SOAF Investigation Output Summary

Reference: SOAF.R 00001

Please see Audit Statement Technical Guidance for further information

ASSET INVESTIGATION DETAILS					
SAP Asset Name:	Landore Neath Road CSO		**Asset Template reference**	BW4105401-CSO 70 A4067 NTHBND LANDORE SWANSEA-52497-Stage 4 - Non CBA-Swansea	
Investigation Type	SOAF (River)				
Year of breach:	*2017*	**Spill Trigger cause:**		*Hydraulic*	
Year of Investigation:	*2021*	**Investigation year performance:**		*90*	
Population of Asset	*14489*	**Modelled Performance: (DESIGN) / (CALIBRATED)**		*86 / 86*	
Permit Details					
Storm Permit ID:	BW4105401	**Storm Permit Name:**		CSO 70, A4067 NORTHBOUND, NEAR RAILWAY VIADUCT, LANDORE, SWANSEA	
Asset NGR:	SS6611895736	**Waterbody ID**		GB110059025690	
Discharge NGR:	SS 662795797	**Water body Discharge location**		Tawe - conf with Nant Cwmgelli to tida	

Brief description of asset
(Screen, PFF flow control, Storage, outfall)

Incoming Pipe: 380mm; CSO Type: Transverse weir; Screening: Powered rotary screen; Flow Control: 380mm orifice; PFF Pipe:380mm; Storage Provision: None; Consent: 200l/s. SocA is 262 l/s.

SOAF STAGE 1	
Details of assessment:	Asset condition surveys supported by hydraulic model assessment of the asset performance.
Permit Compliance	
PFF	Compliant
Storage	N/A
Screening	Compliant
Bespoke/Other	N/A

SOAF Stage 1 findings

Following the hydraulic model assessment, the primary cause of the high spills at the asset is concluded to be hydraulic .The predicted pass-forward flow meets the consent prior to the first spill. The model is fit for use, based on the reported spill numbers and telemetry trends.

Networks have removed a plate from the flow control to increase PFF on 02/02/2022, new measurements - 400x350mm. This does not appear to have had a dramatic impact on spills though asset is coping with minor rainfall events without discharging.

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:	*N/A*					

SOAF Operational Intervention					
Start Date:	-	**Completion Date:**	-	**Indicative future annual spill performance** *(less than 40 do not continue to stage 2)*	86

Intervention Description:					
Target Completion by 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			Moderate		
Stage 2a					
Aesthetic survey:	Spring	2024	**Aesthetic Total score** (inclusive of amenity classification, previous complaints & pollutions)	20	Low
	Autumn	2024		0	No Impact
Stage 2b				*Yes / No unable due to culverted watercourse*	
Invertebrate survey:	Spring	-	**Invertebrate survey score:**	-	-
	Autumn	-		-	-
Stage 2c Required:				*Yes / No*	
Stage 2c screening:	Required	**Progressed through screening?** Yes	**Stage 2c water quality assessment Score:**	04 - No Impact	

SOAF STAGE 3 - STEP 1>3						
Options assessed	Rainscape		Traditional Storage	Y	PFF Increase	N
Equivalent storage volume required	523	**Rainscape Cost**		Not Acheivable	**CBR**	-
Bespoke future trigger agreement	40	**Traditional Storage**		£2,934,211.86	**CBR**	0.0
		Other		N/A	**CBR**	N/A
Key Constraints	*Storage solution would be located coming off of a main trunk sewer in heavily urbanised area and so unit costs used may be underestimated.*					
Future Active Management Proposal	*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.'* *Further details are shown below detailing DCWW's plans for storm overflow spill reduction*					

Conclusion and Future Spill Reduction Proposals					
Summary	*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.* *With a large programme of assets requiring improvement priority will be given to CSOs having the greatest impact in the most sensitive receiving waters.* *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.* *This approach has formed the basis of DCWW's portfolio investment plan for Storm Overflows.* *CSO 70, A4067 NORTHBOUND, NEAR RAILWAY VIADUCT, LANDORE, SWANSEA was Shown to have a No / Very low Impact therefor as set out above based upon our Long Term Delivery Strategy a spill reduction scheem to elimeite this level of impact is Profiled to be delivered between 2040-2050*				
Asset Prioritisation Level	*Priority 5*			**Delivery Predicted Period**	*AMP11/12*
Asset NEP ID	*N/A*	**Asset NEP Driver Code**	*N/A*	**Detailed Design Predicted Period**	*AMP10/11*
Progression to Stage 5 In AMP	*No*	*Proposed Solution yet to be taken through detailed design devloped*			

SOAF AGREEMENT					
	Date	**SOAF STAGE**	**Name**	**Contact Details**	**Location of Output**
DCWW Approval	23/11/2024	*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	**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?	**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?	**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?	**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**		