

Nicholas O'Dwyer Limited (NOD) has been commissioned to carry out the Marlfield Lake Flood Relief Scheme (FRS) by Tipperary County Council, working in partnership with the Office Public Works (OPW).

The overall objectives of this project are to improve the resilience of Marlfield Dam, and the identification, design, and submission (for planning consent) of a Flood Relief Scheme that is technically, socially, environmentally, and economically acceptable, to alleviate the risk of flooding to the community of Marlfield.



The study area for the Marlfield Flood Alleviation Works is shown by the red line in the top right image above.

Marlfield Lake is a freshwater, artificial lake covering an area of approximately 56,000m² (5.6 ha) and with an upstream surface catchment of approximately 19 km².

The lake was created by damming the stream to run mill machinery in the mid-1700's.

The mill was recorded as being built in 1769, becoming a distillery from 1817, until closure around 1857.

Marlfield house estate used a hydroelectric turbine on one sluice outlet to power the house.

Two hydraulic ram pumps provided water supply from the lake for the locality in the past.

1. Scheme Introduction

• 14th November 2014

including:



- Flooding has occurred on several occasions in the recent past causing significant damage.
- Flooding is reported to have occurred in Marlfield on dates
- 19th & 20th November 2009 • 29th December- 2nd January 2013/2014



Baseline environmental data was collected to inform the assessments. The following surveys and assessments have been carried out to date: Preliminary AA Screening (2018), Winter bird survey (Winter 2020), Baseline ecological survey, Freshwater Crayfish survey, Breeding Bird survey (Summer 2021), Bat survey (Summer 2021), Archaeological and Built Heritage assessment (August 2021), and Arboriculture Assessment & Impact (August 2021)



2. Environment



Legend:
Extended scheme area
potential upstream storage
proposed access points
SPA ITM 2019 06
SAC_ITM_2019_06
pNHA_ITM_2015_11
NHA_ITM_2019_06
SMRZONE
Register_of_Protected_Structures
Proposed_Register_of_Protected_Structures
℁ Significant bat roost
NIAH_Sites
National_Monuments
Architectural_Conservation_Areas
Japanese Knotweed
Habitat Line
FS2 - Tall herb swamp
River
Baseline Survey
Basemap
Habitat Area
BC3 - Tilled Land
FL5 - Eutrophic Lakes
GA1 - Improved agricultural grassland
WD / WS1 - Mixed woodland / Scrub
WD1 - Mixed broad-leaved woodland
WD2 - Mixed broad-leaved and conifer woodland
WD2 / WS1 - Mixed Woodland / Scrub
WN6 - Wet willow-alder-ash woodland
WN6 / GM1 - Wet willow-alder-ash woodland / Freshwater marsh
others
WD / WS1 - Mixed Woodland / Scrub
OpenStreetMap



The current situation has been modelled using a two-dimensional computer model. Flood events are presented in terms of their probability of occurring in any given year (e.g. the 1% AEP event has a 1% or 1 in 100 probability of happening in any year) To examine the downstream risk from a failure of the dam, a dam breach analysis model run was also carried out.

MODELLED FLOOD EXTENTS

20% AEP (1 in 5-year Event)



(AEP = Annual Exceedence Probability = chances of a flood of this magnitude or larger occurring in any particular year)

3. Flood Model





Flow Depth (0-2m)







DAM BREACH - MODELLED FLOOD EXTENTS

Flow Velocity (0-4m/s)



An initial screening was carried out of an extensive set of flood relief measures. Options were developed and the options were assessed based on their effectiveness at improving dam safety and mitigating flooding. Environmental and technical considerations were screened for obvious "showstoppers". Feedback from this consultation process will also feed into the selection of a preferred option.

PRELIMINARY SCREENING

A preliminary screening was carried out to identify the objective targets of the Flood Relief Scheme



Dam

> Reduce the water level in the lake by at least 500mm, OR Increase the dam crest level

AND

> Remove the trees from the dam and Protect the toe of the dam from erosion



Village

> Reduce the flow through the village, OR Increase the conveyance capacity in the village











4. Measures Screening



Impacts on the downstream River Suir SAC

Management of invasive species

Marlfield village is an Architectural Conservation Area



Return Period						
	10y	20y	50y	100y	1000y	
In future could become:						
	5y	8y	20y	30y	150y	
/	3.5y	бу	15y	20y	80y	



Option 1

Lower the weir and upgrade the existing spillway with walls and a downstream diversion



- Lower the existing lake outlet weir
- New mid-lake dam to retain water level in northern part of lake
- Flood walls for approx. 90m along the spillway
- Diversion of the channel into a new culvert approx. 340m long
- Culvert discharges to an open channel approx. 190m long

Potential constraints

- Site access during weir works
- Impact of the flood wall on architectural heritage (Mill ruin)
- Constructability of the new culvert crossing the existing culvert
- Traffic impacts during construction of the culvert
- Works in the downstream channel connected into a SAC (River Suir)



- Construction works within the lake

5. Options 1, 2, 3

Option 2

Maintaining existing Weir and add diversion culvert on Pond Road

Maintaining existing lake outlet weir

Construct a new morning glory type spillway approx. 15m diameter in the lake

Construct a flow diversion culvert down Pond Road approx. 525m long, discharging into an open channel approx. 190m long

Potential constraints

• Disruption to local community during culvert construction • Space required for a new weir

• Works in the downstream channel connected into a SAC (River Suir)



- part of lake

Potential constraints

- Site access during weir works



Option 3

Lower Weir and divert 1% AEP flow via new culvert at Mill Apartments downstream of existing road culvert

• Lower the existing lake outlet weir

• Construct a new mid-lake dam to retain water level in northern

• Flood walls for 90m ca along the spillway

• New weir wall across the river with an opening in the base to allow low flows to follow the existing stream course. Diversion culvert approx. 90m long

• Impact of the flood wall on architectural heritage (Mill ruin) • Culvert construction in the grounds of residential properties • Construction of the new dam across the middle of the lake • Works on a stream connected into a SAC (River Suir)



Option 4

Lower part of the weir and add new Overflow with diversion culvert on Pond Road



- Lower half of the existing weir
- Construct new morning glory type spillway 5m diameter
- Construct a new dam (approx. 100m long) across the centre of the lake to maintain water level on top half of the lake at current levels
- Construct a flow diversion culvert down Pond Road approx. 525m long, discharging into an open channel approx. 190m long

Potential constraints

- Site access during weir works
- Constructability of the new dam (sheet-pile or embankment)
- Disruption to local community during dam and culvert construction
- Works in the lake required for a new weir
- Works in the downstream channel connected into a SAC (River Suir)

6. Options 4, 5

Option 5 Raise dam embankment and divert 1% AEP flow via open channel and culvert



- Raise the existing dam embankment and embankment along the lakeside properties
- Flood wall along the spillway and on the west shore of the lake to protect the properties
- Open diversion channel approx. 40m long
- Diversion culvert approx. 10m long
- Regrading works to deepen the existing 40m long channel and provide retaining walls to increase conveyance

Potential constraints

- Site access during construction of dam and flood walls
- Requires stability assessment of the dam with increased embankment
- Impact of the flood wall on architectural heritage (Mill ruin)
- Permanent constructions at residential properties on both side of the road
- Works in the stream connected into a SAC (River Suir)





In addition to these 5 viable Options, other options were initially considered. They were rejected because of the constraints or because they were not able to meet the two objective targets of increasing dam safety and protecting the village from the flood.





This option would have created a temporary lake similar in size to Marlfield Lake during storm events.

Even with this storage, modelling found that the peak flow at Marlfield is not reduced sufficiently to prevent flooding.



with weir



Option 12. Relocate affected residents

This option proposes the relocation of the residents of affected properties. From the hydraulic modelling it is shown that 14 properties could be affected by the 1% AEP flood. This option is rejected due to the high social impact of relocating residents.

Option 11. Do Nothing

The option of do nothing is the baseline option against which potential improvements are measured. Doing nothing does not improve the safety of the dam and does not provide increased flood protection to the village.

7. Non-viable Options Considered

Do Minimum. Divert 1% AEP flow via Option 6. new culvert at Mill Apartments to existing road culvert



The existing road culvert does not have capacity for the 1% AEP flow, so this option does not provide flood protection. Without works at the this does not dam increase dam safety.



Option 9. Add a new overflow weir and divert 0.1% AEP flow to east of stream

> This option while meeting both the target objectives was rejected because of constructability issues due to the steep slopes across the route and the difficulty of access for heavy machinery near the new weir location and the dangers associated with deep construction close to the existing dam.

Option 10. Structural improvement works to dam to allow overtopping safely



Option 13. Additional maintenance

This option consists in additional maintenance of the embankment. However, additional maintenance cannot on its own meet the target objectives. Maintenance will be included with any selected measures.



Option 7. Lower the Weir and divert 1% AEP flow via new culvert at Mill Apartments to existing road culvert

> This option consists in adding the lowering of the weir to Option 6. It was rejected because the existing road culvert does not have capacity for the 1% AEP flow, so this option does not provide flood protection.

This option can provide the dam safety but fails to protect the village from the flood.





8. Next steps



Contact details

Please have your say – speak to the project representatives today and fill a consultation questionnaire to ensure your views are known.

Further questions can be directed to: Tipperary County Council or to Nicholas O'Dwyer Limited

By post: Nicholas O'Dwyer Limited Unit 4E, Nutgrove Office Park, Nutgrove Ave, Churchtown Upper Dublin 14 D14 V3F6

or by email: MarlfieldFRS@nodwyer.com

