



Oldbury on Severn Parish Council

Clerk/RFO: Emma Pattullo
Meadowside, New Road
Rangeworthy
Bristol
BS37 7QH
Telephone: (01454) 228116
oldburyonsevernpc@gmail.com

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Flooding Committee Held on Tuesday 15th August 2017 at 2:00pm At the Memorial Hall

1. Present

Keith Sullivan, Dylan Griffiths, Glynn Poole, Barry Turner, Jim Nichols, Alan Coles

Clerk: Emma Pattullo

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Matthew Riddle and John Cornock.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the last meeting were proposed by Glynn Poole, seconded by Dylan Griffiths and approved by all as a correct record.

4. Actions arising not otherwise on this agenda

The Clerk has booked the hall for future meetings on a bi-monthly basis until the end of 2017.

5. Liaison with SGC on flooding issues

5.1 Responses to flood report

KS sent a response on behalf of the committee, detailing comments and concerns regarding the flood report published in May 2017. An answering response was received from Mark King on 14th August 2017.

Mr King has addressed each point made in this committee's response but it was felt that some of his answers were lacking in detail or did not address the query raised.

Specific issues/comments are detailed in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Page ref.	Detail	Question/comment (FPC June 2017)	SGC Responses (Aug 2017)	Further question/comment (FPC Aug 2017)
2	Comment in footnote re: funding from Local Levy	SGC have provided £10k and EA has provided £30k to investigate flooding issues in Oldbury. How much was spent on the Section 19 report? Is the Local Levy additional money or part of the £40k?	<p>The total levy grant awarded to South Gloucestershire Council for 2 areas (Oldbury-on-Severn and Swineford) was £60k. However, this funding does not need to be distributed equally between the 2 locations as the allocation of money is dependent on flood risk that each community is facing.</p> <p>I assume the £10k figure relates to the SFRA 2 study and these funds were allocated from other SGC budgets. The S19 report was also funded from these budgets.</p>	Funding situation is still unclear – what proportion of allocated £60k was spent on Oldbury?
2	Section 1: Introduction, Para 3	Where is the 'wider area study' and who is undertaking it?	<p>We are currently undertaking a Topographical survey within the village and surrounding area to better understand flood risk.</p> <p>Following a review of this survey information a wider study may be progressed</p>	
2	Section 1: Introduction, Para 3	Why is this not a comprehensive study?	The recently published Flood Report (May 2017) was undertaken at the request of the Parish Council following the rainfall event in March 2016. This report was a relatively comprehensive investigation into the flood event. However, there was no legislative need to carry out more detailed investigations. The investigations were considered comprehensive enough to highlight the flooding issues in the village.	

Page ref.	Detail	Question/comment (FPC June 2017)	SGC Responses (Aug 2017)	Further question/comment (FPC Aug 2017)
2	Section 1: Introduction, Para 3	What was the previous work – who did this and when?	I am unaware of any other previous flood reports prepared by the Council but happy to be proved wrong.	
5	Second paragraph	<p>Can you clarify the differences in the Pickedmoor Brook catchment area as stated in different documents please.</p> <p>The SFRA2 commissioned by SGC dated December 2011 states 13km² (calculated at Oldbury). The draft flood report into 9th March 2016 says 20km² and the current flood report (this one) says 30 km².</p> <p>The influence these numbers have on the % Thornbury contributes could be quite significant particularly when the hard standing is factored in.</p> <p>The geology of the catchment area (if you take into account the draft SFRA2 report prepared for the Oldbury NDP) does not enjoy good permeability and Claire Gardiner’s comments (see 4.3 page12) need to be factored into the thinking.</p>	<p>The difference in areas all come from the methodology used to determine the catchment area. We have looked at how much of the drainage system discharges to this point. For example in our report we have included the Hill Inlet system, which in reality has its own outfall. It should be stated that at higher flows they are connected.</p> <p>The SFRA2 would have just used default FEH data as per SFRA brief and methodology used by the consultant.</p> <p>This is not the case. Thornbury itself is only approximately 3km² in area and the recent development sites are only a small % of this figure, so they will really not have a significant impact on whatever catchment area is considered.</p> <p>The SFRA2 report takes a standard text available in the other reports and literature. I am not sure what the comment relates to.</p>	The reason for differences in catchment area is still unclear.
5	Third paragraph	Why is the assumed flow rate lower than in the Dec report? (see above)	As you are aware the December report was only the 1st draft, the published report that you refer to is the final report with more refinement. More data was gathered and	

Page ref.	Detail	Question/comment (FPC June 2017)	SGC Responses (Aug 2017)	Further question/comment (FPC Aug 2017)
			the flows were recalculated.	
8	Figures 6 & 7	OPC would like some explanation of what these figures represent. We are sure they are extremely useful but we need some discussion.	In Summary, they show that in one event the flow peak coincided with the high tide, and in the other they didn't. Happy to explain further if you wish	
10	Section 2.5 first paragraph	Flooding event was in October not November 2000.	Noted	
10	Section 2.5 first paragraph	Where was the overtopping from – we believe this was fluvial rather than tidal?	Correct, the flood report only relates to flooding from Oldbury drainage systems.	
11	Section 3.2 third paragraph	PC are concerned about the memoranda of understanding; further discussion needed. This has been suggested before but nothing has happened as yet.	This is still ongoing and when significant progress has been made I will be in contact with you again about this matter.	PC are still concerned about the memoranda of understanding; further discussion needed. It was noted that the addition of flap valves to drainage ditches will 'interfere with the flow of water' in contradiction of LSIDB byelaws.
12	Section 3.5 second paragraph	Why were AOD levels changed from the Dec version? Resulting in an increase in the volume from 23,000 to 60,000 m3	As stated above, the December report was the 1st draft, the published report that you refer to is the final report which has been refined. More data was gathered for the final report on the levels at the gate. It should be noted that this makes no difference to the conclusion.	Large change in AOD levels is of concern – can the final figure be relied upon?
14	Figures 11 & 12	Further explanation would be appreciated.	Detailed explanation is available in the text itself. This is just summarising the impacts of tide locking again.	

Page ref.	Detail	Question/comment (FPC June 2017)	SGC Responses (Aug 2017)	Further question/comment (FPC Aug 2017)
18	Section 4 point 1	OPC have already supplied this data.	The OPC went back to check some of the levels, however we still need to confirm what overall datum reference was used and how this might correspond to the survey we are currently undertaking.	OPC believe that all relevant data has been supplied to SGC including datum information.
18	Section 4, point commencing "Work with LSIDB..."	Hill Pill needs work. This has previously been suggested to the Environment Agency.	No comment – Environment Agency issue.	JN reported that LSIDB engineers are planning works at Hill Pill which are expected to cost £20-30k but this spend has not yet been finally approved

5.2 Review of actions from previous meetings

Some members did not recall seeing the Gantt chart of planned actions (drawn up following the meeting with SGC held on 08/3/17) and subsequent progress report against that action plan (sent by Mark Parry in May). KS agreed to circulate this information to the committee.

Action: KS to circulate Gantt chart & progress report

As the latest information is some weeks out of date, it was not possible to fully review progress against these actions at this meeting.

It was agreed that future efforts need to focus on how the desired outcomes will be met and what monitoring will be carried out in the future to ensure that they are working successfully.

One particular area of concern is the works required on Church Hill. In spring of 2015 OPC were advised that these works would be carried out during the 2015-16 financial year but there is no known progress to date. There are three potential solutions:

- Cowhill Wharf Rhine to be opened up (this is the IDB preferred option but it is thought it would be costly);
- a new trench/pipe from Mr Malcolm Lynden's property to the Rhine (which would involve significant highway works and possible road closures);
- improve the existing or lay a new pipe from the junction of Church Hill and Westmarsh Lane to meet the pipe which is routed behind the Anchor pub (SGC do not want to do this option as it would involve works over private land but the committee felt that it would be a sensible and pragmatic solution).

5.3 Future meetings

Further meetings with both the IDB and SGC were discussed.

It was felt that a meeting with the IDB was a priority; this should include both the IDB principal officer and an engineer and would focus on identifying what the IDB is prioritising and how this is decided as well as specific recent and planned works. JN suggested that this meeting could be combined with a site visit to Hill Pill to discuss the planned works there.

Action: JN to discuss with IDB staff to find a suitable date, preferably in early October; Clerk to then write to formally request a meeting.

Action: KS to draw up an agenda for this meeting.

A subsequent meeting with SGC will be arranged following the IDB meeting. Issues to be discussed would include following up on the flood report queries, updates to the previous action plan and clarification of the planned spending on improving highway resilience to flooding.

5.4 LLFA request for information

Item adjourned until next meeting.

6. Planning

6.1 JSP new local plan

Item adjourned until next meeting.

6.2 PSP plan modifications response

Item adjourned until next meeting.

7. Funding matters

7.1 Government announcement re: funding for natural flood defences

Item adjourned until next meeting.

7.2 SGC funding for improving flood resilience of highways

Item adjourned until next meeting.

7.3 Use of S106, CIL and PPA and its relevance to Oldbury (flooding)

Item adjourned until next meeting.

8. Severn Estuary Forum

The forthcoming Severn Estuary Forum meeting was discussed. It was felt that not much of the meeting would be directly relevant to Oldbury and thus no delegate will be sent. However, this committee may progress linked issues with some of the parties involved e.g. provision for climate change predictions to be included in future flood defence planning.

9. AOB

Committee member contact details: a discussion was held as to whether committee member contact details (home & mobile phone numbers and email addresses) should be made public via the website. Whilst it is important for the committee to be open and transparent, and councillors need to be easily contactable, other committee members who are not councillors may not wish to have their details made public. An alternative would be to publish the names of all committee members, but for those who wished to be contactable via the Clerk rather than having direct contact information published.

Action: KS to contact all non-councillor committee members to check whether they are happy for their details to be published.

10. Date and time of next meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20pm due to several attendees having other appointments.

Due to the adjournment, an additional meeting will be held on Monday 4th September 2017 at 2pm in the Memorial Hall (subject to hall availability).

Action: Clerk to book the hall for 4th Sep.