

FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT

BOVERTON

MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 11TH APRIL 2014 @ 3.30PM

BOVERTON CASTLE PUBLIC HOUSE, LLANTWIT MAJOR

Attendees:

Miles Punter	(MEP)	Director of Visible Services
Councillor Gwyn John	(GJ)	Cabinet Member
Kerry Kierle	(KK)	Welsh Government
Phil Pickersgill	(PP)	Natural Resources Wales
Richard Wicks	(RW)	Natural Resources Wales
George Baker	(GB)	Jeremy Benn Associates
Colin Bright	(CB)	Vale of Glamorgan Council
Clive Moon	(CM)	Vale of Glamorgan Council
Tamsin Robbins-Hill	(TRH)	Vale of Glamorgan Council
Jane Hutt	(JH)	Welsh Assembly Member
Alun Cairns	(AC)	Member of Parliament

- MEP opened the meeting by apologising for the late meeting invitation letter and thanking all for their attendance; minutes will be sent to all residents unable to attend due to the short notice. MEP made introductions and advised that Alun Cairns MP and Jane Hutt AM were on route. Apologies were given for Councillor Rob Curtis who was unable to attend.
- GB gave presentation on the modelling work.
 - Model and Calibration Verification.

The river model confirms that the existing culvert will cater for between a 1:5 to 1:10 annual probability flow.
 - Culvert options

Option B is a 3.6m wide culvert, this option allows 7.9m³/s of water and allows up to a 1:20 annual probability flow.

Option C is a 4.2m wide culvert, this option has a capacity of 8.5m³/s of water which equates to a 1:50 annual probability flow.

The culvert gradient has been optimised with a fall of 250mm at the outlet.

- Downstream Effects

The model confirms that there is no detriment downstream during high flows equating to 1:100 annual probability flows. This is confirmed for both options B and C.

The impact of the 1:20 annual probability flow does indicate a detriment downstream, generally 20-30mm but in areas around Ham Manor the detriment is in the region of 100mm. This will need to be addressed along with any improvement works in Boverton.

- Additional Flood Risk Management Measures

A culvert larger than 4.2m is impractical to construct, hence has been discounted.

Upstream training walls have been considered to contain flood flows. This option has been discounted to the extent and increase in height (>1m).

Downstream channel widening immediately below the culvert does have the potential to improve flow capacity and hence raise the level of protection beyond the 1:50 provided by just a larger culvert. The hydraulic benefits of the option will be confirmed via the river model. Options associated with any land requirements will also be investigated.

3. Mr O'Shea asked about attenuation between Boverton and Ham Manor, Mr O'Shea was concerned that works in Boverton could have a negative effect in Ham Manor. GB stated that attenuation would not be feasible due to difficulties in design, operation and cost. Other options would be more appropriate. PP confirmed that further options to prevent a detriment downstream would be considered. GJ stated that Boverton Brook (Hoddnant) is not the main issue in Ham Manor but that some of the difficulties in Ham Manor are also due to the debris in the river from the woodlands and farm lands.
4. MEP welcomes Jane Hutt AM and Alun Cairns MP.
5. MEP stated that the 4.2m wide culvert is the preferred option, with near a 1:50 year flow capacity it provides a great improvement, but to achieve 1:100 year protection is the aim as this would provide better protection and help residents with insurance etc.

6. Whilst appreciating the time it has taken to get to this point, PP stated that we now know:
 - Optimum culvert size is 4.2m x 1.05m to accommodate the flow and still be constructible under constrictions with land ownership and physical restrictions with services and highway.
 - It is impractical to construct upstream walls beyond the substation and this has been discounted due to practicality, aesthetics and cost.
 - Further modelling to consider downstream widening. CB has initiated talks with the land owner which is so far positive.
7. PP stated that moving forward the detailed design is crucial to obtain an accurate construction cost in order to secure funding.
8. Mr O'Shea stated although he is satisfied with the progress of the modelling and that a larger culvert size has been identified he is not happy with the progress and commitment to funding for the scheme and the projected timescale in scheme preparation.
9. PP apologised for not having had the intended discussion with KK prior to the meeting.
10. Mr O'Shea asked how long it will take to resolve the funding issues.
11. PP confirmed that hopefully this (funding) will be resolved this year.
12. JH asked when the detailed design will be complete.
13. CB stated that the culvert works should be at a stage where we can go to tender at the end of this calendar year. There are issues with service diversions, ground investigations, land ownership that needs to be resolved before a detailed design and tender package can be progressed.
14. MEP stated that the damages and insurance liability of downstream detriments needs to be resolved as well as obtaining the land required to carry out the works. MEP confirmed that a cabinet report will need to be prepared to progress with land and consent issues. MEP stated his commitment to have the design complete by the end of the calendar year and the tender process completed by the end of the financial year and to ensure that the council is ready to commence the work as soon as funding is available.
15. MEP stated that a dedicated web page will be set up for the Boverton scheme with monthly updates.
16. AC asked for a breakdown of the estimated £1m cost. How much of this is the culvert?

17. PP confirmed that £1m is for the culvert.
18. MEP stated that one of the larger costs could be the diversion of the river during the works if over pumping is not possible. This is being investigated along with the other constraints to the works.
19. Mr O'Shea stated that his understanding is that the works will have to be undertaken in the summer when the water levels are the lowest.
20. MEP confirmed that the design and preferred contractor will be ready dependent on funding.
21. AC asked if there is any funding available.
22. MEP stated that the council has put forward £250k for the works. MEP is trying to utilise contributions from other budgets for survey works etc to ensure not all of this money is spent prior to commencing on site.
23. PP stated that it is best to justify the scheme on a cost/benefit analysis and important to move the scheme up on the risk rating.
24. AC stated his concern that the scheme will lose its space on the priority list and that the progression will be reliant on "left overs" from other schemes.
25. PP confirmed that Boverton is high on his risk register but not as high on the overall Wales risk register. However, it is important to appreciate that Boverton is on the list.
26. JH stated that she is pleased with the 1:100 year commitment from this thorough (model) work and she appreciates the considerable time it has taken to get to this point. JH thinks we are now in a better place to get on a programme. JH confirmed that this is a partnership and we need to ensure we progress on every issue. JH stated that the web page is a good idea however meetings are still needed. JH stated she will do everything she can to ensure Boverton is properly considered.
27. PP confirmed that his priority is to secure funding.
28. JH stated that the funding discussion needs to progress with talks to include Alun Davies and KK.
29. GJ stated that we are nearer a scheme than ever and we need to press on.
30. MEP stated he is optimistic that the culvert replacement alone will increase the capacity to 1:50 year compared to current 1:5/1:10. MEP committed to continue to come to meetings.

31. Mr O'Shea asked about the progress of the works in Llanmaes, as he is concerned that similar to how improving the situation in Boverton could cause detriment in Ham Manor, the scheme in Llanmaes could have detriment on Boverton?
32. CM stated that the works in Llanmaes cannot be allowed to have detrimental effects downstream just as Boverton cannot be allowed to have detrimental effects on Ham Manor. NRW has to be consulted and have to approve any works in Llanmaes. The works in Llanmaes is undergoing remodelling which is expected to take 4 weeks.
33. PP stated that the two schemes are independent from each other and without detriment.
34. RW stated that he is the NRW approver of the Llanmaes scheme and he will not approve the works if it has detriment downstream, this is the reason for the current remodelling.
35. MEP reiterated that a web page would be set up shortly detailing progress on the scheme. The information on the web page will also be published locally and/or a letter will be sent to residents who do not have access to the web page.
36. AC stated that he appreciates the effort that has been put into this scheme and the presence of technical staff at this meeting.
37. MEP thanked everyone for attending the meeting.
38. Meeting closed.