

Minutes of the Multi Agency Flood Defence Meeting held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 in Lydney  
Town Council Chambers at 10.30 am

**PRESENT:** Cllr Brian Thomas, Lydney NDP (**BT**)  
Cllr Brian Pearman, Lydney NDP (**BP**)  
Dave Street, NDP (**DS**)  
Chris Johns, Forest of Dean District Council (**CJ**)  
Ben Gray, Dean Forest Railway (**BG**)  
District Cllr Martin Quaile, Forest of Dean District Council (**MQ**)  
Cllr Christine Jones, West Dean Parish Council (**CJ**)  
Martin Young, Environment Agency (**MY**)  
Stewart Charters, WATTS Group (**SC**)  
Richard Price, Lydney Park Estate (**RP**)  
Jason Westmoreland, Forest of Dean District Council (**JW**)  
Brian Watkins, Gloucestershire County Council Highways (**BW**)  
Rose Christodoulides, Lakeside Resident Representative (**RC**)  
Chris Bull, Dean Forest Railway (**CB**)  
David Parrish, Gloucestershire County Council (**DP**)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Jayne Smailes, CEO Lydney Town Council (**JS**)  
Kate Hammond, Admin Assistant, Lydney Town Council (Minute  
Taker)

**APOLOGIES:** David Graham, (Gloucestershire County Council)  
John Thurston, (Watts Group)  
Robert Frankton, (Lydney Park Estate)

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b> Cllr Brian Thomas chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone. Introductions were made around the table.	
2.	<b>NOTES OF LAST MEETING (24 July 2014)</b> Notes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true record.	
3.	<b>LYD MAP AND RIPARIAN OWNERSHIP</b> BT advised that requests had been received and an order would be placed for those who had requested a copy of the riparian ownership map. It was confirmed that a copy of an AO laminated final version of the map would cost £42.00 plus VAT and an AO unlaminated version would cost £20.00 plus VAT.	
4.	<b>RIVER LYD WATERCOURSE CLEARING</b> BT requested an update from Dean Forest Railway and FODDC in regard to their section of the watercourse along with an update of the cost of monitoring two areas of Plummers Brook.  CJ advised that no costings had been made as yet in regard to	

<p>Plummers Brook however certain areas of vegetation on FODDC section of the watercourse had died back which would now enable them to access the area and work closely with Network Rail.</p> <p>BT questioned the necessity to produce a riparian ownership map specifically for Plummers Brook and, as Severn Trent were not present, asked whether the working group could provide an update? BP advised that Severn Trent were in the process of report collation and were awaiting rainfall to enable them to 'model' the measurements.</p> <p>BT drew members attention to page 5 of the picture hand-outs (which showed pictures of the trash screen) and asked FODDC whether changing the trash screen was an option in order to minimise the risk of flooding.</p> <p>JW advised that it was one option to look at however there were still ownership issues to resolve. FODDC were still investigating other options such as digging stakes into the bed to catch any debris.</p> <p>SC arrived at this point.</p> <p>DP arrived at this point.</p> <p>BT asked DFR about their section of the River Lyd in regard to how far forward they were with clearing their section. CB advised that they had left the area alone during the summer months and that the community payback team had unfortunately been withdrawn and DFR did not have enough volunteers to continue the work themselves. CB advised that they were awaiting a grant from FODDC; they were not able to fell trees themselves until undergrowth had cleared. BG advised that due to community payback politics they had been told that there would be charges for the service which they couldn't pay as they did not have the funds to do so.</p> <p>JS suggested that if the issue was grant funding, given that GCC had a financial sum for flood alleviation was there any possibility that FODDC provide a sum towards the work which GCC could then also match?. DP advised that GCC hadn't received a request this year and there was a small sum left in this year's budget however if the request was put forward then GCC could look to allocate. BP queried whether the Rec Trust could do anything to assist however JS advised that it was not Rec Trust land. MQ asked how much money DFR required to carry out the work. BG responded that £2,800 was required.</p> <p>MQ felt that GCC, FODDC and LTC should work in partnership,</p>	<p><b>Action:</b>  <b>Severn Trent to provide data to be used to inform improvement measures</b></p>
---	--

	<p>along with appointed contractors to carry out the work quickly.</p> <p>BG advised that DFR had a full schedule of clearing 4 miles of the river. JS asked that if DFR could not meet the deficit fully to advise LTC/Rec Trust as soon as possible in order that LTC/Rec Trust could consider providing a donation, bearing in mind that the Trust had already paid out a considerable sum themselves to clear their area and as such Trustees would expect DFR to have made a similar financial contribution prior to requesting any additional financial assistance.</p>	<p><b>Action: DFR to advise LTC/Rec Trust if they cannot meet the deficit required for the work</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>SEWAGE</b></p> <p>As Severn Trent were not present at the meeting to provide a verbal update, JS asked SC whether Mr Thurston had been able to obtain the information from Severn Trent as to how many times sewage had been allowed to be deposited into the Lyd in the last 12 months? SC advised that it had been discharged 41 times according to telemetry systems.</p> <p>MQ expressed frustration in regard to the sewage system and advocated the recycling of 'grey water'.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>FLOODING TO LAKESIDE</b></p> <p>BT requested an update from FODDC regarding provision of attenuating ponds/funding to provide same and also an update from GCC Highways/FODDC regarding the Engineers Report on Fallers Field.</p> <p>CJ advised that FODDC had completed the survey and Lakeside culvert now had a 'clean bill of health'. CJ also advised that during the survey it was found that two manholes had been covered up by Severn Trent however they had since been reinstated.</p> <p>CJ advised that CCTV had also been put into Fallers Field culvert and images had been captured which had been forwarded to GCC to be assessed. BW advised that GCC Highways had commissioned consultants to start the assessment process with possible solutions being to develop a 'model' upstream. Following assessment of the CCTV survey, it would then be forwarded to AMEY who would build the 'model' to include intervention measures. BW advised that a report was expected by the end of December 2014.</p> <p>JW advised that FODDC have 'penstop' arrangements in place to the eastern side of the A48. The 'penstop' is a sliding arrangement which is adjustable and will reduce flow rate. It was discovered along Rodley Manor there was a blanket Tree Preservation Order (TPO).</p>	<p><b>Action: GCC Highways to provide update of findings at Fallers Field from images sent to them by FODDC</b></p>

BT queried who would need to be contacted should the 'penstop' need to be lifted due to a blockage? JW advised that the 'penstop' would permanently be "down" and always active as it would effectively reduce the level of flow in the area. JW confirmed that the Solar Farm proposed to dig swales on site.

MQ suggested that LTC consider appointing a contact representative to assume the role of the contact person in the event of the 'penstop' needing to be raised. Whilst FODDC could be contactable via phone, he felt that it would be useful to have a representative from LTC available should an immediate response be required and a contact list could be created in the same format as the one LTC currently used for the sandbag tree.

RC agreed that a representative should be appointed for emergency situations as there were concerns over the Lakeside catchment.

JW advised that the only reason the 'penstop' would need to be opened would be if something was stuck, such as a blockage, meaning they would need to investigate; ordinarily no maintenance/flow alteration would be required.

RC drew members' attention back to the previous comment regarding the Solar Farm and their proposal to dig swales as part of their planning requirements and queried whether the same requirements were made as a condition to the developer? JW advised that it wasn't down to Planning Officers and the developer had complied with what had been asked of them. BP requested that JW sought clarification on this point as, due to the original recommendation, when the bypass was built, no water was permitted this side of the bypass. If this recommendation had been observed the problems currently experienced would not exist.

RC advised that whilst residents were consultees they felt under constant threat of being flooded due to what she perceived to be close to an act of negligence by FODDC. RC felt there was no point in consultees recommending improvements if they were to be totally disregarded by FODDC.

BW advised that GCC Highways were planning to make potential improvements to the A48 'attenuation pond' in the following weeks followed by the EA ecology survey, the aim being to re-instate the pond by the end of November. BW confirmed that contractors had been informed of the urgency of the task in hand.

BT drew members' attention again to Plummers Brook. BP felt that Plummers Brook was often referred to in various meetings however Planning Officers did not have a clear understanding of Plummers Brook or its affect on neighbouring watercourses. BP also felt that the Solar Farm would have effected Plummers Brook and there should be a recommendation that any future development should have flood measures in place to retain SUDS on site and not discharge into existing watercourses.

DS expressed concern that there were areas that had flooded parcels of land, such as the industrial estate which regularly has flooded public pathways and felt that some professional evaluation was needed to assess exactly what could be done. BP proposed the formation of a working party to walk the area and report back at the next meeting. JW advised that he would provide a copy of the flood map which would enable the working party to mark any potential issues. DS advised that he believed the area should cover Neds Top to Lydney Harbour.

RC questioned what measures were in place at Fallers Field to deal with blockages similar to those experienced at the trash screen and the culvert? BW advised that GCC have asked for an annotated document detailing sections/properties which had flooded in past years and the impact of such flooding. JS asked BW to confirm who GCC have asked, given FODDC were provided with the information prior and GCC have been party to the information for over 18 months?

DS raised concern in regard to the flow of water from Crump Farm area, directly south of Lakeside, where there is a strip that goes through the watercourse into Camborne Place and questioned whether it could be bypassed? JW advised that it would be too expensive due to major engineering works, health and safety etc. BP responded that engineering solutions could work and that the planned re-instatement should be addressed as a priority.

BT requested a report from AMEY post December. BW advised that he would provide a report of their plans however could not offer such an assurance regarding the stipulated deadline.

BT asked FODDC about Mr Thurston's planning application in regard to flood maps? JW advised that it was bound up with The National Planning Policy Framework and advised of the planning process whereby the Planning Case Officer would assess the planning application, taking into account the planning policies that applied to the proposal, other material considerations and their judgement of the impact it would have. When the Planning Case Officer had concluded their assessment of the application, they would prepare a report and

	<p>recommendation, and pass it to the relevant Senior Planning Officer. He or she would check that they agreed with the assessment, often in discussion with the Planning Case Officer, before either making a decision under delegated powers or placing the item on the agenda of the relevant Planning Committee. JW also advised that they have National Technical Guidance they have to refer to; following relevant advice from the EA.</p> <p>BT spoke on the 100 year forecast. JW advised that the maps were vague and were for guidance only.</p> <p>JS asked that FODDC ensure that Mr Thurston was provided with a copy of the flood maps. An action point from the last meeting was that the EA would send copies of the relevant guidance. JW advised that the EA have a website where interested persons may access the information. SC spoke on his experience in obtaining a response from the EA. BP believed a barrier to effective communication was due to a lack of a direct relationship with numerous agencies and felt it would be beneficial to have a definitive document.</p> <p>JW committed to email the documents to Mr Thurston and advised that the EA did not make bespoke comment however they posted a document on their website which provided answers to set questions.</p> <p>MQ asked whether the end project may require funding and if so where the money would come from? BW asked whether FODDC would be able to provide funding? CJ advised that funds for the attenuation pond had already been allocated however in regard to Fallers Field it would be something FODDC would look at if any problems were identified.</p> <p>RC expressed her frustration regarding the length of time which had been taken to provide the engineers report for Fallers Field; the situation being exacerbated by the decision to now assign responsibility for providing the report to AMEY. RC expressed concern that there would always be a time when the attenuation pond would not work and Lakeside would once again flood, with new housing developments compounding her fears.</p> <p>JW advised that the main focus was to stop water deluge – measures were being put in place such as the ‘penstop’ balancing point and GCC were working on other measures.</p>	
7.	<p><b>ACTION PLAN/ACTIONS PENDING</b></p> <p>Action points for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As detailed, plus -</li> <li>• JT to receive Flood Zones in addition to Flood Maps</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To consider/formulate an action plan ahead of any adverse weather conditions</li></ul>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> Tuesday 11 <sup>th</sup> November at 2.00 pm at Lydney Town Council Chambers.	

Meeting closed at 11.50 am