

Minutes of the Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Meeting held on  
Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020 in Lydney Town Council Chambers at 2.00pm

**PRESENT:** Walter Leach, Lydney Town Council **(WL)**  
 Louis Arnold, Lydney Town Council **(LA)**  
 Joe Baker, GCC **(JB)**  
 Andy Bryant, Watts Group **(AB)**  
 Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Rep **(RC)**  
 N Coulson, Persimmon Homes **(NC)**  
 J Fisher, Severn Trent Water **(JF)**  
 Laurence King, FoDDC **(LK)**  
 Colin Legg, Lakeside Resident **(CL)**  
 R Mclean, Severn Trent **(RMC)**  
 D Morgan, FoDDC **(DM)**  
 Alan Preest, Town Council, District Councillor, County Councillor  
 R Sweeney, Severn Trent **(RS)**  
 John Thurston, Watts **(JT)**  
 Claire Vaughan, District Councillor **(CV)**  
 Brian Watkins, Gloucestershire County Council Highways/Amey **(BW)**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Carolyn Whittington, Lydney Town Council (Minute Taker)

**APOLOGIES:** Chris McFarling FoDDC, Liz Fowler E/A, Peter Siret GCC, Jason Walker E/A  
 Tess Tremlett Lydney Town Council, Ed Argent Robert Hitchins, Barry Kilner  
 E/A.

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b> Cllr Walter Leach <b>(WL)</b> chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone.	
2.	<b>APOLOGIES and APPROVAL OF THE NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b> <i>(Copy attached)</i> The meeting notes were accepted as a true record with an amendment to item 4, the monitoring station at Forest Road is a just a monitoring station (it is unable to be opened to allow water to flow through).	
3.	<b>PRESENTATION FROM SEVERN TRENT REGARDING FLOOD METER MONITORING</b> Rebecca Sweeny & Rebecca Mclean provided a report of their presentation.  It is important to clarify that Severn Trent's responsibility is for flooding from sewers and all references to flooding relate specifically to sewer flooding. Customer advice on types of flooding and responsibilities can be found on our website here <a href="https://www.stwater.co.uk/in-my-area/flooding/">https://www.stwater.co.uk/in-my-area/flooding/</a>  The presentation detailed what work had been done to date, and that some projects have been completed including a Sewer Flood	

Alleviation scheme at Lakeside Terrace completed in 2012 and a sewer requisition which takes flows from East of Lydney new development direct to East Marsh Pumping Station avoiding the sewer network in Lakeside Terrace.

A flow survey was completed in winter 2017/18 where 27 monitors were distributed across the catchment. Model verification was completed in 2018 compliant with industry best practice methodology. More detail can be found in the CIWEM UDG code of practice.

Concerns were raised about the flow survey taking place during a drier period, it is not thought to be a problem because even though the 3 storms which meet the flow survey best practice criteria may have been less intense than during a prolonged wet period, during the verification process they are used to determine if the model responds in the same way to the storm as the flow monitors show happens in reality.

If the model matches well against these storms it indicates that it would also match well to more intense storms. The verified model, alongside known reported incidents recorded on the Severn Trent Hydraulic Flood Risk Register (HFRR) has been used to identify areas of hydraulic capacity issues in Sling, Whitecroft, Alvington and Mead Lane Lydney.

The next section looked at what work is planned and provided more detail about how Severn Trent decides where to spend money on flooding projects.

Currently underway is the scoping of locations for the customer flooding questionnaires. To decide where to issue questionnaires we use "Return Period Analysis" from the computer hydraulic model, which tells us the probability a sewer pipe is predicted to flood, and records of past customer complaints of flooding to understand which areas are at risk of flooding. This will also help to ensure our Flooding Risk Register is up to date, and is an additional check that our computer hydraulic model accurately represents the risk of flooding. We also use the Flooding Risk Register to support prioritisation of projects within the Severn Trent region, as we need to ensure those customers with greatest risk are prioritised. As there are several separate locations within the Lydney catchment that need to be contacted this process will take between 9-12 months to complete.

Severn Trent asked if this group could support with identifying resident flood groups or meetings which could improve the response rates to questionnaires and ultimately support the prioritising a project to address sewer flooding risk in Lydney catchment.

Following the Flooding questionnaires, we will re-assess the frequency and impact of flooding risk and carry out a cost benefit exercise to decide whether to progress a project for Lydney

	<p>catchment. Previous individual schemes have been raised across the Lydney catchment however their cost benefit has been insufficient to progress with a scheme and there are concerns that a future scheme may be borderline cost beneficial. However due to the concerns raised by the Lydney Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Group Severn Trent have decided to consider a strategic approach and review the cost benefit across the whole catchment as there may be a better chance of justifying a project. We wish to clarify that a strategic approach does not necessarily mean that there would be one big central solution but may involve multiple localised solutions with a combined cost benefit. Following the Flooding pre-promotion and revised cost benefit prioritisation, Severn Trent will decide whether to promote a project within the current 5 yr period or delay a decision until a later date when sufficient cost benefit can be demonstrated.</p> <p>JT asked who sets the protocols and what value could be put on pollution as Lydney does have pollution issues. RS stated that pollution is a legal responsible and is taken out of the normal process. LK asked how they will react to smaller problems on risk register and RS stated they will attempt to find smaller lower cost solutions. There was concern for the time lag in currently reported issues, but this was explained that they may be put into the long-term plan. RC asked if new build were taken into account as to the money payable to ST, RS stated growth was being looked at as part of a wider strategy. AB asked if this was looked at before the planning went ahead, ST are made aware of new developments. JT asked how much the sewer capacity had been increased due to the growth, the east of Lydney has been bypassed to East Marsh causing a low risk as a result to the survey. Concerns were that with the combined sewers flood has a sewerage impact to back flooding which is critical. LK felt that ST did not always prioritise the issues needed to be done.</p>	
4.	<p><b>TO DISCUSS RECENT FLOODING ISSUES IN LYDNEY</b></p> <p>AP &amp; CV visited Oakdale on the 9 February and were in Lydney on 16 February when 8 homes were flooded. For the first time water came along Cambourne Place and Beaufort Drive, they attempted to activate the plan but could not reach anyone at FoDDC. FoDDC provided no help and when AP attempted to discuss it at the recent FoDDC under urgent business he was prevented from doing so. The plan could not be activated so AP contacted GCC who provided support and AP also called 999 who were unable to help on the 9<sup>th</sup> February but provide a brilliant service on the 16<sup>th</sup> February. The Sluice gates were opened from 9.30 to 4.30 on the 16<sup>th</sup> February, uncertain if the gates had been opened earlier if this would have helped the situation. As this was a known event FoDDC should have made operatives and officers available. Cllr Preest expressed his thanks to all the individuals who helped.</p> <p>Persimmon phase 2 had water running of the site and Cllr Vaughan stressed the problem would have been worse had residents not had</p>	

their own pumps, something they should not have to do. Persimmon had followed all the conditions put in.

RC was in contact with James Hill from Persimmon all day and he attended site contrary to speculation. Persimmon put in place a more robust system prior to the event. LK thanked Persimmon for their co-operation as not all developers are as co-operative.

NC stated designs need to be looked at by archelogy, the local planning authority have raised archelogy issues with GCC.

WL commented that Lydney Town Council used all their sandbags and were unable to obtain more, contact was made with Highways who were unable to help and no sandbags were forth coming from FoDDC.

AP read out part of the Emergency Plan which highlighted FoDDC responsibility to act in such circumstances. LK stated any issues should be taken up with Peter Williams at FoDDC. LK attempts to be contactable at such times, information gained on what is happening is used to attempt to rectify future planning. LK to attend a meeting at FoDDC next week to ensure/understand sandbag availability and what happens when sandbags are not enough.

It was suggested that a dummy exercise of the plan be implemented.

RC queried who would get an alert from the rain gauge and the flood alert list is available on the LTC emergency plan. The rain gauge would only alert with substantially heavy rain.

JT stated that some schemes in place proved to be good and the situation could have been far worse.

LA main observation is there are natural blockages along the River Lyd causing the back up and action is needed to be more reactive to these problems. LA suggested community clean ups and lowering the levels of the River Lyd in advance of advertised events. The flow rates need to be improved to ensure the opening of the sluice gates have an impact. DM agreed that the volume of water is not reaching the harbour. AB said the silt in the upper basin was causing a blockage, which JT thought the E/A were in the process of desilting the upper basin.

LA stated the S bend by the industrial estate culvert needed clearing out and, in his opinion, would help the situation. AB spoke with the Harbour Master on the 16<sup>th</sup> February who stated if water could get to the harbour, they would be able to get it out. RC said that historic minutes of the group showed there was plenty of room in the harbour basin. It was felt the pumping station bridge acts like a dam so could be taken away and maybe reinstate the Trout ponds.

The group agreed that a letter should be sent to Jo Martin E/A asking for explanations and understanding of the dredging and removing of silt, together with the impact the gates would have if they were opened during such an event. The E/A be invited to a meeting later in

	<p>March to fully brief the group.</p> <p>LK confirmed they had details of enough flooded properties to talk to Central Government for Council Tax Reduction under the Flood Resilient plan. Only possible to obtain Flood Resistance grant once. LK asked for information on any unreported flooded properties to enable FoDDC to apply for Grants.</p> <p>DM validating the flooding information.</p> <p>JT stated the local sports clubs had been devastated by the recent flooding and praised the Community effort to put things right.</p>	
5.	<p><b>FLOOD WATER RELIEF VIA THE HARBOUR SLUICE GATES AND MONITORING OF –</b></p> <p>Due to the ongoing flooding issues in the county the E/A were unable to send any representation to the meeting.</p> <p>To remain an agenda item with action from last month to remain.</p>	<p><b>LF TO CONFIRM IF GATES ARE AN E/A ASSET</b></p>
6.	<p><b>MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BW visiting site next week. (1<sup>st</sup> week of March)</li> <li>• Penstock: DM advised water was right up to the top. Water had come from the solar farm, but a bund had been put in.</li> <li>• Flood Meter monitoring: Covered in Presentation.</li> <li>• ST: Combined sewage outfalls (CSO) need real time monitors ST share feedback with E/A. Church Road CSO is when the river is above level. E/A monitor the River Lyd data. Data couldn't be shared with the group but could be shared with FoDDC and Lead Flood Authority, they log times and frequency of CSO relevant to the rainfall.</li> <li>• Cookson Terrace: BW is meeting with the Costal Community fund as Highways have put forward a drainage proposal. Discussed in Agenda item 3. Cllr Vernon Smith GCC Highways and Flooding is due to visit Lydney and DM &amp; LK will meet with him regarding the Flood Resilience Fund.</li> <li>• Mead Lane: Concerns with the NRVS, recent emails from AB have documented the levels are high, with water coming up the road drainage, they don't appear to be operating correctly and needs maintenance work. The dredging and clearance will make a difference. E/A to look at levels. DM/AB to follow up. <i>AP &amp; CV left meeting.</i></li> </ul> <p>The levels in the harbour is predicted by the shipping levels. Historically the levels of the weir have been raised. JT suggested the canal is not acting as an attenuation point and that the silt in the harbour gets worse each year. DM asked JT for historic evidence of the weir.</p>	<p><b>BW TO REPORT DATES OF SITE VISIT</b></p> <p><b>LK TO ADVISE OUTCOME AT NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p><b>E/A TO BE MADE AWARE OF THIS BY LETTER</b></p>

<b>7.</b>	<p><b>LAKESIDE AVENUE LYDNEY- Report on any outstanding issues.</b></p> <p>Issues other than discussed in item 4 above.  RC and CL said that the manholes were back flowing and bubbling up. FoDDC will check function.  JB said that addresses for flooded properties would be available on swim.  Parts of Lakeside had work undertaken by the land drainage board in 2007, the culvert and up to property No 68.</p> <p>NC stated improvements had been made the new clean stone replaced and the land drainage and drainage adjacent to site had been pumped out by a six-inch pump. Bells of JF will operate the pump.</p> <p>CL asked if when they move on to the next phase of the development which is near the culvert entrance if the run-off water will go directly into the culverts or run down the road. The culvert as yet hasn't caused an issue but has been close to overspilling. CL concerned this land will be stripped causing further problems. Persimmon do not want to strip site further and have spoken to GCC to that effect. JB to chase up GCC for alternative ways.  NC will meet LK on site to go through procedures before they start the next phase.</p>	<p><b>LK TO ADVISE OUTCOME AT NEXT MEETING</b></p>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>LYDNEY COMMUNITY FLOOD RESILIENCE PLAN (v8 JUNE 2017) RAIN GUAGE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to representatives from the E/A being unable to attend the item is to remain an agenda item for the next meeting.</li> </ul>	<p><b>TO REMAIN AN AGENDA ITEM FOR THE NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p><b>LTC CLERK TO LOOK AT CURRENT PLAN WITH INPUT FROM JW</b></p>
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>TO AGREE A REPORT BEING WRITTEN FOR LYDNEY TOWN COUNCIL ANNUAL MEETING</b></p> <p>It was agreed that District Council Chris McFarling would be asked to write a report.  Cllr Leach informed those present that the format of the Annual Town meeting would be revised this year and invited each agency to attend.</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>CORRESPONDENCE and A.O.B</b></p> <p>Several letters were received from members of the public and a local Sports Facility regarding the flooding issues of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> February and these were passed to Dawn Morgan Flood Risk Engineer from FoDDC to follow up.</p>	<p><b>DM TO FOLOW UP CORRESPONDENCE</b></p>

11.	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Next Meeting TBA in agreement with the E/A</b></li> <li>• Meeting closed at 4.00pm</li> </ul>	
-----	--	--