



| ASSET INVESTIGATION DETAILS | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| SAP Asset Name: | BAGILLT GREENACRE DRIVE | | Asset Template reference CM0168801-BAGILLT GREENACRE DRIVE - SSO-2363-Stage 1 - OC-Flintshire & Wrexham |
| Investigation Type | SOAF (River) | | |
| Year of breach: | 2019 | Spill Trigger cause: | OC Continuation Restriction (Maintenance) |
| Year of Investigation: | 2019 | Investigation year performance: | 67 Spills |
| Population of Asset | 395 | Modelled Performance: | Model not required for assessment |
| Permit Details | | | |
| Storm Permit ID: | CM0168801 | Storm Permit Name: | BAGILLT GREENACRE DRIVE SSO |
| Asset NGR: | SJ2266274552 | Waterbody ID | GB111067056940 |
| Discharge NGR: | SJ2270074700 | Water body Discharge location | 'Ditch' |
| Brief description of asset (Screen, PFF flow control, Storage, outfall) | | | |
| Incoming Pipe: 150mm; CSO Type: High level pipe; PFF Pipe: 150mm; PFF control: None; Storage Provision: None; Consent: 'Not lower than the overflow setting on the date this permit was authorised.' | | | |

| SOAF STAGE 1 | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|----|
| Details of assessment: | Review of CSO and SPS As Builts and telemetry Records Review of Operational history. No requirement to undertake any hydraulic modelling. | | | | | |
| Permit Compliance | | | | | | |
| PFF | Compliant | | | | | |
| Storage | Compliant | | | | | |
| Screening | N/A | | | | | |
| Bespoke/Other | N/A | | | | | |
| SOAF Stage 1 findings | | | | | | |
| The recorded spill events for 2017 and 2018 were 1 and 6 respectively. The 2020 reported spill count is 9. The 67 spills in 2019 was due to a blockage which was cleared in March 2019. CSO Removed from Schedule; average over 5 years 17.2 spills | | | | | | |
| Cause of spill count : | Other Cause | Yes | Catchment Hydraulic | No | Infiltration & IRP required | No |
| Future Operational Management Proposal: | None | | | | | |
| Operational intervention required: | None | | | | | |
| SOAF Operational Intervention | | | | | | |
| Start Date: | | Completion Date: | | Indicative future annual spill performance (less than 40 do not continue to stage 2) | | |
| Intervention Description: | | | | | | |
| Proposed Completion Date: | | Data years to be excluded from future SOAF triggers calculations | | Request to hold stage 2 surveys for environment recovery | | |

| SOAF STAGE 2 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Receiving Waterbody WFD Status | | | | | |
| Stage 2a | | | | | |
| Aesthetic survey: | Spring | | Aesthetic Total score (inclusive of amenity classification, previous complaints & pollutions) | | |
| | Autumn | | | | |
| Stage 2b | | | | Yes / No unable due to culverted watercourse | |
| Invertebrate survey: | Spring | | Invertebrate survey score: | | |
| | Autumn | | | | |
| Stage 2c Required: | | | | Yes / No | |
| Stage 2c screening: | | Progressed through screening? | | Stage 2c water quality assessment Score: | |

| SOAF STAGE 3 - STEP 1-3 | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|
| Options assessed | | | Traditional Storage | | PFF Increase |
| Equivalent storage volume required | | Rainscape Cost | | | CBR |
| Bespoke future trigger agreement | | Traditional Storage | | | CBR |
| | | Other | | | CBR |
| Key Constraints | | | | | |
| Future Active Management Proposal | | | | | |

| Conclusion and Future Spill Reduction Proposals | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Summary | <p>Based on the direction from the Welsh Government lead Better River Quality Task Force, DCWW Storm overflow spill recution programme will target the elimination of ecological harm and prevention of adverse ecological impact of any SO.</p> <p>With a large programme of assets requiring improvmnt priority will be given to CSOs having the greatest impact in the most sensitive receiving waters.</p> <p>To ensure that the improvement delivered is long term, the improvements for each site will be based on the expectation that water quality upstream of the discharge meets good or high ecological status (GES) irrespective of the actual status of the water.</p> <p>This approach has formed the basis of DCWW's portfolio investment plan for Storm Overflows.</p> <p>BAGILLT GREENACRE DRIVE SSO was Shown to have a other cause issue resulting in higher spills which are expected to reduce once a resolution has been implemented.</p> <p>Once the assets New spill performance is established, if this is shown to still be in excess of 10 the impact of the asset will be established as part of DCWW's Storm Overflow Water Quality Assement Strategy (SOWQAS) in AMP8</p> | | |
| Asset Prioritisation Level | - | Detailed Design Predicted Period | - |
| Asset NEP ID | N/A | Delivery Predicted Period | - |
| Progression to Stage 5 In AMP | No | Proposed Solution yet to be taken through detailed design developed | |

| SOAF AGREEMENT | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------|
| | Date | SOAF STAGE | Name | Contact Details | Location of Output |
| DCWW Approval | 26/06/2023 | Stage 1 - OC | Christian Phillips Adams | christian.phillipsadams@dwrcymru.com | NRW - Sharefile |
| Regulator Liaison Date | Click here to enter a date | | | | |
| CSO Classification | | | | | |
| Satisfactory | Y | Unsatisfactory | - | Sub Standard | - |
| | | Any operation in dry weather conditions? | N | Does not meet modern standards of engineering and aesthetic control for storm overflow structures set out in the British standard BS EN 752:2017 drain and sewer systems outside buildings | N |
| | | Any operation in breach of permit conditions? | N | Does not have sufficient hydraulic capacity compared to accepted minimum design standards | N |
| | | Any significant visual or aesthetic impact due to solids or sewage fungus? | N | Risks becoming unsatisfactory because discharges have increased beyond the original design due to infiltration, growth and urban creep | N |
| | | Cause or significantly contributes to a deterioration in the biological or chemical status of the receiving water? | N | | |
| | | Causes or significantly contributes to failures in bathing water quality standards for identified bathing waters? | N/A | | |
| | | Causes or significantly contributes to failures in shellfish quality standards for identified shellfish waters | N/A | | |
| | | Causes or significantly contribute to failures in water quality standards in coastal and transitional waters? | N/A | | |
| | | Causes pollution of groundwater? | N/A | | |