

**BCA comment on the new submission by David Wilson homes dated June 07 ref. CWW**

**ENGINEERING MATTERS**

Ref: JUBB CE Ltd doc W8834 1Jun07

**Surface water drainage.**

B&DBC planning officers to require confirmation that EA approves the scheme in detail BEFORE any approval is given including confirmation that the probability that sub surface percolation from the chalk strata will find routes into the old foul drain in Lower Brook Street (LBS) via the disused and broken connections from the demolished houses that used to exist in May street (now the site of the dual carriageway) and along the north side of LBS. Such “surcharging of the foul water system to be assessed and the EA declare their findings in the matter.

Local flood records of the area know as “Noah’s island” to older residents to be recalled by the EA. David Wilson homes and all their agents to confirm that they are fully aware of the history of the flooding (both foul, surface and combined) in the area. Local knowledge, press reports and the council’s own records are available to the developer.

No response to the criticism that the trial pit drain away rate tests were done in the summer (drier season) has been received.

The probability that the development will add to the risk of flooding in the Loddon flood plain is assessed at higher than 70%.

The Environment Agency now requires all Flood Risk Assessment include a Sequential Test to comply with PPS25. An Exception Test should be carried out if the site is in Flood Risk Zone 3 and the development is of the more vulnerable residential type.

**The B&DBC are reminded that CWW falls into the special category in PPS25 para 26 in that it is a proposed major development on land exceeding 1 hectare outside a flood risk area. For this reason it is urged that the council Planning officers to require confirmation that EA approves the scheme in detail BEFORE any approval is given; and should at the very least obtain perpetual indemnities from the developer to protect the public from the obvious additional risks of flooding from the CWW development.**

**Foul water drainage.**

Copies of the reports have been requested of Jubb together with and assurance from Thames Water and the developer that these reports represent the totality of reports for the area in the last 15 years. It is noted that the reports mentioned by Jubb stop at 2000 when we all know that serious flooding had occurred in 1999 and before. Would the inclusion of that year painted a truer picture? Perhaps, for completeness, studies should extend back to when the dual carriageway was built in the late sixties.

The foul water system is compromised by the fact that surface water percolation via the chalk strata will find routes into the old foul drain in Lower Brook Street (LBS) via the disused and broken connections from the demolished houses that used to exist in May street (now the site of the dual carriageway) and along the north side of LBS.

The B&DBC planning dept must insist on a statement from Thames Water that their calculations have taken this into account.

It is of great concern that Thames Water rely on a model exercise only for their calculations, there have apparently been no actual flow measurements taken over time, neither any study into distribution of flows over the day, the week or the year. Reliance on the sewer mains acting as temporary stores until the outfall at Chineham can cope with the volume is not acceptable and certainly not in the case of low lying Brookvale.

Calculations of the input from the multiple occupancy in the 1000 + flats along the north of Churchill Way should be conducted. (VH has 70% multiple occupancy with 2 persons per bedroom) An overall average of 5000 people.

### **Road access.**

Reference is made to the BCA report of 27 Mar07 previously issued which identified major flaws in the briefing, report and conclusions. The proposal to use pedestrians and disabled people to “slow the traffic” is unsound and deplored. Indeed HCC confirmed that they had not studied the proposals in detail relying on B&DBC to have done so.

Jubb’s earlier report indicated that the traffic generation from the site was minimal yet now they aver that the left-in left-out only option will cause an “unacceptable increase in waiting times at Victory Roundabout”. Which report are we to believe? We insist in retaining the left-in left-out only option, with no opening up of the central reservation.

A bridge has been provided across the dual carriageway (erected 23Jun07) without any hesitancy on the part of HCC and B&DBC, this to serve just Winklebury and Rooksdown. The same approach is expected, indeed demanded, in Brookvale, clearly of an enhanced design given the landmark position.

The comparative table is biased in that the Bridge scenario scores are downplayed and the Toucan crossing scores are uplifted. The BCA submit the following for consideration.

	Bridge	Toucan
Pedestrian safety	12	5
Vehicle safety	20	5
Pedestrian security	16	8
Visual impact	6	9
Impact on trees	12	12
Crossing distance	9	15
Initial Cost	3	10
Maint costs	3	4
Total	81	68

The Bridge option now scores highest.

### **Acoustic barriers.**

These are not shown on plan, the extent has to be defined e.g. from the NW corner to the position at spot height 91.71 on the plan H441A where the noise zone crosses the boundary.