

From: Planning_THM <Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 August 2025 17:12
To: Salter, Tim <TIM.SALTER.OO@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: Oliver Murray <Oliver.Murray@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Mark Croucher <Mark.Croucher@wokingham.gov.uk>; Stuart Slatter <stuart.slatter@planningpotential.co.uk>; Jo Marchant <joanna.marchant@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Environment Agency Proofs of Evidence - submission

WARNING!

For the attention of
WBC, Optalis, WHL, BCSolutions and
Councillors

This mail is from an external sender - please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust this sender, and know the content is safe

Dear Tim

We have completed the flood risk model review. Please see the attached the completed hydraulic modelling review and hydrology review spreadsheets. Both are not considered fit for purpose which means that the FRA is not adequate and so we will be maintaining our objection. Please also see below for summaries from the model reviewer.

For the hydraulic modelling, sections that need addressing include:

- The model is very sensitive to the state of the Culverted sections. These are currently represented with a roughness value of 0.011 n, according to Chow, 1959 this value corresponds to a smooth concrete culvert, which is straight and free of debris.

However, survey data of culvert (Hurst Culvert CCTV) shows that the culvert is corrugated with some damaged sections & debris. For closed conduits Chow, 1959 states that corrugated storm drains should have a roughness between 0.021 & 0.03.

For the hydrology review, the outstanding issues summarised below need to be addressed:

- Donor transfer for statistical calculation - Donor site was selected based on proximity following the small catchment procedures. However, the donor selected is extremely permeable ($BFI_{HOST19} = 0.782$) and has unusually small annual maximum flows, the flood estimation guidelines states that such catchments require "Special treatment". How QMED was calculated at this location needs a careful reviewed & comparison to other donor options.
- Calculation of DPLBAR - Catchment shape have changed significantly from FEH webservice, DPLBAR has revised using the equation " $DPLBAR = Revised\ AREA^{LOG(FEH\ DPLBAR, FEH\ AREA)}$ " resulting in a value of 0.727. However, the FEH guidelines & handbook v5 states that DPLBAR should not be updated by area weighting and should either be re-estimated using the equation - $DPLBAR = AREA^{0.548}$ or recalculated from the digital terrain model this may significantly affect the ReFH2 results.
- Storm duration testing – information provided is currently limited, it is currently unclear how storm duration testing was completed and considering the extent of the culverts impact the hydraulic regime storm duration testing should be undertaken within the hydraulic model for fluvial scenarios.

Please let us know if you require further details.

Kind regards
Judith

Judith Montford

Planning Specialist | Sustainable Places | Thames Area

Environment Agency | Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, OX10 8BD

Telephone: 020802 63064

From: Salter, Tim <TIM.SALTER.OO@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Sent: 04 August 2025 14:15

To: Planning_THM <Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>

Cc: Oliver Murray <Oliver.Murray@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Mark Croucher <mark.croucher@wokingham.gov.uk>; Stuart Slatter <stuart.slatter@planningpotential.co.uk>; Jo Marchant <joanna.marchant@environment-agency.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Environment Agency Proofs of Evidence - submission

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tim.salter.oo@planninginspectorate.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Afternoon Judith

Further to the e-mail below, I have heard back from the Inspector & he has said that the Environment Agency should share any conclusions on the model with the main parties. The Inspector will ask for an update at the inquiry.

Kind Regards



Planning
Inspectorate

Name Tim Salter

Inquiries & Major Casework Case Officer

Planning Inspectorate

T 0303 444 5520 | **M**

Tim.salter.oo@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/pins

Ensuring **fairness, openness** and **impartiality** across all our services

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Our [Customer Privacy Notice](#) sets out how we handle personal data in accordance with the law.

From: Planning_THM <Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>

Sent: 01 August 2025 13:32

To: Salter, Tim <TIM.SALTER.OO@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Cc: Oliver Murray <Oliver.Murray@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Mark Croucher <mark.croucher@wokingham.gov.uk>; Stuart Slatter <stuart.slatter@planningpotential.co.uk>; Jo Marchant <joanna.marchant@environment-agency.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Environment Agency Proofs of Evidence - submission

Importance: High

Dear Tim

As mentioned in my email of 24 July to you, we were to complete the flood risk model review on the 31st of July. I confirm that we have completed this review and in summary the Appellants flood risk model is not fit for purpose. This therefore implies that the FRA is not adequate. Our Flood Risk Engineers are analysing the model results at the moment and should complete the analysis by Monday 4 August. We intend to send you comments by Tuesday -5 August with details on the outcome of the model review.

Kindly confirm if you consider this acceptable and also let me know if you have any question.

Many thanks
Judith

Judith Montford

Planning Specialist | Sustainable Places | Thames Area

Environment Agency | Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, OX10 8BD

Telephone: 020802 63064

From: Salter, Tim <TIM.SALTER.OO@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Sent: 25 July 2025 07:48

To: Planning_THM <Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Judith Montford <Judith.Montford@environment-agency.gov.uk>

Cc: Oliver Murray <Oliver.Murray@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Mark Croucher <mark.croucher@wokingham.gov.uk>; Stuart Slatter <stuart.slatter@planningpotential.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Environment Agency Proofs of Evidence - submission

Dear Judith

Further to the e-mail below, I have been in contact with the Inspector.

He has responded by saying that 29th July is the latest he can accept proofs and still allow other parties including the Inspector himself, time to read them and prepare the inquiry programme. The Inspector therefore needs a proof from yourselves unless the flood risk issue can be resolved. If there are any outstanding issues such as conditions those can be discussed during the inquiry.

Kind Regards



Planning
Inspectorate

Name Tim Salter

Inquiries & Major Casework Case Officer

Planning Inspectorate

T 0303 444 5520 | **M**

Tim.salter.oo@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/pins

Ensuring **fairness**, **openness** and **impartiality** across all our services

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Our [Customer Privacy Notice](#) sets out how we handle personal data in accordance with the law.

From: Planning_THM <Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 July 2025 17:27
To: Salter, Tim <TIM.SALTER.OO@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: Oliver Murray <Oliver.Murray@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Judith Montford <Judith.Montford@environment-agency.gov.uk>; Mark Croucher <mark.croucher@wokingham.gov.uk>
Subject: Environment Agency Proofs of Evidence - submission
Importance: High

You don't often get email from planning_thm@environment-agency.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Tim

I hope this email finds you well

I am emailing to kindly ask for an extension of time to submit our proofs of evidence to you. We understand from the CMC meeting notes that the Inspector - Guy Davies very kindly proposed that we submit this to you on the 29 of July. However, the flood risk model review is still underway to be completed on the 31st of July and also, we have had to clarify a sudden change in position from the appellant regarding the de-culverting condition we suggested and had previously agreed in principle. We are working with them on this.

With these two issues at hand, we would have difficulties in completing our proofs by 29 July. Although we are very appreciative, we would like to humbly ask that given the issues we have highlighted, would the Inspector be willing to accept our proofs a bit later (i.e. 5 of August) than the 29th of July. As he requires it 10 days before the Inquiry starts, this may be factored into when we are to attend the Inquiry.

I trust this is acceptable and we will be grateful for a favourable response.

Many thanks

Judith

Judith Montford

Planning Specialist | Sustainable Places | Thames Area

Environment Agency | Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, OX10 8BD

Telephone: 020802 63064

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any

Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Please take a moment to review the **Planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice** which can be accessed by clicking this link.

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



Please consider the environment before printing this email

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Please take a moment to review the **Planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice** which can be accessed by clicking this link.

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any

Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.