

On 18 Apr 2017, at 23:59, Rod Lord wrote :

Dear Victoria,

Many thanks for this.

I have been reading through the document in an attempt to see how the proposal differs from what was previously submitted when OGAFCA were obliged to build a 3D digital model of the scheme in order to quantify it and put it into some sort of understandable perspective.

This latest document is certainly crammed with numbers but none of it makes any sort of sense to a non professional ... dare I say amateur ? !

As far as I can tell thus far there is nothing contained in this document that might serve to refute OGAFCA's previous assessment based on the 3D digital model nor anything that looks as if it might differ sufficiently to finally seem like common sense and a viable and practical scheme.

On the contrary - the document contains a rather puzzling statement on page 5 ...

"This surcharged condition of the ditch has been modelled as a surcharged outfall, with a water depth of 1.45m from the base of the ditch identified as the maximum possible water level, corresponding to the maximum height of the road above ditch invert."

I have no idea what "ditch invert" means but I believe the general meaning of this sentence to be that for the purposes of their calculations they have assumed that the ditch they are proposing to discharge into is capable of containing water to a depth of 1.45 m. This assumption seems to be supported in their drawings at the end which show a cross section of ditch at 1.45 m deep and 2 m wide.

The ditch was originally measured by me for dimensions needed to build OGAFCA's 3D model ... and I was so surprised by the dimensions stated on this page 5 that I immediately grabbed a length of timber and a tape measure and walked straight round to the ditch in question to check it. It turns out that my original measurements were correct, although we erred on the generous side for the construction of the model to be as fair as possible. The pipe emerging into the ditch was modelled as 0.9 m and therefore the height of the ditch the same. In fact the pipe itself is only 0.8 m and the bottom of it is at the same level as the ditch bed and the top is above road level, although the banked verge means that water at a depth of 0.9 m would JUST be contained in the ditch.

So if the suggested water level of 1.45m were truly to occur I would be thigh deep in 0.65m of flood water if I tried to wade down the road !

Of course that could never happen because before that Fifield Village, the A308, and Monkey Island Lane would be completely inundated and the flood waters would be spreading rapidly towards both Dedworth and Bray.

The very next paragraph on page 5 states ...

"The analysis shows that 4.2m3 of flooding occurs at over the porous car park. Since the permeable paving is installed at slightly lower elevations than the remainder of the car park (to receive runoff from the impermeable car park surfacing), the flooded volume will pond on top of the permeable parking bays and not run off site. The maximum water depth for this scenario is 2mm."

Well I'm afraid it is fairly obvious that if the ditch really did contain 1.45m depth of water at any time then the depth in the car park would be considerably more than 2 mm !! It would in fact be nearer to 0.7 m or 0.8 m given that it is lower than the road.

This is clearly absolute nonsense and I suggest that for their own sake the Applicants should once again withdraw this fantasy fiction and check their figures.

Is it possible that neither the Applicants nor their professionals have even glanced at the 3D work done by OGAFCA ?

<http://www.ogafcap.co.uk/PAGES/ENVIRONS/Phoenix-3D-Diagrams-A3.pdf>

There does not appear to have been any attempt to address the problems and inadequacies pointed out by it.

I have passed this information on to OGAFCA and no doubt there will be a response shortly.

Thank you and best wishes,

Rod

Rod Lord

<http://www.rodlord.com>
