

Minutes of the Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Meeting held on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> November 2016 in Lydney Town Council Chambers at 10.30 am

**PRESENT:** Cllr Brian Pearman, Lydney Town Council **(BP)**  
 Cllr Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Rep/Lydney Town Council **(RC)**  
 Edward Argent, Robert Hitchins Ltd **(EA)**  
 Jayne Smailes, Lydney Town Council **(JS)**  
 Dawn Morgan, Forest of Dean District Council **(DM)**  
 Lawrence King, Forest of Dean District Council **(LK)**  
 District Cllr Marilyn Smart, Forest of Dean District Council **(MS)**  
 Andrew Bryant, Watts Group **(AB)**  
 John Thurston, Watts Group **(JT)**  
 Peter Siret, Gloucestershire County Council **(PS)**  
 Cllr Bob Berryman, Lydney Town Council **(BB)**  
 Cllr Alan Preest, Lydney Town Council/Gloucestershire County Council **(AP)**  
 Cllr Colin Legg, Lakeside Resident Rep/Lydney Town Council **(CL)**

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

**APOLOGIES:** Cllr Dave Street (Lydney Town Council)  
 Dr Jerry Burch (Glatfelter)

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b> Cllr Brian Pearman (BP) chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone.	
2.	<b>NOTES OF LAST MEETING (22 September 2016)</b> The meeting notes were accepted as a true record.	
3.	<b>CONDITIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT</b> BP requested an update/written response from Head of Paid Service FODDC regarding action taken to flooding issues at Faller Fields.  AP advised that he had not been able to further a response as to whether FODDC had enforced either a Grampian Condition or a Phased Condition at Faller Fields or whether FODDC would enforce such on any/all developments within the catchment area of Lakeside Avenue (as appropriate) to prevent water run-off etc entering existing watercourses, however he gave an undertaking to address and report back to the group at the next meeting.	<b>Action: AP to gain written response from Head of Paid Service (FODDC) regarding action taken re. flooding issues at Faller Fields</b>

4.	<p><b>FLOOD DEFENCE CURRENT FINANCIAL BALANCE</b></p> <p>BP requested a copy of the financial statement from FODDC confirming the current balance of the Flood Defence Earmarked Account.</p> <p>DM provided a copy of a spread sheet created by FODDC advising that the total variance left in relation to the Flood Defence Earmarked Account was £36,739.90. Noted.</p>	
5.	<p><b>FLOODING TO LAKESIDE AVENUE</b></p> <p>BP requested an update from FODDC regarding attenuation measures between Crump Farm and Lakeside Avenue.</p> <p>DM advised that the first bund had been installed at Crump Farm near the bypass attenuation, with the second bund due to be constructed in due course (with assistance from R Hitchins Ltd). EA advised that although R Hitchins Ltd were willing to assist with the location and construction of the second bund, due to its contractual obligations on the development at Highfield Hill he was unable to guarantee that the bund would be in place prior to Christmas.</p> <p>LK advised that in relation to the Trash screen to the rear of 115 Lakeside Avenue, he had met with the property owner and had instructed a survey be carried out. The result survey was that there was a complication in design due to the second pipe, therefore he had arranged for another site meeting to take place to investigate further and should the second investigation prove that the Trash screen was not fit for purpose FODDC would need to install a new Trash screen, which would be of a correct design, with future maintenance obligations then being agreed between FODDC and the property owner.</p> <p>BP requested that any information regarding future maintenance of the Trash screen be circulated to all members prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>JS questioned should FODDC install a 'new' Trash screen, how much would it cost and where would it be sited? LK advised that it would depend on the design and other factors such as frequency of water flow and where the pipes were situated.</p> <p>LK further advised that a plan had been already considered/discussed by FODDC; the 'new' Trash screen being sited 12 metres up the watercourse from where the inlet is currently sited, extending the culvert by 12 metres and building a headwall with a second pipe along, resulting in a 'new' Trash screen, headwall and platform which he felt would hopefully address the situation at Lakeside Avenue.</p>	

	<p>JS questioned whether (should/once FODDC install a 'new' Trash screen etc) FODDC would make FloodRe aware of the works to Flood alleviation in order to assist residents of Lakeside Avenue and surrounding areas with their home insurance? LK advised that FODDC updates its own website advising what has been done in different areas of the Forest of Dean, which can be accessed by the public/all organisations. LK further advised that FloodRe had since April 2016 assisted by 'capping' resident's home insurance premiums and as such if a resident was deemed to be in a flood zone 2 or 3 they were encouraged to contact FloodRe who would offer advice and assistance with insurance matters.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>FLOODING TO COOKSON TERRACE</b></p> <p>BP requested an update from FODDC regarding investigation into the removal of the culvert near Harbour Road/Whitehouse Press Ltd and the response from Statutory Consultees regarding the proposal for the installation of clay bunds near Plummer's Brook and Cookson Terrace.</p> <p>DM advised that FODDC were due to carry out another survey of the area and were currently working with Mr Bendall (owner of the land and lakes – Lake Windrush) who had assisted in the installation of a clay bund along the further edge of the Lake (where house no. 5 Cookson Terrace had previously reported an issue with flooding).</p> <p>DM advised that the initial survey had resulted in a number of items to consider such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High voltage cable on two sides of the site (FODDC/Mr Bendall to contact Western Power to ascertain whether construction of bunds would be an issue and form an agreement)</li> <li>- There would be a 500ml difference between the height of the bund and the field (field would be lower than bund) with the field being utilised for any water run-off going back into Plummer's Brook</li> </ul> <p>JT expressed concern as to what effect the removal of the culvert near Harbour Road/Whitehouse Press Ltd would have on the levels upstream, particularly at Mead lane, as he felt the water level would increase?</p> <p>LK advised that FODDC were looking into ways of changing the direction of water flow to another place, rather than stopping the flow or allowing any 'back up' of water flow to affect upstream.</p> <p>DM advised that before FODDC could consider removal of the culvert near Harbour Road/Whitehouse Press Ltd, the culvert would need to be cleared/dredged in order to ascertain what is in there, however FODDC first priority was to focus on the clay bunds.</p>	

	<p>JS questioned whether a response had been received from Statutory Consultees regarding the proposal for the installation of clay bunds? LK advised that as no planning application had been submitted yet (due to the issue with the High voltage cables on site etc) that Statutory Consultees had yet to be contacted.</p> <p>JS expressed concern (due to FODDC exhausting its budget) where FODDC would gain the expenditure for the flood measures at Plummer’s Brook and Cookson Terrace, however LK assured members that FODDC would gain the expenditure required.</p> <p>JT questioned whether there were any plans in place to dredge the canal? BP advised that he believed the Environment Agency were looking into the possibility of dredging the canal.</p> <p>AB sought advice from FODDC regarding the culvert/attenuation measure at Mead lane, for it appeared little maintenance had been undertaken in quite some time (evidence of silt build up in culvert/attenuation measure).</p> <p>LK advised that he would investigate/establish the ownership of the culvert/attenuation measure at Mead lane and advise of any action required at the next meeting.</p>	<p><b>Action: LK to investigate/establish ownership of the culvert/attenuation measure at Mead lane and advise of any action required at the next meeting</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS/OAKDALE DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2</b></p> <p>Members noted the comments from FODDC and Redrow’s Civil &amp; Structural Engineer regarding drainage plans for planning application P0924/16/APP on land off Highfield Hill, Lydney.</p> <p>Among other items it was advised that the site layout was considered to be permeable with respect to the watershed. The proposed levels and plot spacing are such that significant depths of water were unlikely to result as a result of exceedance and/or blockage. Significantly, as finished floor levels were typically elevated 150mm above adjacent ground levels it was unlikely that overland flows would impact upon the dwellings.</p> <p>EA advised that Redrow were ‘plugging’ their drainage into R Hitchins Ltd infrastructure spinal drainage for the development and furthermore R Hitchins Ltd had already installed a balancing pond which Redrow would also utilise.</p> <p>LK advised that there had been previous concern regarding issues with any excessive flows of water to plots 13-15 during an extreme event however Redrow had proposed erecting an extra flood wall to prevent any concern, which was considered a satisfactory defence.</p>	

RC queried whether there was potential for Lakeside Avenue to be at an increased risk of flooding whilst the Highfield Hill site was in its development stage?

EA advised that the only areas that would have a possible affect was the areas that they were working on (ie. areas where houses were being put up) but R Hitchins Ltd assured that a phased drainage plan was in place, which would work to limit any water 'run off' from the site and instead excess water would puddle on the site (rather than flowing away).

BP requested an update from GCC and FODDC following contact made with MMC's Consultant Engineer regarding the proposed drainage plan/map for Phase 2 of the Oakdale Development planning application P1881/15/FUL.

JS provided members with a copy of the response which LTC had recently submitted to the LPA regarding the aforementioned planning application (P1881/15/FUL).LTC's original concerns centred around the issues of SUDS and Transport/Highways infrastructure and had since been advised that the concerns re. drainage had been addressed by the revised plan submitted by MMC.

PS advised that the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA/GCC) had originally objected to the planning application due to the connection to proposal to the culvert that runs through Lakeside Avenue. The applicant was unclear as to whether the site currently drains to that culvert and the flood risk modelling conducted in the area did not show how the site behaved with respect to the culvert. Nevertheless, the Lydney Integrated Drainage Project Report by Halcrow (2009) stated that a connection to the Lakeside Avenue culvert even at 5l/s/ha would increase the flood risk to the southwest of the development by 30%. The report did not specify what the 30% represented (e.g depth/volume/flow rate) so this was sufficient to refuse the connection to the Lakeside Avenue culvert. As MMC have now proposed to connect to Phase 1's drainage system, which exhibits sufficient capacity to receive Phase 2's water, it has now been deemed appropriate by the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA/GCC). Conclusively, Phase 2 will no longer connect/discharge to the Lakeside Avenue Culvert.

AP felt that since GCC had taken over as LLFA it had put a 'safeguard' in place when considering future developments in the Town.

JS asked whether FODDC places any form of 'condition'/maintenance obligation on the developer when the developer decides to use an existing watercourse? LK advised it depended on the situation ie. In the case of most developments it would fall to the responsibility of the residents/maintenance company, unless there was a section 106

	agreement in place prior.	
8.	<p><b>FLOOD RESILIENCE PLANNING</b></p> <p>Attendees were advised that whilst Lydney Town Council Members are very supportive of the idea of a 'dry run' exercise it was felt that the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA/GCC) should be the one organising such (rather than the Town Council given resource capacity).</p> <p>PS advised that it was not within LLFA/GCC's remit to address such.</p> <p>LK advised that FODDC and GCC would liaise over who would take the lead on organising a 'dry run' exercise and report back to the next meeting.</p>	<p><b>Action: FODDC and GCC to liaise over who would take the lead on organising a 'dry run' exercise re Flood Resilience Planning</b></p>
9.	<p><b>A.O.B</b></p> <p>JT reminded members that Severn Trent Water Ltd had previously carried out a series of programmes such as feasibility studies and monitoring of other issues in regard to drainage across Lydney and questioned whether there was any update from them in regard to the feasibility study at Mead Lane? JS advised that LTC would seek an update from Severn Trent Ltd and would request their attendance at the next meeting.</p> <p>RC questioned who was responsible for the maintenance to the balancing pond/attenuation by the bypass and the watercourse to Lakeside Avenue?</p> <p>LK advised that the balancing pond/attenuation by the bypass would be the responsibility of GCC Highways, the watercourse at Crump Farm would be the responsibility of the developer and the watercourse to Lakeside Avenue would be the responsibility of FODDC and the developer (maintenance plan on one side is FODDC and the other side is developer as riparian ownership).</p> <p>JS advised LTC would contact Mr Brian Watkins at GCC Highways/Amey regarding the maintenance to the balancing pond/attenuation by the bypass.</p> <p>RC, MS and BP all expressed their gratitude to Dawn Morgan (DM) and Lawrence King (LK) from FODDC and Edward Argent from Robert Hitchins Ltd for all of their effort and hard work to date.</p>	<p><b>Action: LTC to seek an update from Severn Trent Ltd re. feasibility study for Mead Lane/ drainage plans for the rest of Lydney and request their attendance at the next meeting</b></p> <p><b>Action: LTC to contact Mr Brian Watkins at GCC Highways/Amey regarding the maintenance to the balancing pond/attenuation by the bypass.</b></p>
10.	<p><b>ACTION PLAN/ACTIONS PENDING</b></p> <p>Action points for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AP to gain written response from Head of Paid Service (FODDC) regarding action taken re. flooding issues at Faller Fields</li> <li>• LK to investigate/establish ownership of the culvert/attenuation</li> </ul>	<p><b>AP</b></p> <p><b>LK</b></p>

	<p>measure at Mead lane and advise accordingly re. future maintenance arrangements at the next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FODDC and GCC to liaise over who would take the lead on organising a 'dry run' exercise re Flood Resilience Planning</li> <li>• LTC to seek an update from Severn Trent Ltd re. feasibility study for Mead Lane/ drainage plans for the rest of Lydney and request their attendance at the next meeting</li> <li>• LTC to contact Mr Brian Watkins at GCC Highways/Amey regarding the maintenance to the balancing pond/attenuation by the bypass.</li> </ul>	<p>LK</p> <p>JS/LTC</p> <p>JS/LTC</p>
11.	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2016 at Lydney Town Council Chambers at 10.30 am</p>	

Meeting closed at 11.26 am