

Notes for self & Gavin

Walderton test pumping June & July 1962 to ascertain potential extra yield to that granted in Feb 1962.

Originally sought larger amount – 7<sup>th</sup> Feb 1962 granted licence for 2mgd – in words of Mr Hall, PWCo Engineer, ‘*thought very reasonable decision*’. But Ministry was concerned might need more and encouraged them to prepare for full capacity (then considered 4 mgd)

Lordington Pond served as very interesting location – agreements were made between owner and PWCo....owner reported abnormally low pond in July 1962!! Sept 64 flow to pond ceases...dam built to hold water....On 22/7/66 owner writes to PWCo saying on Monday there was water over the boards and on Friday the pond was 18 inches down!! 25/7/66 PWCo engineer says will come and see him to tell him whats going on, and furnish results of test pumping’ .....but paper referring to tests says pumping was in August 66 and Sept 67!!

Jan 1968 application for 6mgd made – granted in may 1968.

According to file records copied to Gavin Sharpin (EA), from 5 4 67 weekly mg per WEEK was 5-6mgd right up to March 72 – usually around 6 in late summer, falling to c3 in winter and spring.

Funtingdon 67-72 – around 1mgw

Woodmancote – between half and one mgd in this period

### PW Co Files Ems Walderton – Inspected by N Holmes Feb 13<sup>th</sup> 2007

R W Hall, PWCo engineer to Sherwood (legal/parliamentary agents drawing up notices etc)- **Ems in the area where we propose to abstract underground water is normally dry between August & December** (Note: this suggests pre abstraction the river dried say for four (max five) months yet now it surely flows for an average of <6months, but we probably do not have clear idea of exactly what the split times for wet/dry is. The flowing every (most) year(s) from Jan to end July supports view of local people – Mrs Glue says she walked through the wet meadows from Stoughton to her grand mother’s house in Walderton every summer in the early 1960s.

In 1906 and 1930 the Co promoted bills to acquire additional resources within the Ems valley – both were unsuccessful.

In 1950s started looking again. Instructed Edgar Morton in 1957 to make hydrogeological investigations (not found). In 1959 wrote to the Secretary for the Ministry of Housing and Local Government stating knowledge that neighbouring water suppliers were intending to seek new resources in the Ems and Lavant. PWCo had in mind Walderton, at a site 1mile from the Woodmancote site (that was in the ownership of Chichester RDC).

Prior to application, some flow measurements were made – for five locations

	1 Lumley	2 Redlands Tribof Alds. stream	3. Aldsworth St -u/s Watersmeet	4. Deepspring on Ems	5. Broadwash
In Cusec					
7/11/60					75.6

4/4/61	55.9	.375	22.6	35.5	28.3
1/6/61	38.2	0	13.7	27.2	16.2
6/7/61	22.5	0	7.8	17.6	8
In Cusec					
7/11/60					40.7
14/4/61	30.2	.202	12.2	19.1	13.3
1/6/61	20.6	0	7.4	14.6	8.7
6/7/61	12.1	0	4.2	9.5	4.3
25/7/61	9.1	0	2.5	*	3
12/8/61	7.5	0	2.5	*	2.1
18/9/61	0.5e	0	Tr	*	0
20/10/61	0.5e	0	Tr	*	0
21/11/61	0.5e	0	Tr	*	0
13/12/61	11.6	0	3.16	*	0
26/1/62	10.5	0.48	3.68	*	2.5
7/3/62	22.6	0	7.04	*	12.4
13/4/62	12.9	0	5.98	*	5.34
11/5/62	9.16	0	3.31	*	3.78
* = flow diverted to 'Canal'					

Entry for June/July 1962 – *'No readings due to test pumping at Walderton'*. 0 Readings at Broadwash for 4 months, and statement from engineer that the river dried to this point (but no statements ever found that failed below) suggest that the engineer was aware that perennial flow started at the cress bed areas downstream of Broadwash – supported by logic of their locations, and local people (Rudkin) reference to fact that historically the river might fail as far down as Racton Park dell (c1km d/s).

Flow gauging data on file also for 61-65 – in mgd

	Below Westbourne		Hampshire Farm
8/8/61	7.5	8/8/64	8
18/9/61	.5	18/9/64	3
20/10/61	.5	20/10/64	1
21/11/61	.3	21/11/64	.3
13/12/61	11.6	13/12/64	.5
21/1/62	10.5	21/1/65	2.5
7/3/62	22.6	7/3/65	7.3

Lots of correspondence from Mr Michael Hamilton (MP) of Lordington House and the pond. Objected to the early 1960s plan for fear his pond would dry. Correspondence in the early 1960s implies always held water prior to pumping, but all correspondence does not support this. Reference to 4lb un-stocked trout being caught there.

Engineer in letter of 8/2/60 refers to gauged readings at Aldsworth Bridge – held by W Sussex RB (not found).

Note when exploring possible sources in 1960, Woodmancote was in Chichester CC ownership, and to supply 'Regnum Authorities' Chichester was looking to explore resources in Ems and Lavant too. As an aside in 1961, it is identified that Chichester CC made an application to sink and test pump in the Lavant valley with an ultimate abstraction of 4.3mgd. Now have that authority to sink. PWCo initially looking for 4mgd. Applied for planning permission in may 1960 – refused in Jan 1961.

In 1961 much pressure was put on a Dr Forrest, a lecturer at London University to say the river was unsuitable for fish – but because of too much weed!! – the letter from the engineer acknowledged that otherwise it was suitable for trout. Engineer wrote to Dr Forrest to say ‘evidence for extensive fishing is very scant’. Tone of letter was to suggest catching a fish was very rare, yet I have been told that poaching was a real problem up to the 1960s!! In the same letter he also cites the pond (Lords Fishpond) used to be stocked with trout, but had not been stocked or fished for years – not true!! In 1961 Dr Forrest was urged to be an expert witness to support view that fishery interests would not be impacted by the order.

PI (appeal the order application) began in July 1961 and concluded in August...loads of irrelevant information in the file, but nothing on the case and objections at all!! Inspector’s decision, accepted by the Minister, was for 2mgd. Copy of Inspectors judgement made for files. Portsmouth Evening News reports that minister granted order for 2mgd.

Engineer on 7<sup>th</sup> Feb 1962 – wrote – ‘a very fair decision’. However both the ministry and PWCo were concerned that figure could/should be higher to secure adequate supplies. Engineer wrote to the Ministry’s legal advisor (while the ink of the decision was barely dry – 23/2/62) seeking confirmation that the ministry would support them building the full mains capacity so that full abstraction could be accommodated (at that time assumed to be 4mgd!!)...and also...the ministry supported amalgamation of the local water supply interests

Pump testing was carried out in July 1962 (info to Gavin Sharpin). Hamilton (Lordington House) wrote in July 1962 that pond was abnormally dry (but letter appears to have been written before pump tests began)...Note PWCo had entered an agreement to build new weir, line and/or provide some compensation water in the event of ‘being impacted’ ... Subsequently in July 1962 PWCo wrote to Mr Hamilton...pond slow to fill in winter due to poor recharge – also said ‘Colonel Phipps Hornby did tell me that it was usually dry by Goodwood week’!! Therefore further conflicting info that this was never a permanent pond, but PWCo stated that test pumping should not have affected it!! Plans were afoot to lay pipe to supply water to it. .1964 Hamilton wrote saying was concerned the two years in which he had to say if it was impacted was far too shorter a time – suggested PWCo just do what they said they might have to so he would then not have to keep pestering them, because he was sure it would be needed. **Interestingly, letter from engineer to Hamilton stated that ‘2 year clock started ticking in May 1964 when permanent plant in place’.** Interestingly, reported flow out of Lordington Pond ceased 7/9/64, so dam was built in Sept/Oct 1964.

Engineer to PWCo wrote to Edgar Morton in August 1962... ‘When we started the test on 23<sup>rd</sup> May (1962) there was a small flow in the river where it passes the site. This did cease after about 24 hours..... We completed the present tests on 16<sup>th</sup> July and on 18<sup>th</sup> July yhr river was completely dry at Lordington, Ellbridge and Broadwash...I had spot river gaugings taken on the 10<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> July when we were doing the combined tests. The results were:

Date (1962)	Monument Lane	Broadwash	Pump Rate
10 <sup>th</sup> July	5.43	4.32	8mgd
13 <sup>th</sup> July	7.36	7.18	10.3mgd (for 48hrs)’

The letter concluded by stating that Woodmancote was unaffected and ‘the only thing we now want is authority to take more than 2mgd’!!

In 1963 PWCo engineer wrote to a Miss Couzens and said they had taken little water and any concerns on flow in the Ems was nothing to do with them...and said it would take many years before useful information emerged to identify effects.

An incredible letter to the Sussex River Authority (SRA), undated, the PWCo engineer wrote in relation to proposed plan to apply for an increase FROM 2 TO 6MGD..it ended....'Whatever the outcome of the discussions with objectors I hope you will agree that we may immediately proceed with our application for the licence'. (Note application was made 11<sup>th</sup> Jan 1968).

22/7/66 Hamilton wrote to PWCo saying on Monday the water was flowing over the dam, but on Friday it was 18 inches down....25/7/66 Engineer replies..I will come and 'explain what is going on'.... 'I hope to be able to give some more information as the tests proceed'. **Whatever the interpretation this indicates that pumping at the granted amount has a very marked impact on flows in then upper Ems that has a significant 'cone of depression effect' (NH interpretation).**

In the build up to the 1968 application to increase abstraction from 2-6mgd, there was abundant correspondence between the Co and cress growing interests, and concerned expressed they would be potentially impacted. Principally this was with Scales/Hairspring Watercress, Mill Farm, Hambrook, Chichester who also ran, at the time, the cress beds in Westbourne (ASSUME THE ONES CLOSE TO THE CHURCH). In July **1975 PWCo** paid £2,000 on condition – the payment was not taken as an acceptance of flow depletion, and that it was a full and final settlement.

Meeting held March 1968. Authority summarized representations – but details of these are not on file. Objectors included, with some of reasons given below:

Westbourne PC – Will reduce flow through village in summer; could affect springs and cressbeds'; **lack of water for fishing.**

- Chichester RDC – adverse affect on water resources in area generally.
- West SCC – holding objection
- Langmead, Church Farm, Stoughton – wanted assurance that previous quarenteed supplies would be honoured
- Hamilton, Lordington House – Reasonable safeguards needed (for pond)
- Rook, Deepleap, Rowlands Castle – Interest in tributary of Aldsworth stream feeding into that stream d/s Aldsworth pond. Interest since 1932' restocked with trout many time; annual fall in flow strated much earlier since pumping began – increase will be disastrous
- Rule (Westbourne Mill) – handwritten note on document, but no entry beside name (know Mr Rule made submission)
- AE Hair – cress interests – Felt in drought the natural springs would succumb to the Company's pumps.
- Leigh Thomas & Co, Emsworth – Increased abstraction likely to have serious affects on mill at Emsworth. Present abstraction has resulted in greatly reduced flows to the turbine.

Decision letter of Authority stated had '*the report of their Chief Technical Officer on investigations which he had been carrying out since the company were authorised in Dec 1965 to proceed with test pumping.....satisfied can also increase rate of abstraction without adversely affecting other water interests.....agreed to 2,190 mg per year (at daily rate of 6mgd)....subject to a condition that the Water Company shall discharge a sufficient quantity to make up water into the River Ems so as to ensure that a reasonable flow is maintained at all times in that length of the river through Westbourne (which normally flows perennially)*' Said also could allow occasional daily abstractions >6mgd, but this was to be subject to a formula to be agreed. Amazing the basic studies of both the Authority and the Co are not on file(s).

Other correspondence on file from the engineer to Watling & Hirst, Pallant Court, 1977, he states the varied license was operated from 5<sup>th</sup> June 1968. The engineer, unless I am mistaken then makes claims about abstraction that are not borne out by the data!!! Said first exceeded 2mgd under a

drought order in 1965, and operated above 2mgd '*in the months before granting the extended licence we were operating above the 2mgd level under the provision of the test pumping*'. [So in 1977](#) claimed they could not say when the 2mgd was first exceeded!!

In June 1968 Engineer wrote to PP Jarman of Emsworth stating remarks in press had been misquoted. Said NOT abstracting 6mgd; flow in Westbourne varies considerably, and in autumn frequently is below 0.5mgd...what I meant to say was that compensation water '*will improve the river amenities.....the situation will improve during periods of natural low flows*'!!!.... ***'It is of course well known that the upper course of the R Ems above Broadwash Bridge has always dried up except in very wet years'***

In Dec 1970 made plans for permanent connection to make augmentations – noted to landowner that in both 1969 and 1970 were required to add water via temporary connections.

WATER RESOURCES ACT 1963

Notice of Application to vary a Licence  
to abstract Water

Notice is hereby given that an application is being made to the Sussex River Authority by Portsmouth Water Company to vary Licence No. 10/41/511002 to abstract water from three boreholes marked on the plan annexed to the Licence and bearing the serial number of the Licence and identified by numbers 1, 2 and 3, at Walderton Pumping Station in the Parish of Stoughton, near Chichester.

The variation applied for is the variation of quantity of water authorised to be abstracted during a period or periods specified and to delete "The quantity of water abstracted shall not exceed 2 million gallons in any one day of twenty-four hours" and to substitute "The quantity of water abstracted shall not exceed 2,196 million gallons per annum or 8 million gallons in any one day of twenty-four hours".

A copy of the application and of any map, plan or other document submitted with it may be inspected free of charge at the Head Office of Portsmouth Water Company, "Brockhampton Springs", West Street, Havant, Hants., at all reasonable hours during the period beginning on 18th January, 1968 and ending on 14th February, 1968.

Any person who wishes to make representations about the application should do so in writing to the Clerk of the Sussex River Authority at 137-139 Preston Road, Brighton, BN1 6AF, before the end of the said period.

Signed ..... L. J. SIMPSON  
Engineer,  
PORTSMOUTH WATER COMPANY  
On behalf of .....  
Date 11th January, 1968.  
.....

## SUSSEX RIVER AUTHORITY

B. R. THORPE, LL.M.  
SOLICITOR  
CLERK OF THE AUTHORITY

ANSTON HOUSE,  
137-139 PRESTON ROAD,  
BRIGHTON, 6.

MY REF. JAC/DJP WR2/156(2)

YOUR REF.

24th May, 1968

Dear Sir,

Walderton Pumping Station

Following the meeting at the County Hall, Chichester on the 25th March, the Authority have now considered the application submitted by the Portsmouth Water Company to increase the authorised abstraction from the Walderton Pumping Station. In considering this application the Authority have had before them full details of all the representations which have been made, and of all the points which were raised at the meeting on the 25th March. At the same time, the Authority have also had before them the report of their Chief Technical Officer on the investigations which he has been carrying out since the Company were authorised in December 1965 to proceed with test pumping at an increased rate.

The Authority are satisfied that the water resources in this area are such as to allow an increased rate of abstraction without adversely affecting other water interests, and they have accordingly agreed that a licence can be granted to the Company for an increased abstraction up to 2,190 million gallons per year, at a daily rate of 6 million gallons. This is, however, to be subject to a condition that the Water Company shall discharge a sufficient quantity of make-up water into the River Ems so as to ensure that a reasonable flow is maintained at all times in that length of the river through Westbourne Village which normally flows perennially.

The Company, in addition to asking for an average daily quantity of 6 million gallons, also asked whether the maximum daily quantity could, on occasions, be increased to 8 million gallons. Whilst the Authority are of the opinion that this requirement can be met for limited periods without detriment to the hydrological regime they consider it essential that such abstractions in excess of 6 million gallons a day should be subject to far more rigid control by the Authority, and consideration is at present being given to a formula which can be incorporated in the licence so as to ensure that the Authority have the control they consider necessary.

Yours faithfully,

Clerk of the Authority.