

ASSET INVESTIGATION DETAILS			
SAP Asset Name:	Opp 74 Bonymaen Road Swansea		Asset Template reference
Investigation Type	SOAF (River)		
Year of breach:	2020	Spill Trigger cause:	Hydraulic
Year of Investigation:	2022	Investigation year performance:	32
Population of Asset	2085	Modelled Performance: (DESIGN) / (CALIBRATED)	61 / 61
Permit Details			
Storm Permit ID:	BP0244501	Storm Permit Name:	SWANSEA - BONYMAEN ROAD (POINT 101A) CSO
Asset NGR:	SS6726595194	Waterbody ID	GB110059025710
Discharge NGR:	SS6723095235	Water body Discharge location	Nant y Fendrod - headwaters to conf with Tawe
Brief description of asset (Screen, PFF flow control, Storage, outfall)			
<p>Incoming Pipe: 375mm; CSO Type: Single-sided, low-level weir; Screening: None consented or installed; Flow Control: Baffle plate set at 380mm x 240mm ; PFF Pipe: 375mm; Storage Provision: None consented or provided; PFF Consent: None - Deemed consent. SocA is 36.6l/s.</p>			

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).					
Permit Compliance							
PFF	Deemed Permit – Meets SocA						
Storage	N/A						
Screening	N/A						
Bespoke/Other	N/A						
SOAF Stage 1 findings							
<p>Following the hydraulic model assessment, the primary cause of the high spills at the asset is concluded to be hydraulic with no specific secondary cause of spills. The asset has a deemed Permit and hydraulic assessment shows PFF exceeds SocA. The model is fit for use, based on the telemetry trends.</p> <p>The discrepancy between the EDM and predicted spill numbers is primarily due to incomplete EDM data for the full year. Therefore, the comparison was made using periods where EDM data was available, during which the model predicted 38 spills compared to the 32 observed.</p> <p>"Proceed without 2a Survey as the site is not safe for access"</p>							
Cause of spill count :		Other Cause	No	Catchment Hydraulic	Yes	Infiltration & IRP required	No
Future Operational Management Proposal:		The primary cause of spills was found to be hydraulic, and as such the asset progressed through to Stage 2 of the SOAF process					
Operational intervention required:		The system is operating as designed and no additional maintenance changes are required to improve the operation of the asset.					
SOAF Operational Intervention							
Start Date:	-	Completion Date:	-	Indicative future annual spill performance (less than 40 do not continue to stage 2)		61	

Intervention Description:					
Target Completion by Date:	Jan-00	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			Moderate		
Stage 2a					
Aesthetic survey:	Spring	UTC	Aesthetic Total score (inclusive of amenity classification, previous complaints & pollutions)	UTC	UTC
	Autumn	UTC		UTC	UTC
Stage 2b				Yes / No unable due to culverted watercourse	
Invertebrate survey:	Spring	N/A	Invertebrate survey score:	N/A	N/A
	Autumn	N/A		N/A	N/A
Stage 2c Required:				Yes / No	
Stage 2c screening:	Required	Progressed through screening?	Yes	Stage 2c water quality assessment Score:	17 - Low

SOAF STAGE 3 - STEP 1>3						
Options assessed	Rainscape		Traditional Storage	Y	PFF Increase	N
Equivalent storage volume required	2m3	Rainscape Cost		£1,721,250.00	CBR	0.0
Bespoke future trigger agreement	40	Traditional Storage		£75,953.22	CBR	0.0
		Other		N/A	CBR	N/A
Key Constraints	None					
Future Active Management Proposal	<p>The primary cause of spills was hydraulic and Stage 2 impact assessments have shown that the asset was having a minimal effect on the receiving waterbody, with the waterbody itself requiring improvement to achieve Good or higher status. Assessment of the potential high-level solutions have indicated that any solution entailed excessive costs for the benefit it provided and thus the asset does not pass the SOAF Cost Benefit threshold and will not progress to detailed benefits assessment as part of the SOAF process.'</p> <p>Further details are shown below detailing DCWW's plans for storm overflow spill reduction</p>					

Conclusion and Future Spill Reduction Proposals							
Summary	<p>Based on the direction from the Welsh Government led Better River Quality Task Force, DCWW Storm overflow spill reduction 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 improvement 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>SWANSEA - BONYMAEN ROAD (POINT 101A) CSO was Shown to have a Low Impact therefor as set out above based upon our Long Term Delivery Strategy a spill reduction scheme to elimeite this level of impact is Profiled to be delivered before 2040</p>						
	Asset Prioritisation Level			Priority 4	Delivery Predicted Period	AMP10	
	Asset NEP ID		N/A	Asset NEP Driver Code	N/A	Detailed Design Predicted Period	AMP9
	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	01/09/2024	Stage 4 - Non CBA		Christian Phillips Adams	christian.phillipsadams@dwrcymru.com	Email
Regulator Liaison Date	Click here to enter a date					
CSO Classification						
Satisfactory		N	Unsatisfactory	N	Sub Standard	Y
			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	Y

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		