Lower Mole Flood Alleviation Scheme Website – Ideas

| Idea | Vote |
|---|---|
| I would like to be able to walk or cycle along the Ember riverbank all the way from Molesey to Esher. Currently some sections are blocked.<br>Open up the Ember riverbank for walking ramp; cycling | 25 |
| Beaver Reintroduction<br>Have you looked into the successful beaver reintroduction trials which have been taking place in other parts of the Country? Their reintroduction to the area could drastically reduce flooding and increase biodiversity. | 14 |
| End to end river Mole and Ember access with towpaths and for swimming and paddle boarding access either side of sluices etc.<br>This can be as simple as slopped river bank access from the towpath either side of the sluices, minimal cost impact. Encourage end to end use of the river, the deeper backed up widened channels make a great resource we currently can see but can't use ...shame! Give us open access please and fair use end to end alongside all the wildlife and other interest groups. | 10 |
| Make the paths along the schemes more 'wild'<br>The current footpaths along the scheme around Island Barn sluice, river mole and Viaduct are very industrial. Make these more wild, as well as the river corridor itself | 6 |
| Provide access along the whole scheme<br>It would be a great community asset to have a riverside walk from Viaduct sluice to river mole offtake, to Island Barn Sluice and up to Molember. | 19 |
| Kingfisher Holts etc.<br>There's a kingfisher regularly at Island Barn reservoir - can we encourage more by providing nesting holes? | 6 |
| Open it up to all<br>I'd love to be able to walk the length from East Molesey onwards. Never understood why, what could be such a great amenity is closed off to the public | 3 |
| Would be great to see another option: option 6 + dealing with the 'hard engineered structures' and so deal with one of the cons do option 6. | 4 |
| Royal Mills extend river walk<br>At present it's a sadly short walking area, the caravan club has fixed high locked gates one side and on the other side of the river the water board have high gates, so access along the river is halted either side. Wrong! | 4 |
| Hydroelectric scheme<br>Replace the sluice gates incorporating a hydroelectric scheme that over time will pay for the renovations, be a green option and preserve the water levels. | 7 |
| Zenith Weir Boat passage<br>Provide safe access across this weir for kayaks etc. as is the case on the Molember weir, rather than blocking it off and trying to prevent people accessing a route that is clearly popular (not that I have used it myself). | 3 |
| Zenith weir boat access<br>Add boat access across Zenith weir, people are clearly using it and are attracted to the route so better to manage than try to prevent | 0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Emergency gate lowering**<br>As a mitigation for option 1, develop an emergency gate lowering procedure to mitigate flood risk whilst spending minimum and not changing the scheme beyond normal repair and maintenance | 1 |
| **Automation**<br>Review the value of automation, especially since there will be an ongoing need for inspection and monitoring. Does this change the cost, and reduce the associated maintenance cost estimates? | 3 |
| **Enable greater use of riverside paths**<br>It always strikes me as a shame that there is no continuous walking route along the banks of Ember and Mole. I realise there will be problems with land ownership, safety concerns around weirs, etc., but spiked railings and locked gates where it looks as though a through route could be established (e.g. from Grove Way recreation ground) is a missed opportunity. | 7 |
| **Please retain water height. Dropping the water will create a hard hazard**<br>Children now wear lifejackets for safety when enjoying the water. Dropping the level removes a vital amenity and creates a high-drop hazard for all residents. | 15 |
| **Prioritise reducing climate change risk and improving wildlife habitat**<br>Climate change risk is important to all of us that live here - the area will be uninhabitable if flooding becomes a problem. I would prioritise dealing with that and making the best wildlife habitat possible and ensuring good public access so all can enjoy! | 1 |
| **Be honest on the proposal documents**<br>Costs do not include potential structural work. Environmental impact does not include impact on sewage works overflow. Be honest and open about these in the documents. | 6 |
| **Make the waterway a key part of our community**<br>Enhance the rivers and create a clean place for open water swimming; paddle boarding; kayaking; boating; fishing and a way to enhance and encourage the amazing wildlife we have. Create paths and access across the rivers and allow it to create a green path to cycle/walk across the area as an alternative to creating cycle paths on roads. It is a massive assets abs we need to keep it and make it better not turn it into a small trickle that will look awful. | 2 |
| **Hydro electricity generation**<br>The reading hydro scheme (https://hydro.readinguk.org/) in partnership with the EA highlights the potential for the EA to self-fund aspects of the build with a 20 year payback on investment and a further 20 year revenue generation opportunity. I am connected to the team there and am happy to help with connections and discussions. | 2 |
| **Dropping the water levels, as many residents have already indicated will be unsightly, dangerous where high concrete reinforcements have been**<br>Option 3 is the ONLY option. | 0 |
| **Option 3 is THE only sensible option. Leave the flood gates as they are at your own peril.** | 5 |
| **Open up this natural asset for walking etc.**<br>The river is a natural asset that shouldn't be hidden away from the local communities. If the pathways, that do already exist, were opened up, it would provide access on footer bicycle between different communities. Such as Lower green to the Wilderness, to Molesey etc. At the moment it's all disjointed, people come face to face through big gates. It could be done in a way that enhances the natural habitat of | 3 |

| | |
|---|---|
| the river wildlife. And certain areas could be used for different water activities such as SUP kayaks etc. If this was properly planned people would know what area to use safely. Walks between each area could be sign posted together with wildlife and how to respect it. Authorities in other areas actually encourage the local people to use the river with walking paths and water activities, such as the proposed reservoir in Hampshire. | |
| I share XX's the idea for replacement sluice gates with hydro electricity generation.<br>I lived in Grove Way, where my Mother still lives. I remember clearly the devastating floods of 1968 before the flood scheme measures were taken. The back garden is within 100 yds. Of the River Ember (now joined with the River Mole). I also recall the river breaking its banks and our garden flooded on two other occasions within the same decade. - N. B. NOT REPLACING THE SLUICE GATES IS NOT AN OPTION!!! | 0 |
| Water Level Monitoring<br>Can Option 1 not be enhanced by water monitoring equipment which will give 'early warning' of gate failure and hence an 'emergency team' sent out to force it open? I am presuming the water level would not rise rapidly enough to flood before such a team could get there | 2 |
| Option 3 is the only option.<br>Any other course of action will decimate wildlife and cause terrible stress to animals living in and around the Mole & Ember. | 1 |
| Give public access to use the footpath from Spa Meadow to Esher<br>Public footpath | 1 |
| Do not bring this site down. Also review the costs or explain they are not accurate due to the strength limitations of the ground anchors<br>There are many ground anchors holding the river banks' walls structure from falling in to the river, the river water weight creates a supporting force reducing the pulling effect the river banks' walls exercise on the anchors. The lack of risk assessment means the cost of the various options are not adequately calculated therefore you are unable to any costs and final solutions. It is important you leave this site available so everyone can see the impact your new solutions will have on costs and look when considering your new remediation solutions. | 5 |
| I would go for option 3<br>I would like flood protection to be retained in this area. I would also like to see water levels in rivers and streams maintained and wildlife protected and allowed to flourish. | 2 |
| Option 6 mentions" mitigation measures" to increase flow, could be used with tree planting (shading) upstream to clear PW once and for all<br>Pennywort elimination in Old Mole | 0 |
| Easy access to the meeting of the River Mole and Ember<br>Retain public footpath between meeting of the rivers and the Island Barn Reservoir. | 0 |
| Fishing line bins<br>Molesey Veterinary Centre would be interested in constructing, installing and emptying 'fishing line bins' as used at many commercial fisheries: would the EA support this idea and have suitable locations for these? Alpha Vets in Teddington would offer the same for that area of the Thames. | 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| I would support Option 3 to properly retain this exceptional natural resource and continue a successful flood alleviation scheme. | 4 |
| Do not bring this site down, there are many valid questions & answers that the public & involved parties will find useful to refer back to<br>Keep this website active beyond 24 March | 0 |
| It is important to retain this very special natural habitat. So maintaining existing water levels is crucial. Therefore I support option 3. | 2 |
| Safety & security compromised for residents if water levels drop as predicted, the public will have access to walk along exposed river beds<br>Safety ramp; Security ramp; Health risks to the public and residents if river beds exposed | 1 |
| I support Option 3 that will maintain existing biodiversity, ecosystems, wildlife habitat, safety & security, recreation & flood alleviation<br>Option 3 to continue to support and maintain long established ecosystems and wildlife | 2 |
| Go with option 3<br>Having read through all the questions submitted, there is zero support for options 5 and 6 that reduce water levels. Local people clearly want option 3 and are very concerned about drop in water levels under other options. | 2 |
| 25 years ago the plan was to "pulse" the floodwater into the Thames to protect downstream areas. Only Option 3 still has this flexibility.<br>When the Mole is in flood, Thames Ditton, Kingston etc. are flooded too. They need protection as well and without the use of the sluices etc. that is not possible. So Option No. 3 is the only one. | 0 |
| Option 3 is the only way forward. I hope that Education visits are arranged for local schoolchildren – with Environment Agency staff? | 1 |
| Increase biodiversity with more natural riverbeds would be great.<br>Option 5 and 6 say they will increase biodiversity along a large section of the rivers. This is supported by recent projects elsewhere. I have seen; cormorant, great crested grebe, water rail, kingfishers and terns along the Mole. How would you a) 'Clean' these riverbeds of the junk accumulated over the decades and b) alleviate the problems associated with drying out. | 1 |
| Option 3<br>You only have to see the community effort to clear the area of weed to know how special and important this area is for wildlife and for our mental health. Option 3. | 0 |
| Clean water ways around heath and Molesey,<br>Areas and water ways need to be cleaned and maintenance regularly done. Is over grown and can't access areas. Locals unable to walk or appreciate most of what used to be available. | 0 |
| A more thorough cost benefit analysis is required.<br>The review of options needs to factor in water quality, structural integrity and safety. | 0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Retain water volume<br>https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/mar/31/water-firms-discharged-raw-sewage-into-english-waters-400000-times-last-year | 0 |
| Extend footpath along Old Mole along stretch owned by Thames Water, landscape with trees and access to help clear Pennywort etc. | 0 |
| Move Esher sewage outflow downstream so it cannot pollute Old Mole any more, with possible erratic and less flow rates in future. | 1 |
| Option 3<br>Please don't drop the water levels. It doesn't make sense. | 1 |
| Option 3<br>I vote option 3, a much better plan than dropping the water levels. | 0 |