in inflows.	Ongoing	Early identification of areas where infiltration has increased
2.2a	Investigate highway 'mis-connections'	Where non-sewage flow is identified, check highway drainage relative to sewers to ensure road drainage is not a source of flow into the SW sewers	Kent County Council with support from SW, 2014 onwards. To be pursued as and when required.	Reduced flow of surface water (if connections are found).
2.2b	Investigate groundwater infiltration on domestic drains	Where non-sewage flow is identified from domestic properties, investigate to identify source of flow into SW sewers	SW, with assistance from Canterbury City Council where required, 2014 onwards. To be pursued as and when required.	Reduced flow of surface water (if connections are found).
2.3	Consider effects of proposed new developments on infiltration.	District Council to continue to consult with SW on development applications.	District Council, Ongoing.	Developments in areas which would be detrimental to sewer flooding, to have conditions recommended by SW and applied, as appropriate, by the City and District Councils.
		SW to determine threshold above which they require to be consulted.	District Council, Ongoing. SW wish to be consulted on all proposed development.	

Ref.	Item	Actions	Owner, Timescale and Status	Outcomes
		Sewerage materials for new developments	SW & District Council, when developments are at planning approval stage. Ongoing.	

*Note: Southern Water does not have powers to require residents to repair private drains. Hence the support of the other agencies is required. It is acknowledged that customers may not be aware of infiltration in their private drains, so SW will consider ways of obtaining information to demonstrate the presence of infiltration. District Councils would only be able to instigate action under Section 59 of the Building Act where proof/evidence is provided of the defect.

Table 6.3. Publicity / Communication Activities to Reduce / Mitigate the Effects of Groundwater Infiltration.

Ref.	Item	Actions	Owner, Timescale and Status	Outcomes
3.1	Public meetings about reducing groundwater infiltration into sewerage system	Attend public meetings with other agencies as appropriate.	SW, as required	Inform stakeholders of progress and planned activities and receive feedback.
3.2	Letters from SW to stakeholders about reducing groundwater infiltration into the sewerage system	Send letters at regular intervals to communicate progress and planned activities	SW, as required	Inform stakeholders of progress and planned activities

Lower Nailbourne Infiltration Reduction Plan

3.3	Multi-Agency Group meetings	Discuss and agree actions to reduce requirements for tankering and emergency discharges to watercourses.	All Parties, Discussed and actions agreed in 2013 and 2014. To be discussed in future as required.	Improved understanding and appreciation of issues. Agreement to actions to help reduce the need for tankering and emergency discharges to watercourses
3.4	Implement local campaign to discourage misconnections	Publicise through parish councils. Include article in Parish magazines. **	District and Parish Councils, Summer 2014 Complete	Article included in Canterbury City Council magazine.

** SW can provide base information to councils to include in articles publicising the role that everyone can play in minimising non-sewage flows into sewers, and the importance of doing so to reduce the incidence of restricted toilet use during periods of high groundwater.

Table 6.4. Activities to Mitigate the Effects of Groundwater Infiltration/ Other Flood Protection Mechanisms

Ref.	Item	Actions	Owner, Timescale and Status	Outcomes
4.1	Early Warning system	Joint continuous monitoring of groundwater levels and sewer levels/flows.	SW, EA, 2014. Ongoing. Commenced Jan 2015. Re-commenced annually	Develop trigger levels by comparing historic customer complaints and tankering with BH levels (or other reference). Note: due to the success of the rehabilitation work, the trigger level has been raised from 78.5m to 80.0m at Little Bucket borehole.
4.2	Tankering arrangements	Investigate options for improving location of tankers and over-pump units for future events. e.g. by use of longer hoses/ pumping	SW, Spring 2014, Complete	Potentially less disruption to residents when tankering / pumping is essential.
4.3	Maximise the capacity of the sewerage system and pumping stations	Investigate the carrying capacity of the sewerage system north of Littlebourne	SW, July 2014 for capacity determination. Trial - if and when - the sewers are surcharged	Potential to increase output from the pumping station at School Lane, Bekesbourne.
4.4	Flooding Management Plan	Develop plan to address the flooding issues caused by high groundwater. Implement recommendations. This is being addressed by the Little Stour, Nailbourne and Petham Bourne Flood Management Group Action Plan.	Kent County Council & Canterbury City Council, Shepway District Council with inputs from SW, EA, and Parish Councils	Plan including actions for participating authorities, that in unison will reduce the extent of flooding and the impact of flooding.
4.5	Maintenance of watercourses	Riparian owners to carry out their responsibilities to maintain adequate flow through watercourses by clearing vegetation, desilting, etc	Riparian owners with input from District and Parish Councils – ongoing responsibility	Maximise the flow along watercourses in order to minimise surface flooding, which results in inundation of manholes to the sewerage system.
4.6	Review of utilisation of a control structure	Investigate the possible use of a fixed control structure to relieve hydraulic overloading of sewers.	SW	No current plans to progress this option.

Appendix

- A Survey Findings and Rehabilitation Scope
- B Emergency Discharge Sites