

Minutes of the Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Meeting held on  
Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2021 by Zoom at 11.00 am

**PRESENT:** Walter Leach, Lydney Town Council **(WL)**  
Joe Baker, GCC Strategic Flood Risk **(JB)**  
Andy Bryant, Watts Group **(AB)**  
Stephen Holley, Clerk Lydney Town Council **(SH)**  
Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Rep **(RC)** Joined part way through  
Nic Coulson, Persimmon Homes **(NC)**  
Matt Jeynes Network Manager Severn Trent **(MJ)** Joined part way through  
Richard Kemsley, Lydney Town Council **(RK)**  
Chris McFarling, FoDDC Climate Change **(CM)**  
Rebecca McClean, Severn Trent **(RM)**  
Sid Phelps, FoDDC **(SP)**  
Sophie Reid, FoDDC **(SR)**  
John Thurston, Watts **(JT)** Joined part way through

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

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> - Apologies were received from Liz Fowler E/A, Brian Watkins GCC and Laurence King FoDDC - The meeting notes of the meeting held on the 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2020 were accepted as a true record.	
3.	<b>ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA</b> WL stated from the Town perspective there have been four significant events, with people on tender hooks and a sense of concern around flooding, with it becoming a major issue in terms of consciousness. WL thanked JB for his help and support and for looking for long term solutions for the problems.	
4.	<b>GCC CO-ORDINATED PROJECT UPDATE</b> JB stated GCC would be the lead local authority to get the study commissioned. JB visited Lydney Tuesday with AB, RC and WL showing him the affected areas. The E/A was already working with ST, GCCH and FoDDC. FoDDC and E/A have seen the report and would work with other agencies before bringing to the Flood Group. In future Severn Trent would be involved. Due to an oversight, they had not been invited to the meeting. The aim would be to include all flood risks in Lydney and to examine the sluice's effectiveness, to model Lakeside Avenue at critical levels that properties flood and to see what could be done to reduce flood risk, seeing the cost benefit from all organisations. The E/A had requested not to have recommendations, as it did not want to be held accountable for them. The crucial thing is it is an action for everyone. The E/A was aware of previous experiences where recommendations had been made that were not feasible.	

	<p>All previous work needed to be collated together with previous studies. Any feedback would be useful for the consultants, so please forward to JB. Report hoped to be circulated to agencies next week, then group members, before obtaining quotes. The funding for the report would be partly by GCC with E/A saying they would provide some. GCC and E/A frame work will be looking for best value for money. Anticipate quote stage by the end of March. Aitkens would come back for data available, which would then take a couple of months, as a complex model. JB explained a workshop between agencies used model to test effectiveness to come up with solutions, the model then developed the solutions and cost benefits.</p> <p>ST had completed some modelling in the area which would feed into it. JB stated the report would test a few solutions. JB would look at the effects of the gate siltation in upper basin, effect of channel restrictions and the bridges. ST flood prepromotion studies identified seven sites, including Alvington and further North of Lydney. Initial modelling had been completed with rainfall location data obtained. Site visit to take place following week, having been delayed due to COVID restrictions. Next step, to agree the number of customer questionnaires, identity hotspots, targeting those areas, giving six weeks for forms to be returned, then reviewed and updated. Hydraulic flood risk register would review cost analysis elevation schemes time, to complete by end of May. CM asked how the Lyd feasibility study was connected to bigger flooding bids. James Blockley worked in upper catchment which would have significant effect on Lydney Catchment. Trying to include Forestry Commission for brooks and streams in FoD including Lyd. So much work already done in water storage schemes. James's manager was part of the River Severn Partnership covering Shropshire/Worcester/Telford. Shropshire have put in a bid through the Resilience Scheme there was 1.3 million available for Gloucestershire. 10 locations, one being Lydney. An expression of interest has been put in and if successful would be able to deliver NFM measures. They were aware of restrictions upstream catchment management and would look at everything holistically. CM wanted clarification this was a holistic approach as climate change flood increasing, look at cause and need to store carbon and protect bio diversity.</p> <p>JT pleased things are progressing and thanked JB. Transparency and openness is possibly why E/A do not want recommendations, but options and suggestions and recognises a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase where agencies get together to view report. Essential to get Severn Trent on board.</p> <p>WL stated outside of Harbour and Lakeside, Mead Lane appeared to be the most complicated Multi Agency problem, with private land owners also involved.</p>	<p><b>FEED BACK AND REPORTS TO JB</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>AGENCY REPORTS: To advise current activities, progress report and respond to specific actions as listed.</b></p> <p><b>A. Environment Agency:</b> Dave Hudson and Liz Fowler had identified a monitoring point at Station Road that reflected what was happening. To be installed in a couple of weeks and once installed would provide additional data. It would be a permanent fixture and Dave Hudson was intending to host an event at the harbour to explain interaction between operational gates and tide times, but things may have moved on since that discussion.</p>	

	<p>JB confirmed he was in touch with Jo Martin, Dave Hudson and George Tomlin from the E/A</p> <p><b>B. Severn Trent:</b> MJ joined the meeting. At Christmas the East Marsh Pumping Station was flooded which took out the electrical supply from the site. The electrics had now been moved higher up to prevent this happening again, eradicating the electric tripping in future.</p> <p>ST looking at flood prevention of flood gates on door of building. Longer Term ST looking at protecting pumping station. The drains at Lakeside had been checked and functioning as they should. The properties by the lake had had the sewage issues to their frontage solved with NRV in place. They may still get some restrictions regarding showering and doing washing for short periods of time, which was not a perfect solution, but will prevent flooding.</p> <p>RC stated there was an infrastructure charge for each property and with all the new builds in Lydney asked if ST had plans to upgrade the archaic system. RM said nothing promoted at this stage, but if grounds to promote will do an additional scheme. MJ stated ST as a company were not statutory consultees on Planning Applications, effectively ST unable to stop applications if they felt the infrastructure would not support it. CM to look into why they were not consultees. RM explained ST picked up development sites from local plans and assessed at desk top level, where needed model studies were done. AB asked if flood water from East Marsh was pumped into the Lyd, MJ to confirm.</p> <p>AB advised the NRV at Mead Lane only protected the toilets for a certain amount of time, with sewage still backing up after flood event over. MJ stated further sewage capacity problem fell into prepromotion paper. Challenges to get all relevant information.</p> <p>JT asked how Lydney could be escalated to top of list, RM advised written letter reports needed for a Growth Scheme at East Marsh. MJ, very little with gift to resolve issues require forums like this one and all incidents to be reported to call centres to be logged, as only then are they aware of the extend of the problem.</p> <p><b>C. FoDDC:</b> SR was progressing properties through the Flood Resilience Plan since the scheme two properties have received funding with two awaiting funding. The amount is £5k per person, five other properties identified and having surveys. SK to complete a dye test at a property in Lakeside expect it to be the NRV. Residents had put in a bund at the back of the properties to protect them, a more substantial one would be needed in the event of a serious flood. Potential problems also from land drainage. On the plans the pipe was stated as a metre wide, but a 300mm pipe was going into the NRV. RC said it would be good to see immediate action taken at that part of Lakeside, Lakeside always perceived to be separate, but there was an overlap as when in Lakeside the water could not get away, highlighted to JB during visit. The ditch at the back of the properties was drained, water was seeping out of the ground.</p> <p>The pumping station periodically gets flooded which in turn causes sewage to back up. RC stated in December there was flood sewage issues with sewage coming up the manholes and the toilets. RM emphasised to report to ST each time. Once logged RM will pass on to the appropriate team. During the height of the flood ST answer phone was stating they could not come out for 24 hrs due to demand. CM asked if there was responsibility with Ground Water flooding for land drainage and how it fits in to this, JB</p>	<p><b>MJ TO CONFRIM WITH SITE MANAGER IF FLOOD WATER FROM EAT MARSH IS PUMPED INTO THE LYD</b></p>
--	---	--

	<p>suggested they wait to see what FoDDC investigates. RC said Land Drainage Board are responsible for that area of Lakeside as looked into by Colin Legge resident at Lakeside. RC suggested they talk directly with him. SP advised Cllr Phil Burford is FoDDC rep on the Land Drainage Board.</p> <p><b>D. Highways Maintenance Programme:</b> No Update BW unable to attend.</p> <p><b>E. LTC Data/Report consolidation:</b> SH would collate library of key documents, together with key dates off flood events. SH and CW would be asking for information and copies on local reports, LTC do not have a comprehensive record.</p>	<p><b>LIBRARY OF REPORTS TO BE COLLATED.</b></p>
6.	<p><b>Stakeholder Groups Updates</b></p> <p><b>A. Residents</b></p> <p><b>B. Business groups</b> AB, Mead Lane maintenance issue of NRV at one end of the railway line, Highways drainage flow into site and ST sewage backing up and mitigation with pumping station, need feedback. FoDDC clearing behind channels, but this was a multi-agency problem.</p> <p><b>C. Environmental</b> CM stated before there was a sense of urgency to the situation. Good to hear the Emergency Rapid Flooding rapid response in place and pleased E/A have been proactive outside of the meeting.</p> <p><b>D. Other Parties Present</b> NC asked ST if it was combined sewers mainly coming through Lydney, ST replied without looking at plans most is except of half of Lydney Town. NC explained in West Wales under Welsh Water it was kept separate and they fund such schemes, stressed as part of the planning process. RM unsure if ST have grounds to make developers do that, but was looking at it as options after flood pre promotions. SP felt ST have some powers to protect their assets. The existing issue was surface water taking up capacity and planning would look at SUDS. If anyone aware of surface water going into combined sewers, these are wanting to be separated out as part of the bigger picture for sustainability, highlight to ST.</p>	
7.	WL thanked JB for the great progress.	
8.	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING:</b> The next meeting would be held at 11.00am on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, by Zoom</p>	
	The meeting closed at 12.44pm	