

Minutes

Project title	Barmouth North Promenade OBC	
Meeting name and number		File reference
Location	Telcom	Time and date
		27 January 2020
Purpose of meeting	Presentation of Barmouth North Promenade OBC to WG	
Present		
Apologies		
Circulation	Those present	

Action

1. Introductions and context

Purpose of meeting is:

- For Gwynedd Council (GC) to bring Welsh Government (WG) up to date with Barmouth North Promenade OBC. Noting present issues around affordability of the scheme.
- For Welsh Government to obtain an overview of the approach to the OBC and support with programming and funding constraints.

2. Presentation on Barmouth North Promenade OBC

provided a presentation on the Barmouth North Promenade OBC (see Appendix A for attached slides). Key highlights include:

- *Context:* The study area, and wider flood cell of Llanaber and Barmouth South, are at significant risk of coastal flooding and erosion. Ultimately a solution is required to safe-guard the community and local economy put at increasing risk of climate change. We are recommending an initial phase of works to safeguard the coastline at Barmouth for Epoch 1 and 2 (i.e. up to 2069) with a total non-discounted budget of £22,559k, including optimism bias of £8,307k with a cost benefit ratio of

Prepared by
Date of circulation 30th January
Date of next meeting N/A

Minutes

Project title

Job number

Date of Meeting

Barmouth North Promenade OBC

27 January 2020

Action

1:2.4. WG highlighted that a scheme with an SOP <1 in 200 year is not considered to be a 'show-stopper' in terms of approval of the project.

- *SMP2 Policy Context:* Policy looks to move towards 'Managed Realignment' in the medium term. It's recognised the timescales are less prescribed than indicated, with the policy change seen as a continual process. The proposed preferred option aims to align with these objectives in the longer term.
- *Condition of existing defences:* The structures along the frontage have experienced significant deterioration and now have an anticipated residual life of <10-20 years – likely to cause a breach in the defences and ultimately, a risk to life. There is extensive voiding of the structure. GC have closed the most northern end of the promenade due to H&S concerns.
- *Economic case:* takes precautionary approach. The promenade and frontage are a valued asset to the local community and tourism based economy.

- WG appreciated the precautionary approach to the economics in terms of robustness, but were wary of under-egging the benefits and suggested these should be quantified where possible.

Action: [REDACTED]/GC to review benefits in OBC update based on discussions above.

[REDACTED]/GC

- Economic case indicates the scheme affords significant protection to the Cambrian Railway Line. Network Rail should be engaged with to ensure there is alignment with their proposals and partnership working. GC have had a number of meetings with [REDACTED] of Network Rail, who indicated funding availability was limited due to the lack of a prioritised spend for FCERM measures beyond their assets. Discussion highlighted the need to speak with Network Rail at more senior levels. GC have been in touch with [REDACTED] of Network Rail.

Action: GC to share contact details for [REDACTED] with WG. WG to consider engagement and note challenges to seniors.

GC/WG

- *Scheme costs:* There are a number of uncertainties associated with the final cost of the scheme.

Minutes

Project title

Job number

Date of Meeting

Barmouth North Promenade OBC

██████████

27 January 2020

Action

- GC are looking to do further work to de-risk. However, the scheme is likely to be of significant expenditure (i.e. £10-15+ million). GC noted issues with match-funding to progress with activities and are looking to submit a proposal to WG in the next few weeks following agreement with Council members. WG noted they would be happy to support the activities with full grant funding to help better understand the risks – provided the activities could be undertaken by March 2020. Arup confirmed this programme is achievable if commissioned within the next week (i.e. end of January).

Action: GC to confirm proposal and funding arrangements with WG, and provide confirmation to ██████████ to proceed.

GC/WG/██████████

- WG highlighted that the Phase 1 Business Case for 50 years for planned asset life is a sensible approach and supports managing uncertainty. There was concern over the fixed decommissioning costs associated with the scheme and suggested they should be incorporated into the costs of Phase 1 – it was considered important to build in a decision point in the future when such costs will be incurred. ██████████ noted that from an economics perspective benefits may be more appropriately defined over the proposed life-span of the scheme (i.e. benefit period is reduced).

Action: ██████████/GC to review OBC based on discussions above.

██████████/GC

- GC were proceeding on the basis of assuming 75%/25% match funding, but this presented challenges. WG were supportive of the scheme and were happy to discuss/investigate how they could support funding. It would be useful for GC to provide evidence to WG of the challenges experienced in aid in a justification of any change in approach – to act as evidence for WG in wider discussions.

Action: WG and GC to continue to engage and discuss funding arrangements associated with CRMP.

WG/GC