TARMAC Statement

As I continue to fail to get a response from tarmac re an official response. These words are taken from my notes from the recent meeting at TARMAC following the floods caused by Storm Babet.

TARMAC are adamant that the flooding is not of a direct consequence of their operations. During the flood they had to rescue millions of pounds of equipment. The flood seems to have started due to three causal factors.

- 1. The rising of the Trent after a day of heavy and persistent rainfall Derbyshire
- 2. The persistent and heavy rainfall locally
- 3. The tidal variation of the River Trent and its position of high tide on the day of the flooding.

As I am sure you are aware as the Trent breeches its banks the water will pool along the banks this is not uncommon, what was uncommon was that Slough Dyke which normally drains surface water away from the area was also full due to the local rainfall.

Now whether there was a fault with a sluice gate which would normally close when the Trent is full or it was open for Slough Dyke to drain as per its operating instructions is unknown. However the Trent began to backfill Slough Dyke which could no longer drain which manifested itself as flooding to east of Holme near the railway crossing making this road impassable initially.

Once the Trent had no where to go and the dyke was full the water remained to the North of the quarry area and finally washed away a mound of earth that was used to delineate the active quarry area. Once water breached this it ran south toward Holme village.

If Rob could support an EA investigation into the Sluice Gate failure and How we might protect Holme better i.e. Flood defence extension to the North that would be helpful.

Further more only a very small area of Holme lane was flooded so much as to make it passable to 4x4 if this was raised up and water allowed to flow through then Holme may not have been isolated.

