

BROOKVALE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

INFORMATION ON THE

PROPOSALS FOR VICTORY ROUNDABOUT

FOLLOWING THE PRESS REPORT OF 18th JUNE 2001

AUGUST 2001

Ted Blackmore-Squires

Some Brief Historical Facts

1. The valley of the Loddon river has always been a marshy wet area.
2. Mays brewery was sited to the north of the victory roundabout drawing limitless quantities of water from wells for making the beer.
3. Older people from Basingstoke have memories of swimming in the water of the flooded Lodden at West Ham and in Brookvale.
4. The first Victory Roundabout was built at the beginning of the Seventies and suffered severe flooding. It is believed the contractor had great difficulties with keeping the workings dry.
5. The original designers knew the water problems and designed systems to cope with the known situation.
6. The subways have a history of poor maintenance by the council.
7. On 9th July 1998 Grosvenor Estates plc entered into a 278 agreement with HCC to rebuild the roundabout. Letters are on file, which drew blanks from the authorities at this time on the proposed details.
8. On 21 September 1998 at an open meeting in the Brookvale Village Hall the following people presented to the residents a glowing appraisal of the new development and the proposals for Brookvale.

Mr. Kingsbury	Grosvenor
Mr. Ashford	Laing
Mr. Nelson	Laing
Mr. Archer Reeves	B&DBC

At the meeting many residents sought assurances that the poor maintenance of the roundabout would be dealt with, they required a safe, dry means of access into town. The closure of Timberlake and Alencon links to traffic and the consequential concentration of increasing traffic at Victory roundabout were raised as worrying issues. Assurances were given that all aspects would be studied, locals would be consulted and all points considered in producing a satisfactory solution.

9. Since that meeting there has been little dialogue with the BCA or residents on Victory Roundabout. The residents have suffered the noise and dust of construction and the inconvenience of ever changing pedestrian routes. Mature trees have been lost, as has precious parkland. There were legal errors made in the transfers of land. A few of the residents and committee members have tried to maintain a dialogue but clearly have been fobbed off.
10. In April 2000 the roundabout was opened and almost immediately flooded. Letters and meetings have been held with little notice being taken of the BCA or the residents.

Brief Historical Facts (continued)

11. On 1st November 2000 at the BCA committee meeting (see minutes) Mr. Archer Reeves gave a report to advise that a full investigation was underway. Experts would be employed to find out the cause of the problems and to report to the council on the options available to remedy the persistent problems of flooding and the “new” problems of increased ramp gradients. The BCA waited to be kept informed as promised.
12. In a front page report of the Gazette on 18th June 2001 headline “WASHED AWAY” the residents learnt that the Victory Roundabout was to be filled in and pedestrian crossings installed.
13. On the 20th June 2001 councilors John Shaw and Lynden Jones apologised to the BCA for the lack of consultation and the way the residents had learnt of the cabinets decisions.
14. The BCA immediately set up a sub committee to investigate the facts and to report to the BCA.
15. A BCA committee meeting was held on the 18th July 2001, the B&DBC was represented at the meeting by Mr Archer-Reeves, the two ward councilors Lynden Jones and John Shaw were present.
16. After quite a heated debate it was agreed that the BCA would consider the information received and meet the following week on 24th July 2001.
17. The meeting on the 24th July 2001 agreed to canvass the views of the residents and users of the roundabout. A questionnaire was compiled and issued the next week end with a requested return date of the 5th of August 2001. The continued receipt of views was to be welcomed given that many were on holiday at this time.
18. It was agreed that an open meeting will be held.

B. Information gathered so far.

The officers of B&DBC were given every opportunity to release information during meetings on 4th and 9th June 2001. A fax requesting all details was issued prior to the meeting on the 4th June 2001 and questionnaire schedules were issued prior to the 9th June B&DBC meeting.

Information was requested on the following basic issues:

- a Drainage / Flooding of subways.**
- b Ramps and footpaths**
- c Preferred option, choices available**

a Flooding of subways.

- 1 No records of flooding prior to April 2000 had been kept. Only one plan of the roundabout remained from the original construction. There were no reports or specifications available (we know they were produced). HCC only issues guide lines for the maintenance of subways.

Two reports were tabled by B&DBC dated 4 Jan 2000 and 29 February 2000 refer to bore hole reports at the Village of Dean (6 miles to the west), and general flooding problems, with proposals for solutions, at Dean and Worting. These appear to have little direct relevance to Victory Roundabout.

2 Strategic plans.

Only now being formulated. Traffic control. Cyclists provisions, Pedestrian needs (on a single day, 1st Nov 2000, a survey had been done showing 1216 people used the roundabout 6am to midnight). We have doubts that any truly integrated studies have been carried out. We were promised access to more information from 16th July 2001; this has started to happen and will be followed up.

B. Information gathered so far. (continued)

3 As built drawings.

Drawing 47016/DR/14A was shown to us but no copy could be left with the BCA. There appeared to be little evidence of surveys, calculations, specifications, drawings or reports of decisions made in the new construction. Some drawings of services and levels have been received and are being studied. We were told that the pumps were the old ones refurbished. We do not know if the sumps or discharge pipes were renewed.

We were told that the sumps contain three float switches (1,2,3) and two 65mm diameter pumps, the switching is as follows:

- 1 At low-level starts pump one.
- 2 At mid level starts pump two.
- 3 At top level warns of flooding by putting on a red light on top of the control cabinet, there is no link to any central control. Reliance is upon the public to report any flooding when the maintenance team is called out.

The two pumps in each subway can each pump 2.8 litres per second, i.e. 20,160 litres an hour can be handled by the as built situation **if properly maintained**. No surveys or measures have been done locally to the Victory Roundabout to find out if this rate is adequate. We do not know on what basis the existing pumps were retained given that all parties were aware of the previous flooding problems. There is no evidence that recent high ground water or recent heavy rainfall are any worse than in previous years / decades / centuries. It should be noted that the temporary pumps were able to bring the flow under control after only one week of operation.

The gullies and gratings are a mixture of types, Grosvenor refused to replace all of these, the council had to buy some new ones, some original gullies and gratings remain. No details of filters and cleaning / changing recommendations have yet been found. No maintenance manual has been produced to the BCA despite this being a “new” construction.

The officers present agreed that it was technically possible to solve the flooding problems.

B. Information gathered so far. (continued)

- 4 The current incidences of flooding and their causes is NOT being monitored, thus the precise causes of flooding are not being recorded. For instance we know that the flooding on the morning of 9th July 2001 in subway A (Essex Road) was due to the gullies being cleaned out the previous week and the muck not being cleared away. Instead the muck was left adjacent to the gullies only to be washed back into the gullies in the heavy rainstorm of 8/9th July 2001 causing a blockage.
- 5 There is no formal planned preventative maintenance programme.
The B&DBC rely on a call from the public to alert them of a problem.
We all then wait for the councils' maintenance team to 'leap' into action.

b Ramps and footpaths

- 1 No records of the 6 original ramps, which have been replaced, were available. We do not know how comparative statements can thus be made.
- 2 Strategic planning for Cyclists, pedestrians and the disabled will commence later this year. We have doubts that any truly integrated studies have been carried out. We were promised access to more information on this aspect from 16th July 2001; this will be followed up.
- 4 As built drawings.

Drawing 47016/DR/14A was shown to us but no copy could be left with the BCA. There appeared to be little evidence of surveys, calculations, specifications, drawings or reports of decisions made in the new construction. These are part of the 278 agreement held at HCC. We do have a letter from the County engineer agreeing to a ramp slope of 1 in 10 (10%).

We surveyed all the ramps and found 5 out of the 6 new ramps failed to meet the county specification. The B&DBC agreed that the ramps were not even i.e. not a consistent gradient. The corrective work of evening out the slopes and reducing some could be put in hand now.

Clearly the extended subways with level bases has increased the slope of the ramps, had the designers sloped the ceilings and floors of the parts of the subways under the verges they would have eased their problems. Again this corrective work could be put in hand now.

- 5 No records of incidents / accidents have been kept by the B&DBC, the paths are subject only to the regular path maintenance applicable to the rest of the borough.

Preferred option, choices available.

A report to Cabinet dated 13th June 2001 summarised the reports received to date, non of the reports were based on primary data. The reports are of a generalised nature and discuss issues in non-specific ways (see copies attached).

The council prefers to fill in the roundabout and place pedestrian crossings across **all four** roads including the dual carriageways.

The BCAs preliminary views are:

The safety issue of street level pedestrian crossings is serious. We would sadly remind everyone of the elderly lady pensioner who was killed in Havant on 6th August 2001 at a Pelican level crossing similar to the ones proposed at victory roundabout. The delay times appear to be the big issue in the Havant case. We were told that each section of the eight crossing could have a wait time of 3 minutes. Thus if you were unlucky on your way from Essex road to the railway station you might have to wait an extra 12 minutes.

We believe that Grosvenor should be required to bring the subways and paths up to specification and to provide 4” pumps and rising mains at the subways which have flooded.

A solution may be to provide a pedestrian crossing across Timberlake in addition to remedying all the subways. Thus if there was any flooding in future at least we would have an alternative route.

Bridges were not liked.

Traffic management lights were of no consequence to the pedestrian, disabled and cycle issues. We would require risk assessments from the council should any street level crossings be proposed. Recommendations for delay periods lights sequencing and speed bumps for cars all need detailed consideration.

Decisions to be made

- Do we want the subways, some or all four?
- Do we want the pedestrian crossings, some or all four?
- Do we want bridges, some or all four?
- Are there alternatives? Combinations of solutions?

Please make your views known before more mistakes are made and lives are put at risk.
