

Minutes of the Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Meeting held on  
Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> July 2021 by Zoom at 11.00 am

**PRESENT:** Walter Leach, Lydney Town Council (**WL**)  
Joe Baker, GCC Strategic Flood Risk (**JB**)  
Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Rep (**RC**)  
Nick Coulson, Persimmon Homes (**NC**)  
Matt Jeynes Network Manager Severn Trent (**MJ**) **Left at 12.15**  
R Kemsley Lydney Town Council (**RK**)  
Chris McFarling, FoDDC Climate Change (**CM**)  
Sophie Reid, FoDDC (**SR**)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Carolyn Whittington Lydney Town Council (**CW**) (Minutes)

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<p><b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b> Cllr Walter Leach (<b>WL</b>) chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone.</p>	
2.	<p><b>APOLOGIES and APPROVAL OF THE NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b> Apologies received from: Ed Argent (Robert Hitchins), D Bates (Severn Trent), Andy Bryant (Watts Group), Rebecca McClean (Severn Trent), Sid Phelps (FoDDC), Brian Watkins (GCC Highways).</p> <p>The Notes of the meeting held on the 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021 were accepted as a true record.</p>	
3.	<p><b>ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING</b></p> <p>1. CM stated he was liaising with Matt Jeynes at Severn Trent in an encouraging and positive way.</p> <p>2. RC reiterated concerns raised at the last meeting with regard to the proposed roundabout on the A48; she had contacted Peter Siret at GCC. RC was under the impression planning had been approved with no objection to the new proposal. RC concerns were the additional water going into the balancing pond, which may have implications on future applications and by proposing to utilise existing drainage this would have an impact on Lakeside, potentially causing major problems in the future. RC had asked PS for clarification of the percentage of water that would be going into the pond and of some understanding of the attenuation ponds, as the application as whole was a real concern. There was some confusion as to whether the design had been approved as GCC Highways had not applied the S278. CMF would follow up, with LTC contacting Highways to be asked to be advised before any decisions made due to the knock-on effects. RC had contacted County Councillor Alan Preest, but had not received a response back.</p> <p>3. Agenda item 7 from 29 April 2021, SR had spoken with Ubico regarding the maintenance but they did not have the equipment to do the desilting. Laurence King would be selecting a contractor shortly for the work to be completed.</p>	<p><b>LTC TO CONTACT GCC HIGHWAYS</b></p>

<p>4.</p>	<p><b>1. GCC CO-ORDINATED PROJECTS UPDATE (JB)</b></p> <p>JB currently working on study quotes received and had agreed the scope with E/A and consultants. GCC would fund 60% but no more as it felt the E/A was responsible for main flooding in Lydney. E/A had provided 3 options and JB had a meeting scheduled to agree which option. Option 1 would take until the end of September to provide funding. Option 2 would take until the middle of October. If E/A were to provide 100%, they would deduct from the future project amount.</p> <p>If Option 2 was taken with GCC providing 60% and E/A 40% the time scale would be two months.</p> <p>JB reiterated the study was to review existing modelling and to establish what was causing the flood risk, the Harbour gates and their effectiveness, the Harbour gradient and to incorporate a model for Lakeside as there was not an existing one. JB explained once model completed and reviewed with the issues identified, the options for actions could be seen.</p> <p>The E/A had 4 catchment areas across Gloucestershire in blue and green structure due by the end of August.</p> <p>WL stated a sense of urgency and concern across Lydney each time it rains. GCC had the support of the agencies, but JB asked if anyone had any drawings of structure, CAD drawings, or maps that could be sent to him to feed into the model.</p> <p>CMF questioned if ST was looking into cross sections of sewage to Highway's connections. MJ advised RM would identify cross sections in existing modelling.</p> <p>SR advised five properties in the High Street, Aylburton had the water course coming up, the water was from Lydney Park Estates.</p> <p>SR confirmed that a scheme along the route of the culvert at the back of 32-28 Lakeside had not progressed. The landowners either side of the bus route were required to clear the silt out which would help the water get away. Landowners identified as JD Norman and Lydney Recreation Trust.</p> <p>RK advised JB to write to Lydney Recreation Trust and the Clerk would look into this immediately.</p>	<p><b>IFORMATION REQUIRED TO FEED INTO MONDELLING IF ANY AGENCIES HAVE ANY</b></p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>AGENCY REPORTS</b></p> <p>A. Environment Agency</p> <p>(i) <i>Lydney Flood Resilience Plan:</i> being looked at by the Clerk</p> <p>(ii) <i>Flood Meter Flow monitoring reports:</i> No E/A representative at the meeting, but David Hudson and George Tomlin met with AB, looking at monitoring points and the operation of the gates. There are several monitoring points but they are not linked to each other. JB stated the flood gates were now working as they should and should operate to conditions.</p> <p>The footbridge had been cleared at Station Road but the significant blockage was the second structure at Station Road under the bridge. This would be looked at to ascertain the work needed to clear it. The extra monitoring stations at Station Road would be collaborated by August/September. E/A were being supportive and cooperative.</p> <p>B. <i>Severn Trent:</i> MJ stated the survey at Station Road was completed two weeks previous and was now on the planned cleaning programme. The sewer had full capacity, there was more silt than expected, with a full</p>	

	<p>cleanse of sewage at Station Road to the railway bridge. ST would cleanse monthly changing frequency if needed. MJ had spoken with a homeowner in Station Road regarding the pre promotion process and the flooding issues could be sewer related. If sewer related, this added further weight to the scheme for Lydney. MJ had a meeting last week at Mead Lane with a view to starting a scheme for Mead Lane in the next couple of months.</p> <p>MJ stated some work being progressed at Alvington and should be completed within the 12-week period.</p> <p>RM was picking up residents modelling with consultants on site, and would give an accurate record of progress.</p> <p>CMF stated new developments did not combine the system. NC confirmed this. MJ felt this should be done if there was capacity in the system. MJ would ask RM to advise on this and either pass information to the group, or RM would report at the next meeting.</p> <p>RK asked if solutions had been agreed regarding the pumping Station at East Marsh, MJ advised no single solutions.</p> <p>C. <i>FoDDC</i>: SR reported the Flood Resilience scheme was progressing with all properties surveyed and quotes being obtained. The grant covered £5,000 of work completed. SR advised she was leaving FoDDC and would pass on contact details for her replacement. Primrose Hill had some water issues in June, with flood water running off the fields. LK meeting with land owners.</p> <p>D. <i>Highways Maintenance Programme</i>: No Update</p> <p>E. <i>LTC Data/Report Consolidation</i>: E/A requested any photos with timelines and dates to be sent to them.</p>	<p>RM TO ADVISE</p>
	<p><b>Stake Holder Groups Updates:</b></p> <p>A. <i>Residents</i>: RC advised the Oakdale development phase one had cut off drains that run parallel to the bungalows, historically a lot of issues with water run-off from the junction of Mount Pleasant. Currently preforming but every time there was extreme weather, with the build-up of silt this caused problems. RC asked for clarifications as to what would be handed over to the management committee, NC confirmed that the landscape and the cut off drain would be handed over and written into the contract so the management company would then be responsible for both. Property 102 had vegetation growing close to their boundary that had not been cleared despite contractors recently clearing near the area. NC would look into and speak with property owner. NC to update LTC after meeting with the landowner.</p> <p>B. <i>Business Groups</i>: AB who was unable to attend had forwarded an email which questions raised were answered in Severn Trent report.</p> <p>C. <i>Environmental</i>: CMF stated the Environment Scrutiny committee review all water courses in County, looking at water quality, as an essential standard to maintain. MJ said a specific department at ST was looking into the Environment Bill going through parliament. The Environment Group would involve all agencies but MJ felt there were someone else within ST better placed to be involved. CMF advised the group would make contact with them. CMF felt with recent events the Emergency Plan needed to be updated and with a local resident leaving the estate where he was very proactive with the trash screen (which was now very overgrown) there was a potential issue. SK advised Ubico cleared this and when there was a yellow weather warning it would be on their</p>	<p>NC TO UPDATE</p> <p>LK TO CONFIRM ON</p>

	<p>maintenance list to clear. SK would ask LK to confirm it is on the maintenance programme for clearing.</p> <p><i>D. Other parties present:</i> NC advised Persimmon progressing with bund basin built and attenuation feature to build.</p>	<b>MAINTENAINCE SCHEDULE</b>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING:</b> The next meeting would be held at 11.00am on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021, by Zoom</p>	
	The meeting closed at 12.30 pm	

