

Minutes of the Multi Agency Flood Defence Meeting held on Thursday 24th July 2014 in Lydney
Town Council Chambers at 10.33 am

PRESENT: Cllr Brian Thomas, Lydney NDP **(BT)**
Cllr Alan Preest, County Cllr **(AP)**
Cllr Brian Pearman, Lydney NDP **(BP)**
Cllr Claire Vaughan Lydney Town Council **(CV)**
Dave Street, NDP **(DS)**
Barry Bridgewater, Severn Trent Water **(BB)**
Chris Johns, Forest of Dean District Council **(CJ)**
David Graham, Gloucestershire County Council **(DG)**
District Cllr Martin Quaile, Forest of Dean District Council **(MQ)**
John Thurston, Watts Group **(JT)**
Cllr Christine Jones, West Dean Parish Council **(CJ)**
Cllr Roger Gwynne, West Dean Parish Council **(RG)**
Matthew Panou, Gloucestershire County Council **(MP)**
Greg Daniel, Severn Trent Water **(GD)**
Peter Adams, Lydney NDP **(PA)**
Martin Young, Environment Agency **(MY)**
Richard Price, Lydney Park Estate **(RP)**
Jason Westmoreland, Forest of Dean District Council **(JW)**
Brian Watkins, Gloucestershire County Council Highways **(BW)**
Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Representative **(RC)**
One member of the public

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

APOLOGIES: Dan Howell, (Forestry Commission)
Stewart Charters, (WATTS Group)
Robert Frankton, (Lydney Park Estate)
Ben Gray, (Dean Forest Railway)
District Cllr Marion Winship, (Forest of Dean District Council)

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<p>WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS Cllr Brian Thomas chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone. Introductions were made around the table.</p>	
2.	<p>NOTES OF LAST MEETING (1 May 2014) Three amendments were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correction of the bungalow at 'Lakeside Avenue' not 'Woodland Rise' as mentioned on page 5, item 6. • Correction to 'a partial solution' not 'a solution' as mentioned in the sentence 'the manhole covers had been replaced around the culvert which it was anticipated would provide a solution to any future issues' page 6, item 6. • Correction of the name 'Ben Gray' not 'Ben Grey'. 	

	The notes were then accepted as a true record.	
3.	<p>LYD MAP AND RIPARIAN OWNERSHIP</p> <p>BT advised that the riparian ownership map produced for Lydney Town Council had been received and was duly on display at the time of the meeting. It was confirmed that a copy of an AO laminated final version of the map would cost £42.00 plus VAT and an AO unlaminated version would cost £20.00 plus VAT. Members were asked if they wished to obtain a copy they should contact the Town Council Office.</p>	
4.	<p>RIVER LYD WATERCOURSE CLEARING</p> <p>BT requested for an overview of the findings following the walk which had been conducted by CJ and JW.</p> <p>CJ confirmed that they walked the watercourse and investigated said area and the main issue they found was the culvert under Network Rail heading South (no flow). They also reported that they had made some interesting observations, some on Recreation Trust Ground, others adjacent to the Lyd and believed that if all areas were cleared then the flow would run smoother.</p> <p>JW thanked DS for his local input and advised that FoDDC would only be able to enforce riparian maintenance once there existed a cleared run through from Lakeside to Harbour area. JW also advised that FoDDC had applied to County Council for funding aimed at addressing flooding issues in Lydney.</p> <p>BT advised that following an earlier walk he had noticed that a number of culverts were submerged and suggested that maybe additional drainage was needed. JW advised that FoDDC were in negotiations with the Riparian Owners in regards to the land South Side of the by-pass.</p> <p>MY asked JW to explain where the culvert was to those who did not know. JW advised that it appeared to be under Network Rail as it didn't go through DFR site track.</p> <p>PA in the past had a lot to do with culvert and felt that the area was a dumping ground handed across to Rec Trust. PA also advised that the culvert was under Network Rail; closer to where new signalling is being installed, therefore was not DFR responsibility.</p> <p>JS picked up on two points that were yet to be addressed by FoDDC, point one being the email from G Blake querying the ownership of the culvert behind 115 Lakeside. Point two being the engineers report on Fallers Field, being commissioned by FoDDC in order that a meeting with residents to resolve/reduce</p>	

	<p>issue could be arranged.</p> <p>BT requested an update from C Johns for the cost of monitoring two areas of Plummers Brook to which CJ responded there was currently no update.</p> <p>DS asked whether there was any possibility that any future development would have an impact on Plummers Brook? BT advised it would be important to assess and monitor against such changes and called on CJ/FoDDC to provide an assurance that future Planning Applications include restrictions to prevent this from happening.</p> <p>DS advised that Whitehouse Press culvert looked suspicious and that an investigation on the Harbour site to monitor the flow may be advantageous. BT advised that there could potentially be a new owner for the harbour so it may be a discussion once new owners had been identified. BP asked whether the area could be incorporated in the walk by CJ. CJ confirmed this to be acceptable.</p> <p>BP suggested to members there may be a necessity to produce a riparian ownership map specifically for Plummers Brook in order that everyone would be aware of any potential problems. BT advised that a walk was taking place at Neds Top which is beyond the present mapped area, however felt that they should wait until the walk had been undertaken and then consider whether an additional map was warranted/useful.</p>	<p>Action: CJ to provide costing</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>SEWAGE</p> <p>BB advised Severn Trent were still looking at the Lakeside Pumping Station however the flow rate was considered acceptable. BB explained how the overflow system operated (diluted sewage into Lyd) and advised that at the Works (Meade Lane) sewage goes straight to the River Severn.</p> <p>BP advised he had learned; East Marsh Pumping Station had three pumps which when there was flooding, residents believed the pumps were not working; it was however that they couldn't be heard as they were under water. BB advised that Church Road had a pumping station within the works compound with a Well that filled up when pumping. Severn Trent were assessing the capacity for the station further up Meade Lane which had an overflow that maybe needed to operate quicker, however modifications could not be undertaken until results of such tests proved conclusive.</p> <p>JT advised that this issue had been going on for 2-3 years and suggested there needed to be a resolution within an agreed timescale. GD advised that they needed the relevant data before they could 'model' anything or implement improvement</p>	

	<p>measures.</p> <p>JS requested Severn Trent establish licence details/permission data as she believed it be monitored by somebody and advised that exact data had still not been received as to how many times Severn Trent were allowed to deposit diluted sewage in the Lyd. BB advised that he had brought with him to the meeting the consent which detailed the distribution of sewage etc.</p> <p>JT requested specifics; How many times had sewage been deposited in the Lyd to which BB advised that in the last 12 months it had been discharged 41 times according to telemetry systems.</p> <p>BT proposed that a working party be set up to discuss these findings. All agreed.</p>	<p>Action: GD to provide data to be used to inform improvement measures</p> <p>Action: Working group BP, JT, Severn Trent etc</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>FLOODING TO LAKESIDE</p> <p>RC asked when work would commence now funding had been secured from County Council? JW advised that the funding value was £40,000.</p> <p>RC sought clarification as to what the funding would be put towards, she felt consideration should be given to attenuation ponds to prevent issues in Lakeside/Faller Fields. JW advised that FoDDC were looking to broaden the scope and would discuss with an Independent Surveyor. JW advised that upstream was fairly straightforward as the developer Robert Hitchins had supplied information free of charge, it was estimated that work upstream would therefore cost less than first anticipated.</p> <p>RC queried the timescale and asked whether attenuation ponds would be in place by Winter. JW advised that work upstream would potentially take 12 months a solution to Faller Fields drainage issue, probably longer. RC asked how long the Survey would take. JW responded by advising that 'legal obligations'/consent of land owners would need to be obtained and would need to be put in place prior to further investigation and to ensure Health and Safety Standards. BT advised that although the information would be costly such information would be invaluable and urged FoDDC to address in a timely manner.</p> <p>JS asked whether the LEAP at Fallers Field, which residents had asked be removed, would address the problem, believing the space could then be used to assist in reducing water flow by engineering additional drainage. JW advised that it was more of a planning issue. JS advised that the developer had been</p>	

approached by residents and they are thinking of submitting an application in their own right. BP felt that having been to site, the play area was a separate issue as the site was well above the water level. CJ advised planning permission for Faller Fields 'soak away system' would change the dynamics of the storm water but RC felt it was not a solution to be storing it 'on site' and felt that adequate engineering works needed to be undertaken as a priority.

JW advised that drainage from the A48 was inadequate, with the larger Culvert underneath the A48 towards Plummers Brook increasing water flow. JW advised that there were two drainage canals and work was required on channel. RC questioned whether the concrete pad in the Culvert at the rear of 115 Lakeside had all now been removed? JW advised that FoDDC were planning to undertake work changing the trash screen. JW advised that the flooding issues were not all to do with the concrete. CJ provided an update concerning the Culvert and had cleared land rear to Lakeside 2 months ago. Surveys had been carried out last week which highlighted there were still a number of small blockages. FoDDC were looking to conduct a Survey next week and send CCTV into Faller Fields and if any further issues were found would seek advice and build a report for end of September.

RC felt that it is not capacity issues as no doubt drainage could deal with it, but felt that the large deluge that hits Faller Fields was an engineering fault. BP advised that when water comes down it 'pools' at Faller Fields and instead needs irrigation to ensure it continues to move. CJ advised that no-one was aware of how much of the blockage there was last year and now that the area has been cleared it was hoped that it would be better than last winter. RC felt that there was always an occasion where it could happen again as it has already been heavily blocked since. MQ advised that both he and Peter Hibberd were looking to progress a resolution to the issue and are looking to CCTV all Culverts in the vicinity annually and report back the on-going work.

JT raised two points; point one being the centre of Lydney requires a definitive as to its status regarding possible flooding and point two, the dredging of the Canal.

MY advised that Lydney is highlighted on a map as being map zone 2 and 3 Flood risk – development excluded from area. JT queried the response and inquired how this could be amended. MY referred to map. BT suggested meeting with Highways.

JS sought to establish a response regarding action points from last meeting. Lydney will look to expand in future and will need

	<p>to build on land in the Town. What thought had FoDDC taken away from last meeting? JW advised that it depended on what was to be built. JS queried Town Centre objectives. JW advised that the detail is down to the planning application, SUDS being the usual concern.</p> <p>BT questioned the amount of work estimated to alleviate/reduce possible flood level to Lydney High Street.</p> <p>MY advised that the plan shows to that of a 100 year probability and that if this was not preventing Planning Applications from proceeding at FoDDC it could be down to Officers interpretation.</p> <p>JS sought an assurance from MY that guidance be provided by the EA in order to prevent future Planning Applications being blocked without consideration being given in line with EA guidance sheets.</p>	<p>Action: CJ/FoDDC asked to consider EA response and provide definitive</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>ACTION PLAN/ACTIONS PENDING Action points for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As detailed, plus - • EA explanation/FoDDC to provide clarification as to what is required to contest the 100 year probability paper. • Separate working party to discuss Severn Trent depositing sewage into Lyd • CJ to provide report following CCTV at Faller Fields 	
<p>8.</p>	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING Thursday 2nd October at 10.30 am at Lydney Town Council Chambers.</p>	

Meeting closed at 11.35 am