

Stage 2c Required:				Yes / No	
Stage 2c screening:	-	Progressed through screening?	Required	Stage 2c water quality assessment Score:	Not Required

SOAF STAGE 3 - STEP 1>3						
Options assessed	Rainscape		Traditional Storage	Y/N	PFF Increase	Y/N
Equivalent storage volume required	Volume m3	Rainscape Cost		£ Cost	CBR	Ratio
Bespoke future trigger agreement	Number of spills	Traditional Storage		£ Cost	CBR	Ratio
		Other		£ Cost	CBR	Ratio
Key Constraints	Note of major factors affecting suitability of solution/pricing details					
Future Active Management Proposal	i.e. Bespoke improved planned maintenance/mitigation, investigation under DWMP or NEP revisit – future funding intention					

Conclusion and Future Spill Reduction Proposals					
Summary	<p>CANAL CSO, TOWPATH OFF HEBRON ROAD, CLYDACH 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 Assessment Strategy (SOWQAS) in AMP8</p>				
Asset Prioritisation Level	Priority 1			Delivery Predicted Period	AMP8/9
Asset NEP ID	DCWW101974a	Asset NEP Driver Code	W_U_O_IMP1	Detailed Design Predicted Period	AMP7/8
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	29/01/2024	Stage 1 - OC	Christian Phillips Adams	christian.phillipsadams@dwrcymru.com	Email
Regulator Liaison Date	Click here to enter a date				
CSO Classification					
Satisfactory	N	Unsatisfactory	Y	Sub Standard	N
		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?	Y	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?	Y	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?	Y		
		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		