|  |
| --- |
| Minutes |
| Meeting nameLlanmaes Flood Alleviation  | SubjectNRW- Flood Model Review Meeting  | AttendeesClive Moon (CM)- VoGC Project Manager Huw Morgans (HM)- VoGC Deputy Project Manager Annabelle Evans (AE)- Development Planning Advisor at NRW Barry Cox (BC)- NRW FCA Lead Filippo Scimone (FS) -NRW Flood Risk Analysis Modelling Specialist advisorAthan Tzovaras (ATz)- AECOM Project Manager Ralph Collard (RC) - AECOM Lead ModellerMark Davin (MD)- AECOM Technical Lead  |  |  |
| Meeting date19/01/2022 | Time12:00 |
| Location Microsoft Teams | Project nameLlanmaes FAS  |
| Project number60160078 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **Description of meeting notes** | **Action By** |
|  | ATz and CM introduce the scheme and current position it is. Currently at planning stage. Planning committee due on the 26/01/22. Tenders received for review and the aim is to start works on site in March 2022. |  |
|  | BC – Not reviewed the FCA yet because NRW are not happy with the model, FRAP have been submitted where outfalls into Llanmaes Brook but further review can be triggered until the hydraulic modelling is signed off by NRW Flood Risk Analysis Team |  |
|  | FS – Involved in the NAR, main concern that we do not increase hydraulically anything on Boverton Brook. NRW would like to be able have confidence that the results are proving the above and can confidently input to the FCA.  |  |
|  | RC – Requested clarity on the concerns raised in the model review about the representation of the culverts for the scheme, particularly at Bund 1. FS - confirmed that the Checks and Warnings had not been sufficiently documented and therefore concerned that the representation may be incorrect. Ideally, they would be removed but if not should be documented correctly with justification on why these remain and have no impact to model results. RC - has reviewed the culverts through the bunds and believes that they are functioning correctly. This will be clearly documented and justified in the next submission. **ACTION –** AECOM to fully document checks and warnings in subsequent submission. | RC/MD |
|  | RC – discussion of the representation of Boverton Brook in the model and previous correspondence with Richard Wicks in Jan 2019. FS highlighted concerns with the channel running dry and not correctly representing flows in to Boverton. The model must stand up to scrutiny and therefore it is likely that this will be questioned should that come to pass. RC – Asked for NRW for a pragmatic approach and to simulate for a reduced number of simulations. NRW agreed that this could be simulated as a sensitivity and agreed that the 1.33% AEP (1 in 75yr) event was appropriate to demonstrate that the flows on Boverton Brook have been considered. **ACTION** – AECOM to simulate Baseline and Proposed with the Boverton Brook catchment included to the 1.33% AEP event (1 in 75yr). Results will be documented in a Technical Note | RC/MD |
|  | RC – discussion of the representation of the Village Green. FS concern was making sure the modelled representation is as accurate as possible. RC has amended the incorrect cross sections and is confident it now is correctly representing the scheme at the Village Green.**ACTION** – AECOM to document changes made to the Village Green | RC/MD |
|  | RC – Highlighted that the Amber comments have been considered and will be documented in the next submission. RC states that these changes have a relatively minor impact on the overall results and due to the large number of simulations AECOM request that only a select number of design events are simulated. FS and BC agreed that 75yr, 100yr, 100yrCC and 1000yr would be sufficient demonstrate the current and existing flood risk at planning. This could be presented in a technical note as an addendum to the FCA rather than re-writing the entire FCA .**ACTION** – AECOM to update the model with NRW comments and simulate for the 75yr, 100yr, 100yrCC and 1000yr events. Results will be documented in a Technical Note | RC/MD |
|  | RC – A final sensitivity was raised for Frampton Ponds. The current model begins with this empty and RC accepts that a sensitivity to assess the impact of the capacity of the pond would be sensible. BC and FS state that the Baseline and Proposed model could be simulated for the 75yr event with a half full and completely full starting capacity. The results will be documented in the Technical Note. **ACTION** – Simulate 75yr sensitivity for the Frampton Ponds with a half full and completely full scenario. Both Baseline and Proposed will be simulated. Results will be documented in a Technical Note | RC/MD |
|  | FS – Raised concern about the incorrect specification of the boundary layer and code layer at the SW extent of the Llanmaes Catchment. RC stated that the model has been adjusted in this area and further documentation will be provided to demonstrate this does not impact the model results in this area. |  |
|  | Together with the above agreed model simulations, it was agreed that all the results and responses to be combined in the Technical note, supplementary to the issued Flood model / flood model report and FCA. | AECOM- NRWFor Info  |
|  | Timescales. CM enquired on potential timescales as this review will impact the forecasted starting date of the construction, as the resolve of NRW comments will be part of the pre-commencement condition on the planning applications |  |
|  | Timescales NRW: Technical Note review – NRW Flood Risk Analysis Team - 1 weekFCA review-BC- 1 weekPreparing Planning Response to VoGC- AE- 3 days (minimum)Forecasted timescale – approx. 2.5 weeksAECOM :Forecasted timescale to issue technical note – approx. 4weeks.Agreed to look and arrange a meeting first week of Feb, to expediate any question that may come out at the next submission it would be sensible to have a pre-submission meeting.**ACTION** – AECOM to arrange a pre-meeting with NRW prior to submission of the model and Technical Note.  | AllATz |