

ASSET INVESTIGATION DETAILS			
SAP Asset Name:	Hebron Rd Clydach CSO		Asset Template reference BP0353201-CANAL CSO, TOWPATH OFF HEBRON ROAD, CLYDACH-72004-Stage 1 - OC- Swansea
Investigation Type	SOAF (River)		
Year of breach:	2019	Spill Trigger cause:	OC Continuation Restriction (Maintenance)
Year of Investigation:	2019	Investigation year performance:	65 Spills
Population of Asset	948	Modelled Performance: (DESIGN) / (CALIBRATED)	65 Spills
Permit Details			
Storm Permit ID:	BP0353201	Storm Permit Name:	CANAL CSO, TOWPATH OFF HEBRON ROAD, CLYDACH
Asset NGR:	SN6890001170	Waterbody ID	GB110059032180
Discharge NGR:	SN6891001175	Water body Discharge location	Tawe -confluence with Twrch to tidal I
Brief description of asset (Screen, PFF flow control, Storage, outfall)			
Incoming Pipe: 300mm and 230mm diameter; CSO Type: High-level, single-sided weir; Screening: Horizontal Wave Screen - 6mm 2d; Flow Control: X-Pipe ; PFF Pipe: 300mm; Storage None; Consent: 53 l/s			

SOAF STAGE 1						
Details of assessment:	Asset condition surveys supported by hydraulic model assessment of the asset performance against available telemetry information (EDM and radar rainfall datasets). Additional flow and rainfall monitoring was undertaken to improve the baseline model accuracy and assist in defining the root cause of spills.					
Permit Compliance						
PFF	Design Compliant – Operational Intervention required to restore.					
Storage	N/A					
Screening	Compliant					
Bespoke/Other	N/A					
SOAF Stage 1 findings						
<p>Primary Cause: OC Continuation Restriction (Maintenance) Secondary Cause: None</p> <p>Following the hydraulic model assessment, the cause of the high spills at the asset is concluded to be OC Continuation Restriction (Maintenance), with no secondary cause of spills</p> <p>CCTV survey suggest water holding up with debris below in continuation. Siphon and the local trunk might be holding significant amount of silt, which have significant impact on the spill count as concluded in Stage 1C assessment. The predicted pass-forward flow is below consent prior to the first spill and an operational Intervention required to restore. The model is fit for use, based on the reported spill numbers and telemetry trends.</p> <p>CCTV survey suggest water holding up with debris below in continuation. Siphon and the local trunk might be holding significant amount of silt, which have significant impact on the spill count as concluded in Stage 1C assessment.</p>						
Cause of spill count :	Other Cause	Yes	Catchment Hydraulic	No	Infiltration & IRP required	No
Future Operational Management Proposal:	The primary cause of the spills are operational factors that have been assessed as deliverable in the short term. The asset has been added to the SOAF Intervention programme with the details outlined below.					
Operational intervention required:	Full investigation and cleanse of the continuation pipework and trunk sewer downstream of the asset, with particular focus on the downstream river crossing.					
SOAF Operational Intervention						
Start Date:	Jan-24	Completion Date:	TBC	Indicative future annual spill performance (less than 40 do not continue to stage 2)	33 spills	
Intervention Description:	A continuation restriction due to maintenance has been identified as a factor in excess spills at this asset. A cleanse of the sewerage network is required to restore compliant flows. This asset will be highlighted for future Cyclic Maintenance based upon the review of the post intervention return.					
Proposed Completion Date:	Jan-25	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			Good			
Stage 2a						
Aesthetic survey:	Spring	2021	Aesthetic Total score (inclusive of amenity classification, previous complaints & pollutions)	0	Moderate	
	Autumn	2021		0	Moderate	
Stage 2b				Yes / No unable due to culverted watercourse		
Invertebrate survey:	Spring	2021	Invertebrate survey score:	22	Extremely Severe	
	Autumn	2021		18	Very severe	

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@dwrwymru.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		