

Minutes of the Multi Agency Stakeholder Flood Defence Meeting held on
Thursday 21st October 2021 by Zoom at 11.00 am

PRESENT: Chair - Walter Leach, Lydney Town Council **(WL)**
 Joe Baker, GCC Strategic Flood Risk **(JB)**
 Daniel Bates, Catchment Officer, Environment Agency **(DB)**
 Andy Bryant, Watts Group **(AB)**
 Stuart Budd, GCC Highways Local Manager **(SB)**
 Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Rep **(RC)**
 Stephen Holley, Lydney Town Council **(SH)** (Notes)
 David Hudson, Environment Agency **(DH)**
 Matt Jeynes, Network Manager Severn Trent **(MJ)**
 Rebecca McClean, Severn Trent **(RM)**
 Anthony Mott, Resident of Station Road **(AM)**
 Alex Thrift, Watts Group **(AT)**
 John Thurston, Watts Group **(JT)**
 Brian Watkins, GCC Highways Area Manager **(BW)**.

| ITEM | | ACTION |
|------|---|--------|
| 1. | WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS Cllr Walter Leach (WL) chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone. | - |
| 2. | APOLOGIES and APPROVAL OF THE NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING Apologies had been received from: Ed Argent, Robert Hitchins; Chris McFarling, FoDDC Climate Change; Peter Siret, GCC Flood Risk Management; Stewart Charters, Watts Group; Jason Walker, Environment Agency | - |
| 3. | NOTES OF LAST MEETING The Notes of the meeting held on 29 th July 2021 were accepted as an accurate record. | - |
| 4. | ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING NOT INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA None | - |
| 5. | GCC CO-ORDINATED PROJECTS UPDATE (JB) (i) JB explained that Atkins hoped calibrate their model and identify the most vulnerable properties. (ii) The watercourse downstream of Lakeside Avenue was silted up to 50cm depth for a stretch of around 500 metres. Clearing the silt should be for the riparian owners and Lydney Recreation Trust (<i>Note: of which Lydney Town Council was Sole Trustee</i>) was one of the main owners. There was a lot to remove and the watercourse was an 'internal watercourse' and was due to be cleared, which should make a big difference. (iii) JB explained the objectives of the survey and that a complete survey would take around three months, because it would cover the whole of Lydney. He offered to circulate the scope of the report after the meeting. (iv) Other members were aware that previous reports had been done and | |

| | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>asked how a new report or survey would add to what was already known. In response DH stated for the EA that this report was not intended to deal with a discreet repair or be a temporary fix. It would give an overall assessment of the problems. In response to another question JB confirmed that the report would identify the effect on Lydney of various causes, identify a plan and the funding required, with a time line and that there was one window for capital funding applications each year. The time line would be discussed with the Risk Management authorities.</p> <p>(v) SH stated that he expected Lydney Recreation Trust to be willing to cooperate with the requirement to dig out the Lyd in its ownership. JB explained that there were environmental concerns associated with removing a large quantity of silt, particularly where it should be taken. He was hopeful that the Internal Drainage Board would be supportive of the Trust. DH stated that the 500m section concerned was being looked at for action now, rather than within the report/project</p> <p>(vi) DH stated that the EA had installed an extra gauge, which was now working and providing interesting data. He would circulate an analysis.</p> <p>(vii) It was expected that the peaks of future floods would be smoothed out. This would rely on a lot of landowners doing relatively minor work and he expected replies at the end of December. The first stage would be to assess what was feasible. Volunteer action could be effective and low cost. In addition, if that could be done, the cost of the remaining part of the project should be cheaper because the silt in these areas held back water flow.</p> <p>(viii) Another piece of work would be (in the light of recent floods in Germany) for the areas Members of Parliament and District and County Council Chief Executive Officers to consider whether Gloucestershire was adequately prepared for Flood Resilience. Karen Rushworth of FoDDCs Incident Scheme was aware of this and would be assisting with a model prepared by the Gloucestershire Resilience Group. She would like to start with Lydney and use it as the model for the wider Resilience Plan, which would cover other problems such as snow and other disruption.</p> | |
| <p>6.</p> | <p>AGENCY REPORTS</p> <p>A. <u>Environment Agency</u></p> <p>(i) Lydney Flood Resilience Plan:</p> <p>(ii) Flood Meter Flow monitoring reports: It was confirmed that the output of the water level gauges should be available online with real time information. It was not known whether three gauges had been benchmarked. The gauges could account for tides and rainfall.</p> <p>(iii) AM stated that a major problem with flooding was the backing up of raw sewage from the sewage treatment plant when it could not cope with flood water. He had been told by Severn Trent's CEO that ST was not in breach of its licence when it pumped raw sewage into the river. In response, DH stated that he had looked at what came out of the sewage works and they were compliant. MJ added that he was aware of emails being sent to the EA and he had discussed the complaints with the local Environment Officer for the</p> | |

area, who had visited and checked the sewage works were compliant. He was aware of the EDM data and would discuss the spills with the EA.

B. Severn Trent:

(i) RM reported that:

“Work on the Flooding Pre-promotion is nearly completed. It was delayed due to Covid however over the last 6 months the team has been able to complete site visits at 7 locations across the Lydney council: Netherend, Alvington, Sling, Parkend, Whitecroft, Lakeview, Mead Lane/Station Rd/Cookson Terrace. Customer questionnaires were completed at the time of the site visit, questionnaires were left for customers not in at the time and we have identified a number of additional locations to (re)send postal questionnaires to. In addition to this, assessment of rainfall tools have been undertaken to update the severity and frequency of sewer flooding at these locations. The purpose of this work is to update the Hydraulic Flood Risk Register which is the dataset we use to run the affordability tool for flood alleviation scheme promotion. This work to date has identified a number of new properties not previously on the register and an increase in frequency previously logged which we expect to increase the affordability.

The next steps are to allow 8 weeks for sending and returning of further postal questionnaires, followed by 2 weeks to update the Hydraulic Flood Risk Register and Affordability tools. An internal meeting to agree next steps following the results of the Flooding pre-promotion work is planned for Mid January. If the affordability is sufficient we expect to raise a scheme or multiple capital schemes. I will feedback to the Lydney Flood Action Group following this meeting regarding the outputs and next steps.

Regarding the question on growth. A sewer capacity assessment has been undertaken for the new development. The majority of the growth falls upstream of the East Marsh Pumping Station which should not lead to flooding in the upstream catchment, providing the mitigation to raise the control panels above the flood levels from the rivers proves effective. Any flood alleviation scheme as and when it is promoted will look to consider the growth within the scope.”

WL stated that he was concerned by this report. Some of the first meetings of this group had been chaired by RM when she said that understanding the survey work and looking at the area as a whole were important. WL could not see that any progress had been made by ST or that it had done any actual remedial work.

(ii) MJ also reported for ST that he had contacted AM by email to arrange a visit with him and interested residents by the Mitigation Team on 4th November. Mitigation measures were likely to vary according to circumstances but options for Station Road included flood doors, flood gates and non-return valves. These should either stop flooding on Station Road or at least reduce it.

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>(iii) In response to a question MJ was aware that some flooding on Lakeside resulted after power went from the pumping station when the electrics were shorted by flood water.</p> <p>(iv) MJ stated that it was not for RM or him to deal with surface water flooding arising from newly built properties. When new developments were proposed ST generally undertook an assessment of the capacity of existing infrastructure. In almost all cases of new development ST asked that surface water not be added to the foul sewage system. It was surface water that caused most problems to the sewage system, rather than foul sewage itself. New houses were now being built with low flush toilets and similar, so the actual foul sewage from new developments was minimised.</p> <p>(v) AB stated that the combined sewer created the greatest problems in Mead Road and further studies would not add to what was already known.</p> <p>C. <u>FoDDC</u> AT explained that a lot of what FoDDC did was to put in flow controls with prior attenuation to limit what went into the water system as far as possible. He had just finished some property resilience surveys of around 20 properties in Lydney qualified after Storm Dennis in February 2020.</p> <p>WL advised that there was a yellow weather warning this week and he understood all measures would be checked. In response, AT stated that FoDDC had a contract to clear all assets when yellow warnings had been raised. RC stated that the culvert behind 115 Lakeside Avenue was an FoDDC asset and used to be cleared, but had not been attended to recently. Also, when the contractors had cleared other areas they continued to leave cut overgrowth on the banks (as they always had) and this was swept away by flood waters to cause blockages at the trash screens. AT would raise this with the contractors and discuss access with RC. WL asked that AT ensure this was done swiftly as time was critical.</p> <p>D. <u>Highways Maintenance Programme:</u></p> <p>BW stated that GCC had checked all of its gullies and grilles given the weather forecast.</p> <p>E. <u>Lydney Town Council Data/Report Consolidation:</u> SH and WL reported this had not been done because of staff capacity problems. However, the need for this work appeared to have been overtaken by the latest survey.</p> | |
| <p>7.</p> | <p>STAKE HOLDER GROUP UPDATES:</p> <p>A. <u>Residents:</u></p> <p>(i) RC stated that £102,000 (index linked) had been identified as a Section 106 contribution from development site, with a 20 year maintenance programme. This was supposed to include replacement trash screens and work to the culvert head. RC was aware of a time when this forum had £40,000 and £5,000 from GCC solely for attenuation work for the protection of Lakeside. £9,000 had been spent on a penstock for the bypass but then the culvert head had moved upstream, which had taken up most of</p> | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>the remainder. RC stated her intention to submit a Freedom of Information request to find out what had happened.</p> <p>RC also said that she had spoken with Ed Argent for Robert Hitchins about their willingness to assist with attenuation. EA had said his company would be willing to assist whenever it had the appropriate vehicle/plant on site.</p> <p>RC was concerned about the risk of flooding from the A48 Bypass and had asked Mr Argent what percentage was due from Crest Nicholson and existing highway drainage. He thought the split was 75/25. RC was still concerned with 25% and wanted some gabion baskets under the roundabout for attenuation. WL stated from the Chair that it would be good to get Peter Siret to discuss this.</p> <p>(ii) AM asked about removal of the footbridge. In response, DH stated that it was carrying some electrical cables for Western Power it would be necessary to understand what these cables were for and make a plan for them to be moved. However, the railings had been removed so water could flow over the bridge as well as under.</p> <p>B. <u>Business Groups:</u></p> <p>AH, for the Watts Group, reminded the Chair that FoDDCs Sophie Reid and Lawrence King used to come to meetings with lists of the assets they were going to arrange to be cleared. WL stated that he would ask them to resume.</p> <p>C. <u>Environmental:</u></p> <p>(i) BW stated that GCC had inspected the balancing pond by the outlet with no evidence of significant silting, but he would arrange for vegetation to be cleared along with the base of the pond.</p> <p>(ii) BW stated that Highways would be doing some camera inspections of the drains in Mead Road and Station Road and some jetting in order to identify what was causing water to back up. He would discuss with AB of Watts Group work to a pipe that ran through their property to discharge into the Lyd – it appeared not to be functioning at present.</p> <p>(iii) AB stated that MJ had also done some survey work and identified a junction in Mead Lane. The manhole had silted up, so jetting further down Mead Lane might be beneficial. BW stated that he did find a manhole on private property; it was full because there was no outlet. One it had bene excavated the work could be assessed. He would arrange a meeting with the Watts Group. AM asked to attend because he felt this might affect his property and he felt he could provide some background information.</p> <p>D. <u>Other parties present:</u> Not applicable</p> | |
| <p>8.</p> | <p>CORRESPONDENCE AND A.O.B None</p> | |
| | | |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 9. | DATE OF NEXT MEETING: The next meeting would be held at 11.00am on 20 th January 2022, by Zoom | |
| | The meeting closed at 12.45 pm | |

