

Minutes of the Multi Agency Flood Defence Meeting held on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> May 2014  
in Lydney Town Council Chambers at 10.30 am

**PRESENT:** Cllr Brian Pearman, Lydney NDP (**BP**)  
Dan Howell, Forestry Commission (**DH**)  
Chris Johns, Forest of Dean District Council (**CJ**)  
John Thurston, Watts Group (**JT**)  
Ben Grey, Dean Forest Railway (**BG**)  
Peter Adams, Lydney NDP (**PA**)  
Martin Young, Environment Agency (**MY**)  
Robert Frankton, Lydney Park Estate (**RF**)  
Clive Saunders, Amey (**CS**)  
Jason Westmoreland, Forest of Dean District Council (**JW**)  
Brian Watkins (**BW**)  
Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Representative (**RC**)  
Two members of the public

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Jayne Smailes, CEO Lydney Town Council (**JS**)  
Kate Hammond, Admin Assistant, Lydney Town Council (Minute Taker)

**APOLOGIES:** District Cllr Martin Quaile (Forest of Dean District Council)  
District Cllr Marion Winship (Forest of Dean District Council)  
Cllr James Bevan (Lydney Town Council)  
Cllr Brian Thomas (Lydney Town Council)  
Cllr Alan Preest (Lydney Town Council)  
David Graham (Gloucestershire County Council)  
Christine Jones (West Dean Parish Council)  
Dr Jerry Birch (Glatfelter Lydney Ltd)

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<p><b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b> Cllr Brian Pearman chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone. Introductions were made around the table.</p>	
2.	<p><b>NOTES OF LAST MEETING (22 January 2014)</b> One amendment was proposed: the correction of 'Newerne Street' not 'Newent Street' mentioned on page 7. The notes were then accepted as a true record.</p>	
3.	<p><b>LYD MAP AND RIPARIAN OWNERSHIP</b> BP advised that Pear Technology had now completed the final draft riparian ownership map and that the map was expected by the end of the week. BP took the opportunity to thank all and those who had participated in its collation. In future it would now be possible to base work on something that was accurate and allowed for generic reference to be made.</p>	

	<p>JS confirmed the first objective was to ensure the map's accuracy before having them laminated and distributed. However, JS reiterated that in part it would only ever be the meeting's best guess.</p> <p>As West Dean Parish Council had not confirmed if they wished to extend the mapped area to include West Dean area, it was noted that said area had not been included at this stage.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>RIVER LYD WATERCOURSE CLEARING</b></p> <p>BP reported that the land on the riverbanks owned by Lydney Recreation Trust south of Albany Bridge had been cleared which followed on from the work that the Trust completed further upstream. It was noted that the water flow and level had improved dramatically in the area.</p> <p>Dean Forest Railway (DFR) were currently carrying out some training and hoped to be in a position to clear their section south of Albany Bridge (opposite the Trust's land) as soon as possible thereafter.</p> <p>JS enquired whether Forest of Dean District Council (FODDC) were able to provide financial assistance to help with funding the work which was soon to be addressed by DFR. CJ confirmed all applications would be looked at and had arranged a walk along the watercourse on the 7<sup>th</sup> May 2014.</p> <p>Attention then turned to the issue of Plummers Brook and CJ was asked to provide details of the cost of monitoring two areas of said Brook.</p> <p>CJ confirmed that costings for Plummers Brook was something FoDDC were still currently considering. The condition of the Brook downstream would be noted during the impending walk and reported back to the next meeting. However if, during the course of the walk blockages were viewed, FoDDC would consider these priority areas. It was noted that the walk will commence at Lakeside through to that of the Canal.</p> <p>JS enquired as to whether the group wanted to create another map for Plummer's Brook plus include the other watercourse that leads into the Lyd.</p> <p>CJ recommended that the initial outcome of the walk could be used to determine whether this was necessary.</p>	<p><b>BG</b></p> <p><b>CJ</b></p> <p><b>CJ</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>SEWAGE</b></p> <p>JS advised that there had been no report provided from Severn Trent in regards to the flow results but that a report from the</p>	

	<p>Environment Agency (EA) had been received and duly circulated. It appeared that Severn Trent discharged quite regularly into the Lyd however no account had been received as to how many times this happened in any one month and no progress seemed to have been made regarding the ability to dissuade Severn Trent from depositing into the Lyd. The EA licence also appeared not to regulate said discharge.</p> <p>JT requested an explanation regarding the term of 'dilute storm sewage'. MY expressed his belief that the treatment plant was designed in Victorian times where the maximum input would be multiples of three; the waste could be diluted at a ratio of 20-1. However MY stressed that he was unsure of the modern licence/frequency of discharge and gave a commitment to follow up on this point.</p> <p>JT expressed concern over the unspecified dilution of sewage and the fact that it appeared to have happened 22 times during the course of a year. He was unsure of who initiated the discharges but stressed that some action must be taken as there was a very real Health and Safety concern. MY advised that the EA took samples at discharge points and monitored discharge dilution rates but agreed to investigate as to the exact process.</p> <p>JT suggested that there was a need to enforce Severn Trent to reduce the sewage being discharged in and around the Town.</p> <p>PA questioned whether the sewage plant had been recently upgraded.</p> <p>JT advised that he believed it was due an upgrade as it was running at capacity, however, questioned whether FoDDC planning would allow additional housing to be built on land/in an area where there was a sewage issue.</p> <p>JS enquired whether the FoDDC became involved in such matters and if they could enforce the regulation of the EA licence to deposit in the Lyd. CJ replied that FoDDC could check the licence capacity however the EA had advised that they had no reported incidents to date.</p> <p>JT advised that the matter had been reported to FoDDC during the last 2 years. Severn Trent usually visited site, not the EA, and he felt the problem lay with the dilution as it was carried by flood water resulting in a backup of sewerage, which then ran back into properties. JT confirmed that this had been evident at Mead Lane.</p> <p>JS suggested that 22 times per year indicated that the pumping station was inadequate, and that it would be prudent to ascertain the</p>	<p><b>MY</b></p> <p><b>MY</b></p>
--	--	-----------------------------------

	<p>capacity of the EA licence.</p> <p>JT advised that unless pressure was put on Severn Trent they would not spend money but felt that a solution would need to be found due to the health and safety concern which had been identified.</p> <p>PA enquired if LTC was in a position to enforce. JS advised that LTC had no statutory powers, these were instead held by FoDDC. BP advised that LTC wished to work together with FoDDC on the issue.</p> <p>JT called for the letter of enforcement be made public (eg. published in local press)</p> <p>BP suggested that a smaller group should address the matter with a report made at the next meeting.</p> <p>BG requested a presentation by Severn Trent at next meeting</p>	<p><b>PA, JT, CJ, MY</b></p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>FLOODING TO LAKESIDE</b></p> <p>BP handed over to RC as Elected Lakeside Residents Rep.</p> <p>RC reiterated the content of the report from Mr G Blake which had been circulated with the agenda. RC asked that as part of the walk being conducted FoDDC Officers examine the work completed to the rear of 115 Lakeside. CJ advised that FoDDC would review the culvert which had been identified as being 90% blocked.</p> <p>RC advised that it had been over 5 months since Robert Hitchins (the Developer) had been on site however, debris still remained. JW responded by advising that the Developer was keen to meet a Surveyor and an Engineer to clean further upstream however the debris issue would need to be raised again.</p> <p>RC advised that at Crump Farm a trash screen was located by the By-pass/stone structure erected when the By-pass was created, and that the pond area was used to capture storm water.</p> <p>JS advised that the issue of current land ownership was still being investigated by FoDDC and that it was still necessary to establish responsibility in order to ensure the trash screen was kept clear.</p> <p>RC advised that a letter had been sent to FoDDC. She further advised that an engineer's report had been presented to FoDDC Housing Committee in 1984 and she believed this report held the key.</p> <p>JS questioned FoDDC why the minutes from said meeting were not available as this would assist in establishing ownership. CJ advised that FoDDC were unable to locate the records from said date; however, contact has been made with Land Registry as the issue of land ownership was still being investigated.</p>	

RC stated that she had approached a family who had lived in a bungalow at Woodland Rise in 1984; the family has advised that the trash screen had been installed around this given date whilst the culvert had been in situ (It had been an open pipe prior). CJ agreed that the culvert was undersized.

RC reported that previously the County Council had advised Lakeside residents that they did not meet the criteria for funding as there were only five reports of flooding. CD inquired whether they now met set criteria following the recent events? JW advised that a number that was in the hundreds was required in order to meet said criteria.

JS asked whether FoDDC could assist in remedial works to alleviate the problems faced by Lakeside residents? JW advised that FoDDC did have delegated powers but they do not have powers for flooding as this falls to the County Council, furthermore FoDDC did not hold a 'flood risk' budget.

RC requested information about the budget that FoDDC had for Mead Lane? JW responded by advising that Mead Lane met a different criteria.

Attention was then turned to the possibility to divert the flood water. JW advised that FoDDC were currently looking at stage barriers, a process of reducing water flow and allowing it to pass more slowly.

RC queried the issue relating to Faller Fields; the run off direction of SUDs and why, and indeed how, the Town Council had been allowed to sell statutory allotment ground without seeking the express permission of the Secretary of State?

CJ advised that having checked the planning application everything that had been planned had been correctly implemented.

RC advised that if the Developer had created a basin in the parking area she did not dispute drainage would have been adequate as previously the flood water used to seep away through the allotment site. However, now that area had been built upon there was nowhere for the water to go. Noting that FoDDC had granted consent for the development and that LTC were at fault for not having sought the requisite permissions RC felt that the current problems experienced by residents would continue unless action was taken by those authorities at fault to address the problem with either long term or short term solutions now needing to be urgently discussed.

PA advised that we were now suffering from increased water flow

	<p>since the time when they were built and drainage could not handle it. BP suggested that FoDDC were given the opportunity to work upstream from the culvert in order to control the flow; it was noted that the manhole covers had been replaced around the culvert which it was anticipated would provide a solution to any future issues. Further flood issues of the same magnitude may then not be witnessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JW to provide a copy of original engineer's report which was submitted to FoDDC Housing Committee together with a copy of the relevant Minutes.</li> </ul> <p>JS asked that the report be forwarded to the LTC office in order that it could be made available for the next flood defence meeting in order that it, along with the engineers report, could be considered alongside any remedial short/long term suggestions made.</p>	<b>JW</b>
7.	<p><b>ACTION PLAN/ACTIONS PENDING</b></p> <p>JS advised that a copy of the DRAFT Minutes/action points would be circulated prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>JT enquired about two points from the last meeting. The first point suggested that the canal should be dredged due to silt build up as the flow away proved to be worsening which caused concern as he believed it was adding to the problems experienced.</p> <p>The second point highlighted was the town centre. JT expressed his belief that there was a huge concern that the River Lyd would overflow and go through the car park in the town centre. The flood maps stated that the area must be kept open for the water flow to go through and he questioned the plans put in place prior. MY responded by advising that the EA kept various flood maps and would need to ascertain exactly the area being referred to. The EA however recommend that planning development/permission is not ordinarily granted for a flood plain however given the recent planning application which was held in abeyance agreed to re-check the EAs findings and advise FODDC accordingly.</p> <p>JT sought clarification given that there was now less than 1 in 100 risk from flooding?</p> <p>JS advised that a possible planning argument could be that it was already a designated Brownfield site.</p> <p>Attention was then directed towards a report in the paper regarding the problems faced with the flooding at Lydbrook and the suggestion of tunnelling back into the hill in Upper Lydbrook, diverting the waters of the problematic Great Hough Brook from Mireystock, and channelling it through old mine workings so that the waters eventually joined the River Lyd, and then emptied into the Severn Estuary at Lydney. CJ confirmed that it was only a suggestion from</p>	<b>MY</b>

	<p>the County Council and was in essence not feasible and would not therefore be explored further.</p> <p>Action points for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As detailed, plus -</li> <li>• Small working group would be formed to encourage Severn Trent to address the Sewage problems</li> <li>• CJ to book chamber for working party meeting</li> </ul>	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> July at 10.30 am at Lydney Town Council Chambers.</p>	

Meeting closed at 11.50 am