

[Received via email, from London]

Dear Rachel,

[REDACTED]

My property is located at the beginning of the proposed Counters Creek Storm Relief Tunnel and the highest point of flooding reports in 2007 at Lower Addison Gardens/Holland Road Junction. I explained in the meeting that I was in my flat (which is next to Counters Creek Sewer) in 2007, it has rained all week and soaked all the ground until it could not soak up any new rain, there was a massive deluge of rain lasting about half an hour filling up our local sewer (Counters Creek). A 6 inch thick Cast Iron Street manhole Cover was spat 20 feet in the air outside my house. Up hill at [REDACTED] property [REDACTED] a Commercial Grade Manhole Cover with a 6 foot high Wine Fridge sitting on top of it completely full of wine and therefore extremely heavy was also spat off.

The power that spat a 150 mm (6 inch) Cast Iron Manhole Cover 20 feet in the air was when rainwater came powering down the hill in the sewer pipe from the North and collided with the rainwater already in the Counters Creek Sewer is extremely large. In a similar rainfall event the weight of the rainwater coming from North of my

Property hitting the weight of the water already in the sewer is so large that We do not believe that:

- a) Thames Water can prove the NRV's doors in the FLIP's could withstand that kind of pressure and although the manufacturer, Jung Pumpen is well respected, these units are not suitable in this situation of such a weight of water colliding with another and therefore any property fitted with a FLIP should still be considered as a property at risk of flooding
- b) In the above mention scenario the Jung Pumpen FLIP's store rainwater, but there is a risk of self flooding if the small water storage is exceeded therefore any property fitted with a FLIP should be still considered as a property at risk of flooding

With regard to SUDS

Thames Water has calculated that they need a Storm Relief tunnel that is 4 meters wide and 5.5 miles long and that will hold enough water to prevent flooding.

Therefore, it seems obvious that the scale of the amount of SUDS required is simply enormous and almost impossible without a gargantuan change to every property that drains into the sewer system.

Therefore SUDS cannot be an answer or even a part of the answer.

We are extremely concerned that Thames Water intends to neglect its duty to remove rainwater effectively therefore flooding our properties and intends to flood our properties on purpose through the same neglect. If we flood again there is enough evidence to support a legal negligence case against Thames Water by the residents and businesses of RBKC and Hammersmith & Fulham. This is some of the

most expensive property in the world and any class action claim could cost Thames Water Billions. This in turn could lead to financial difficulty for Thames Water.

We therefore ask you to impose the maximum fine that you can levy upon Thames Water of £292 million as there is no proof that Thames Water has removed any property from the risk of flooding by FLIP's or SUDS rather than just the £130 million you have imposed so far for not actually building the Storm Relief Sewer in an action that insures that Thames Water builds a storm relief sewer or a similar much cheaper smaller scheme of a 2 meter bore tunnel sewer (4 meter for Counters Creek Flood Allievation Storm Relief Tunnel scheme) a second 2 meter sewer pipe piped straight into the new Thames Tideway Tunnel (7 metre bore tunnel).

Regards,