

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	Previous Action Points	Authority	Update from 5 th Oct	Date of Achievement	Update from 25 th Jan
1.	Has investigation (during cleaning) of the ‘suspected’ sewer overflow into soak-away (The Crossways) been carried out, what was discovered, if not complete when will this be done? (Q 28). Please update on progress (following meeting with resident 9/11)	LBC	No action taken by LB of Croydon. <i>Additional info sent (email 10.10.18), response from Tim (TW)... happy to work with Croydon to investigate the soakaway fully.</i> Action:- Croydon to advise.		TW met with resident and did a survey, no evidence. Blockage found in resident’s driveway, cleared and case now closed.
2.	What means of notifying the public of available support/advise during and after a flood event do you propose? (Q 1 on previous action plan).	TW	Currently inform people by mailing out or email. Two documents on TW website, also on Twitter feed. Surrey Prepared network, web page, Facebook, Twitter. FLAG (Nick) to consider text alerts, local radio. Way forward... Council Emergency planners, via Parish Council. Build info into emergency plan (Nick Morley, Parish Council Emergency Resilience Officer), leaflet to include all relevant emergency contact numbers. Tor advised 121 people flooded in 2016, 350 at risk. Action:- Tor to check DP issues and send Surrey Prepared links to FLAG		Problem informing people not on social media/web. Leaflets to everyone not effective as get thrown away, but details on who to call when could go in libraries, doctors, etc. Advised to call 999 if emergency, or local authority if not. FLAG unaware of Croydon Resilience Forum – disappointing that June 16 event not even mentioned in literature. New questions arising to be included in next action plan.
3.	Please provide progress of vented/bolted manhole cover installation, a) Outside No 18 on Caterham Drive (Q 2 previously). b) Banstead Road (Q 2).	TW	a) Caterham Drive, Approved - Thames to contact Cappagh within the next week – for permit from Council to make an amendment to the manhole cover. b) Banstead Road – no firm address/location given as yet. Action:- Helen to advise location.		(a) installed (b) not yet installed as address not yet given – FLAG - it is 134 Banstead Road – TW to investigate.
4.	Update/progress on policy change regarding phasing conditions to provide infrastructure (to respond to population growth whilst addressing flooding) (arising from previous Q 5).	TW	Since April infrastructure to be provided. Team of asset planners will assess impact. The developer to make a one-off improvement payment. Cumulative development now considered.		
5.	Progress of investigation into capacity of overwhelmed Marlpit Lane sewers (Q 8).	TW	Thames Water operation scheme awaiting Surrey CC’s final actions from Strategic study (Atkins report). Ops team to look at the Marlpit Lane issue. Several		Reminder posted on local FB pages on 6/10/18

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	Previous Action Points	Authority	Update from 5 th Oct	Date of Achievement	Update from 25 th Jan
			<p>downstream areas flood, however, no reports. Public to report issues directly to authority, important to get reference number (advised to follow complaints procedure if not satisfied).</p> <p>Action:- FLAG to remind folk to complain (FB with links).</p>		<p>TW say not reported to them. Hasn't been an incident there recently. Work starting w/c 28/1/19 to put duct in to alleviate the smell.</p> <p>Croydon to forward reports to TW.</p>
6.	<p>Assuming both Caterham Drive depth monitors how now been installed in the sewers, do you have any results yet? (Q 9).</p> <p>a) Please confirm that of the three monitors now installed, all are recording.</p> <p>b) What action is proposed to prevent regular blocking?</p>	TW	<p>One has been installed in a manhole in the woods and is recording data/flow.</p> <p>A second, upstream has not (due to regular blockage. Depth monitor contractor to attend with Lanes, to clear then install). Thames Water acknowledge 'issues' with the Caterham Drive sewer, 12.7 km of drains discharge to the Croydon system via just one 9" pipe.</p> <p>Attenuation chamber is reported as not working as intended/designed (installed 2001).</p> <p>Action:- 2nd depth monitor to be installed (complete with alarm, to alert Lanes when blocked).</p> <p><i>Additional info from Tim (TW)... Monitors will stay in situ forever until the batteries run out or until the units fail.</i></p>		<p>'Bin it, Don't block it' TW image posted on local FB pages on 7/10/18</p> <p>(a) All are installed and recording and if it reaches full capacity a message goes to control centre.</p> <p>(b) Operation defect on storage tank, defect in 225 sewer fixed. No issues since 8/12/19. TW say that previous blockage could have been there for years.</p> <p>LBC to monitor SW soakaway adj. to woods.</p>
7.	<p>Has the Landlord been contacted? Has the culvert below the Raglan Precinct been restored or simply 'filled in' and subsequently blocked? (Q 3).</p> <p>a) Has the Landlord responded?</p> <p>b) Could you now please provide details of survey and how/when necessary repair works will be undertaken?</p>	SCC	<p>Landlord contacted but no response. Whatever was reinstated 'seems' to work, not believed to be blocked (culvert to be surveyed to confirm). A survey on Essendene Stream will give further clarity, including CCTV cameras.</p> <p>Geoff Duck mentioned Curry and Brown work on this site in relation to the masterplan process. TDC 'could' buy Golden Lion pub, possibly as part of FAS. Checking and approving capital scheme. Tor - nothing to be put in and will need to be approved. They will know in the next nine months whether the scheme delivers risk reduction.</p> <p>Action:- Surrey CC to survey.</p>		<p>(a) No response from landlord – difficult to do anything as on private land.</p> <p>(b) no blockage (Townend side), but under road near Co-op a brick dislodged on side wall. Not significant.</p> <p>surface water drains in the Raglan precinct are blocked, these are not on the public highway, so maintenance responsibility for maintenance lies with land owner.</p>

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	Previous Action Points	Authority	Update from 5 th Oct	Date of Achievement	Update from 25 th Jan
					<p>Suggestion that the shop owners are asked if drainage is included in their ground rent.</p> <p>Raglan Carwash and trade effluent consent was questioned, still no licence.</p> <p><i>TW advised FLAG, email 30/1 that the trade team will give 7 days notice to officially apply for consent; otherwise they'll take samples of run-off, which could lead to prosecution.</i></p>
8.	Is there a cleaning, repair, maintenance schedule for the entire length of the culvert and how do you intend to address capacity issues at the bottom (fenced soak away Stites Hill, often overwhelmed) (Q.2)?	SCC	There is no maintenance programme for the culverted watercourse, but an annual programme for the gullies. Culvert is currently in good condition apart from a few sections downstream of Queen's Park. The capacity issue is Queens Park to Caterham Drive with two tributaries – the Essendene Stream and one in Ninehams Close both of which cause a flood risk.		
9.	<p>Has the Collapsed Drain on Park Road been surveyed, what action do you intend to take? (Q.3).</p> <p>a) Residents of Park Road are concerned that recommendations by the contractor have been ignored, could you provide details of future work in the area and reassurances of a long-term fix?</p>	SCC	<p>Collapsed drain on Park Road has been fixed. The soakaway carrier from Queen's Park is fine and was surveyed six weeks ago from outside the Golden Lion and under houses north of Park Road. Pipes had separated from the soakaway. There are currently no funds to reinstate the pavement as considered a low traffic area. Helen disagreed.</p> <p>Action:- Helen will speak to the Parish Council re possible pavement repair funding.</p>		<p>The highway drainage system in Park road has been reinstated and connected the soakaway in Hillcroft School playing field. This will not solve the overall flood risk in this area as a large catchment drains through the lower are of park road and through the school. SCC cannot provide a guarantee of a long term fix, but this area is being assessed for additional flood risk measures as part</p>

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	Previous Action Points	Authority	Update from 5 th Oct	Date of Achievement	Update from 25 th Jan
					of the capital scheme and forms part of the Caterham Master plan in which flood risk is being taken into account.
10.	Buxton Lane was due to be cleansed and surveyed, has this been completed, could the ditches be reinstated (or equivalent option), please advise. <i>(Arising from Q 5 & Q 18).</i>	SCC	Buxton Lane clean is running late – was due in mid-September, will now be mid-October. Issues around 92 Buxton Lane where a section of a pipe gets blocked (area team aware and monitoring, to be resurveyed). No plans to reinstate ditch on east side as nowhere to direct the water. Historic water course by the roundabout but the authorities are not sure which way it flows; to the many soakaways in Ninehams Close?		The problem here is four or five springs in this area running down to Ninehams Close. If not cleaned in November will be done in February.
11.	The manhole cover on Whyteleafe Hill is often dislodged, how do you intend to address capacity issues and reduce flood risk? <i>(Q 10).</i>	SCC	Considerable discussion on this. Pipe jetted, misaligned pipe reinstated and to be monitored. Considered low priority by Surrey Highways. Concerns expressed for school at bottom, perhaps an issue for Whyteleafe FLAG to consider? Surrey to consider installing vented manhole as potential trip hazard (yet considered avoidable) and to prevent damage to surrounding tarmac/pavement. Lots of commuters and schoolchildren use this area. Intention to make catchment a 'critical drainage area' in the local plan. Action:- FLAG & residents to keep reporting.		Manhole dislodged previous Saturday, reinstated Thursday evening. Dislodged pipe resulted in backup. Not considered a priority to repair. Tor suggests monitoring and keep reporting.
12.	What powers do you have/intend to implement to remove surface water from sewers and encourage riparian owners to take responsibility for surface water? <i>(Q 15).</i> Where gutters discharge directly (or via hard standing) onto pavements (eg The Glade, Old Coulsdon), can an alternative be insisted upon?	ALL	Highways Act prevents landowners to discharge their surface water onto the highway (Ice in winter). It would however, be too expensive to enforce retrofit changes. Education, residents to be made aware of their responsibility. TW are to give associated local authorities (93) £150k in 2020 to carry out SuDS installation to remove surface		TW rolling programme out 2020. TW staff will be given the planters (25) to trial before this to make sure they are robust and one will go to Hampton Court Flower Show. Some discussion about getting a

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	Previous Action Points	Authority	Update from 5 th Oct	Date of Achievement	Update from 25 th Jan
			water from their assets.		couple for Caterham Carnival and Old Coulsdon Village Fair in the Summer. TW to revert on this. Issue could be expensive as not easy to fit yourself. <i>Planter illustration/details sent to FLAG by TW, 30/1, not for public sharing at present.</i>
13.	Has the flood risk mapping/catchment wide survey commenced? <i>(Q 12 & 13).</i>	EA	Confusion here as thought that the maps were kept up to date. <i>Email from Tom (EA)... Unfortunately, we have not been successful in securing funding to update the Caterham Bourne flood map for planning this calendar year. I am going to see whether there is another way we can get the correct mapping represented (either within Tandridge's SFRA or using outputs from our integrated model). I can provide an update when I am clearer on the next steps.</i>		Resubmitting funding application in November.
14.	The draft Local Plan, TLP47 requires SuDS... 'unless proven to be impractical'. We are concerned this phrase undermines the whole policy, the robust Croydon Flood Policy and flood alleviation in an at-risk area. Can this phrase be removed from the Local plan? <i>(Arising Q 24d)</i>. a) Please could Louise Round provide details of policing planning process?	TDC	TDC said not sensible to remove 'unless proven to be impractical' from Local Plan. If such a major modification was insisted upon, the Inspector might throw it out. Developer will be obliged to demonstrate why it isn't practical to use SuDS. Advised to leave in (Surrey and TW in agreement) and be policed (but how?). Action:- FLAG to ask Louise Round (CEO TDC) how the planning process will be policed. During discussion point, FLAG advised that Chris Hobbs is no longer working on task and that Jason Thomas is Emergency Planning Officer, Viv Riddell will sub for Mark.		Email sent to LR 10/10/18, item to be included on next action plan for others to address... please No response from Louise Round – TDC instructed FLAG to re-ask. Ask for a response deadline. Second email sent to LR 29/01/19 Awaiting response.
15.	Have or when will Strategic Flood Risk Assessment be updated? <i>(Arising from Q 13)</i>.	?	TDC say SFRA is part of local plan. Separate weather cycle studies Phase 1 and 2 completed, now on Phase 3. For		

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	Previous Action Points	Authority	Update from 5 th Oct	Date of Achievement	Update from 25 th Jan
			Planning, they look at fluvial, groundwater, sewage and where the risk is coming from. TDC maps updated on 17 th of each month.		
16.	<p>Do you have any suggestions for public information fact sheets? When will these be available, and can we publish on local Facebook pages and send via our mailing list? <i>(Arising from Q 21 & 25).</i></p> <p><i>Our suggestions...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * <i>Planning advice, what one can and can't do (inc SuDS and driveways).</i> * <i>Managing surface water on site NOT discharging onto pavements (as per a few on The Glade, Old Coulsdon).</i> * <i>Land owners responsibilities (clearing out drive gullies, careful disposal of fat, oil & grease, what NOT to flush).</i> * <i>Road gullies not to be used for disposing rubbish (ie fly tipping).</i> * <i>Encourage 'report it' website use and provide website details. State what information is required eg post code, adjacent house number or lamppost number.</i> <p><i>n.b. The FLAG have actively encouraged the public to use websites to report a problem. (Arising from Q 21 & 25).</i></p>	ALL	<p>The Surrey Prepared sheets are available and can be downloaded from the website. Tor will arrange for some to be brought over. There are leaflets about flood risk, sustainable drainage systems. Agreed they need to be distributed as widely as possible, especially where there is something specific that needs attention. Other sheets (possibly with FLAG input) to be ready in 5 or 6 months.</p> <p>Surrey CC, currently have one leaflet and are working up the other 3 and hope to have them out by the end of the financial year.</p>		<p>Dealt with previous.</p> <p>TW to send FLAG info on the planter.</p> <p>Garden/Drive conversions were discussed; over 5sq m planning permission is required, if not using a permeable material (ie concrete or tarmac, block paving is deemed permeable).</p> <p>To do so without is a planning enforcement issue.</p> <p><i>'Sewer Flooding advice' leaflet and links sent by TW, 30/1, FLAG will include on website (in progress)</i></p>

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
17.	<p>Please advise what options/measures or improvements to the cleaning schedule can be made in the short term to reduce the flood risk, whilst we await a long term solution.</p> <p>a) What practical measures/assistance could be put in</p>		<p>Cleaning schedule will be requantified in the next phase (OBC - Outline Business Case). Surrey CC annual cycle is mid-October with additional ad hoc cleans every 10 weeks to address specific problems. PLP advised, the</p>		

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
	place to help people IF they flood in the meantime?-		surface water network (even when clean) is not of sufficient capacity to manage a downpour. Tor commented that schedules change, and contractors changed two years ago.		
18.	How/which of the flood alleviations options within the feasibility study are progressing?		1, 2, 3, 4 and variations. <i>Email from Tom (EA)... (If this is referring to Caterham Bourne FAS) We are still awaiting the finalised economics and the reporting for the project board to make the final decision on the option to be progressed. My gut is that asset intervention (repair of structure, removal of blockages), and a more stringent maintenance is going to offer the greatest benefits in terms of flood reduction. I think it would be good to host a separate meeting on this specific project when we have the outputs – maybe something to raise in the meeting?</i>		
19.	Are water butts still an option? How and when can these be implemented?		Water butts still an option to manage surface water on site.		Ongoing discussion.
20.	Can we begin to plan the 'drop-in' meeting to discuss any options with public?		Not yet.		£70-80k for Outline Business Case – should be commissioned by the end of this financial year (end March). Surrey and TW to consider attending village fairs to raise awareness/educate.
21.	Has a consultant been appointed to carry out PLP surveys?		No, PLP (property level protection) surveyor/consultant not appointed yet but will be once the OBC has been commissioned.		TW to carry out PLP survey's and pay costs for those flooded with sewage twice.

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
					<i>Awaiting exact details/criteria from TW (as per email 31/1)</i>
22.	The Atkins feasibility study addresses surface water falling on Caterham on the Hill ie the top; How do you propose to reduce the flood risk/flow down from either side of the valley, all roads leading down to Caterham Drive and fields/footpath (opposite Keston AV)?		Looking at all options both sides of the catchment. <i>Email from Tom (EA)... The Caterham Valley is one of the steepest valleys in the south east – it's unlikely that we would be able to stop flows directly running down the roads given the gradient. I think the best thing we can do is to reduce the surface water run off – i.e. make ares spongy.</i>		
23.	Are other flood alleviation proposals being considering to complement the options outlined in the feasibility study? eg In Croydon briefing notes (oct 2017), a surface water flow path into Dollypers was to be investigated, what is proposed?		Yes, action with LBC to include landscaping in Dollypers Wood in Outline Business Case.		
24.	Who is responsible for surface water road gullies and maintenance of, on a private road? a) Where a dropped kerb is not formed (private or public road) and access to drive results in damage to gully, is the resident deemed responsible for damage? b) What powers do you have to require the public to pay for neglect/damage of council assets?		Landowners are responsible for all Surface Water drainage (and associated assets) in a private road – many have associations to manage maintenance and pay into a budget for repairs (residents advised to enquire). a) Yes. b) Need photographic evidence of damage and ask landowner to reinstate (IF neglect can be proven).		
25.	Residents of Roffes Lane have expressed concern regarding the maintenance of the Culvert (under Rook Lane) and potential flood risk. a) Who is responsible for keeping the culvert free from blockages? b) What is the cleaning schedule? c) What powers do you have to ensure the golf		Culvert under Rook Lane was fully blocked, before June 2016, residents are concerned and want clarification. a) Surrey are responsible for Culvert. b) None at present. c) Surrey National Golf Course must maintain their land, so as not to impede flow, they are not permitted to dam the culvert. d) ?		No update. No planned or scheduled work here.

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
	<p>course manage the area to ensure flow is not restricted?</p> <p>d) Are the 'local' soak aways silt free, is there a cleaning schedule?</p> <p>e) The FLAG contacted Surrey National, they have begun work clearing the area adjacent to the culvert. When do you envisage work will commence on clearing the actual culvert?</p>		Action:- FLAG & residents to keep reporting.		
26.	<p>What monitoring methods or reporting regimes are in place to monitor SuDS deployment?</p> <p>a) Where SuDS (or attenuation tanks) are installed, who monitors correct installation?</p> <p>b) In a development (of more than one), once complete, who 'adopts' the asset and is responsible for lifetime maintenance (developer, residents or LLFA)?</p>		<p>a) Building Control.</p> <p>b) Asset to be responsibility of landowner. Agreement reached at Planning stage for five years, or application refused. Afterwards educate residents. Attenuation tank below Church Walk development will be the responsibility of the landowner (betterment is requested but developer not obliged to provide).</p>		Not necc to discuss.
27.	<p>Atkins report, has funding been approved for next phase? What next?</p>		Next phase of Atkins report about to be commissioned – meeting with them next week. Alex (?) is managing.		<p>Funds approved but not commissioned until received. Atkins are ready to go. Amount of water to be stored in Hillcroft area needs defining. On Coulsdon Common maybe a feature at the bottom end would help but there are landscaping limitations. Of the 350 homes at risk, only 56 may be protected in some way. Maybe 3-4 bunds on Coulsdon Common may help. Conversations may need to be had with Coulsdon Common and the Parish Council.</p>

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
28.	<p>The attempt to reduce flooding at the Tudor Parade (Old Coulsdon) has been unsuccessful. What can be done to prevent repeat and how do you intent to address this failure of the contractors?</p>				<p>The Soakaway doesn't work – both sets of works on corner of Placehouse Lane and in front of the shops interlinked. Awaiting £10-15k of funding to create new soakaway.</p>
29.	<p>Tollers (location for 'Goodenough', Brick by Brick development) is reported to be waterlogged, we are concerned this is being dismissed.</p> <p>Existing residents already have trouble with drainage... often being blocked. During the addition of a previous build, some homeowners were left without drainage due to a collapsed drain and consequently were unable to flush toilets, some had sewage bubbling through floorboards, understandably they're concerned of a repeat. It is clear there are problems at present, the council have been notified, residents being unaware that the sewers are in fact TW assets.</p> <p>a) Please can investigations be made to establish the problem and rectify it prior to the situation being made far worse by the increased demand from more than 40 new builds on an already delicate infrastructure.</p> <p>Residents claim the borehole testing was left in situ for only six weeks (providing limited summer readings only) not for one year as instructed. There appears to be some confusion.</p> <p>b) Please could you inform us of why and who requested this period of time (one year) but more importantly, if equipment was removed</p>				<p>Information on this should be available on Croydon Council website, including results of one year borehole testing</p> <p>EA to ask SES water for report on the various issues relating to surface water.</p>

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
	<p>prematurely, why?</p> <p>c) Residents report bucket loads of water being removed from the borehole. What were the results of these tests?</p> <p>Apparently, the build was delayed due to the difficulty of moving the electricity substation to where the community hall is now, an area prone to surface water flooding.</p> <p>d) Is it wise to mix water and electricity, what measures are in place to ensure the substation is flood resilient, safe and that supply of power will not be affected?</p> <p>e) Have ALL planning conditions been achieved prior to commencing construction?</p> <p>f) These new builds will NOT be able to apply for Flood RE, what measures are in place to ensure the entire development is flood resilient?</p>				
30.	<p>We remain concerned about cumulative development in the surrounding area and trust that local plans are now in place to reduce the impact of overdevelopment, manage surface water and ensure the drainage network is able to cope.</p> <p>FYI – new builds from 2013-2018 (spread sheets are available should you require details); -</p> <p>Caterham on the Hill – 415 (East side of catchment (12.7km of drainage pipes) discharging to Croydon via the Caterham Drive sewer. West side to Croydon via Chaldon Way sewer (then Marlpit Lane – refer to Q5).</p> <p>Caterham Valley – 648 (plus 186 pre-2013) undergoing masterplan development.</p> <p>Whyteleafe – 608...consequently 1442 (plus many more pre-2013) new connections have been made to the sewers</p>				<p>Concern expressed at cumulative development but TDC planners unable to give any comfort that more properties will be not be built.</p> <p>FLAG expressed need of LBC planners to attend going forward.</p> <p>Email sent 28/1 asking for response/answers from LBC planning.</p>

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

#	New Discussion Point	Authority	Suggested Way Forward	Date of Achievement	Update from Last Meeting
	<p>heading for the Kenley Waterworks.</p> <p>a) These figures do not include any additional development/s in the LB of Croydon, please could you provide figures from 2013 to present day?</p> <p>b) What reassurance can you provide to ensure the Waterworks are protected from overdevelopment and flood risk (considering too the Bourne factor), which could affect SES's ability to provide water to 20,000 local homes?</p> <p>c) The SOC (2.2.1) states "TDC works with the LLFA and therefore, 'should'... control development within the area". Caterham on the Hill continues to be developed. What additional 'controls' can be put in place whilst we await a long-term flood management solution?</p> <p>d) How do Croydon as LPA intend to 'work with' Croydon as LLFA to control development?</p>				
31.	Any other Business.				<p>SCC to undertake Gulley cleaning (funded by Parish Council).</p> <p><i>Email via SCC 30/1 to confirm they have signed off with the contractor, working dates in Feb 6th to 8th, 13th to 15th, 20th to 22nd and 26th in 28th inclusive.</i></p> <p>FLAG to inform via community Facebook pages.</p> <p>Icarus. A collaborative learning project, meeting 27th Feb 10-12 (SCC to confirm venue).</p>

Caterham Flood Action Group

Revised Flood Action Plan – Multi-Agency Meeting

25th Jan 2019

