

Minutes of the Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Meeting held on
Thursday 29th April 2021 by Zoom at 11.00 am

PRESENT: Walter Leach, Lydney Town Council (**WL**)
 Andy Bryant, Watts Group (**AB**)
 Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Rep (**RC**) Joined part way through
 Nick Coulson, Persimmon Homes (**NC**)
 Matt Jeynes Network Manager Severn Trent (**MJ**) Joined part way through
 Chris McFarling, FoDDC Climate Change (**CM**)
 Sid Phelps, FoDDC (**SP**)
 Sophie Reid, FoDDC (**SR**)
 Nikki Salter, Lydney Tennis Club (**NS**)
 John Thurston, Watts Group (**JT**)

IN ATTENDANCE: Stephen Holley, Clerk Lydney Town Council (**SH**) (Minutes)

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<p>WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS Cllr Walter Leach (WL) chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone.</p>	
2.	<p>APOLOGIES and APPROVAL OF THE NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING Apologies had been received from: Joe Baker, GCC Strategic Flood Risk; Rose Christodoulides, resident (for late arrival); Matt Jeynes, Network Manager Severn Trent (for late arrival); Rebecca McClean, Severn Trent; and Brian Watkins GCC.</p> <p>The Notes of the meeting held on the 28th February 2020 were accepted as a true record.</p>	
3.	<p>ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING NOT ON THE AGENDA</p> <p>1. WL stated that there was very significant concern about flooding in Lydney. When there was heavy rain residents were on tenterhooks worrying where floodwater would go. WL read out an update provided by JB (attached as Appendix A) and explained that he felt JB was the linchpin for making progress in Lydney, because JB's primary role was to lookg at flooding issues across the county. JB had confirmed that Lydney was at the top of his list for attention, but had told WL that things were not progressing as he would have liked.</p> <p>2. The Environment Agency (EA) seemed well engaged in what JB was doing but it appeared to WL that the same could not be said of Severn Trent Water.</p> <p>3. WL expressed his curiosity as to the supplementary location referred to by JB. SR advised that Severn Trent had emailed JB regarding this.</p> <p>4. CM reported that he had met representatives of Severn Trent the previous day, for a frank discussion. The responses had not been satisfactory, so CM was taking the matter to the Consumer Council for Water. If that did not work, it would be escalated to OfWat. In the following discussion it was said that legal action should be the last choice, but it had been noted that Severn Trent had to be taken to court elsewhere in the country to achieve the necessary</p>	

	<p>action and it might be that this would have to be done in Lydney. Another option would be to request the support of our Member of Parliament. WL suggested that Lydney could follow CM's action in Alvington and copy the MP in. CM would supply contact details for WL and SH to compose a letter.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>UPDATES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RC referred to a proposed new roundabout on the A48. The plans had been passed, and RC had seen that they included the proposal to drain rainwater into the adjacent ponds but bulk rainwater would go to the existing drainage network. RC expressed her surprise that there had not been questions during the planning process because Lakeside's problems came from the bypass. 2. In response, SR stated that all of the drainage concerns should be addressed as part of the planning process. SR would look at the plans with reference to the 1:100 Year Flood Plan plus 40% for climate change. 3. CM reported that, the previous week, he had become aware of new Flood Risk Assessment maps which accounted for a rise in sea level and falling carbon emissions. Lydney was expected to be seriously affected by the 2030 and CM felt things would come to a point when the cost of clearing up after floods became unsustainable. 4. MJ joined at this point, so WL briefed him on the discussion at point 3.4 above. MJ stated his understanding; he was always customer-driven. 5. MJ reported there had been a delay due to Annual Leave but the necessary information had been sent the previous day. He had no information on property owners in Station Road suffering during the December flooding, but it was possible they could not get through to make a report. In response, AB expressed his surprise at hearing that, because the residents of Station Road had suffered the same problems as the Watts Group. MJ explained that he did get reports from Station Road residents after the February flooding. He planned to visit Station Road on 10th May in order to meet residents and put their concerns on the register. 6. In response to a question, MJ stated that there was not a simple correlation between flooding complaints being actioned and health and safety. The need for action was assessed more on the scale of the problem, which would include the number of people affected and the impact on them. 7. AB asked if Forest of Dean District Council was looking to de-silt the channel. SR offered to find out. 8. SR reported that three properties remained to be surveyed for flood resilience grants. 10 applications were in progress. It was thought the deadline had been extended to 2022. The ditch by nos. 28 to 32 Lakeside required attention and SR had asked JB to contact the landowners to get it cleared, which should help at that end of the water flow system. 9. SP expressed interest in flood sacks. 	<p>SR to address in Planning process</p> <p>SR to investigate</p>

	<p>10. AB noted that the FoDDC website had a lot of useful reports in PDF format, including the Halcrow report.</p> <p>11. NC reported that Persimmon Homes had reached Phase 2 of its Lydney development plan.</p> <p>12. NS stated that she had attended as an Observer on behalf of Lydney Tennis Club. She felt it encouraging to learn what was going on in the background. The Club was aware it was on the flood plain and that its courts would be flooded, but she had greater concern for the Clubhouse and for adjoining householders.</p>	
8.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: The next meeting would be held at 11.00am on 29th July 2021, by Zoom</p>	
	The meeting closed at 12.28pm	

From: BAKER, Joe <Joe.Baker@gloucestershire.gov.uk>

Sent: 27 April 2021 08:35

To: Carolyn Whittington <finance.assistant@lydneytowncouncil.co.uk>; Councillor Leach <cllr.wleach@lydneytowncouncil.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Notes for Multi-Agency Stakeholder flood defence and meeting invite

Hi Both

I will have to send my apologies for Thursdays meeting, an EA training event has come up which I have to attend.

I didn't have much to update anyway.

The only things I do have to say is the draft scope and supplementary location document is nearly ready for a quote, I've sent it to partners. I'm waiting for some information regarding one of the locations from one of the partners which is slowing the process of obtaining a quote down because we can't supply the information to the consultant yet. We've asked if the quote can be broken down into separate elements in case we can't fund everything right away, we will review the quote with the EA and see what external money we can draw in before proceeding. I'm hopeful if I can get the information from the partner we are waiting to hear back from we will be able to obtain the quote within a few weeks.

We have made some positive progress into flood risk at Lakeside Avenue, the Highways CCTV survey has confirmed my suspicions that the levels in the watercourse where the highway drainage outfalls to aren't correct and the channel needs clearance. We're going to complete a long section to determine how much silt/ sediment requires digging out to allow the channel to flow better and the highway drainage to work better in Lakeside, reducing property flood risk from the front. There will still be flood risk from the watercourse but that will be looked at as part of the study. The responsibility for clearing out the channel will be the riparian land owners.

Best wishes,

Joe