

Meeting of : Fairbourne Project Board	Date: 25/09/2014
--	-------------------------

Present: Huw Williams (HW), Gwynedd Council (YGC)
 Huw Davies (HD), Gwynedd Council (YGC)
 Cefin Edwards (CE), Gwynedd Council (YGC)
 Lisa Marshall (LM), Gwynedd Council (YGC)
 Nia Davies (ND), Gwynedd Council (Planning)
 Shirley Huws (SH) Gwynedd Council Emergency Planning (GC)
 Louise Hughes (LH) Gwynedd Council Councillor (GC)
 Peter Cole (PC), Fairbourne Facing Change (FFC)
 Sylvia Stephenson (SS), Fairbourne Facing Change (FFC)
 Phil Parker (PP), Fairbourne Facing Change (FFC)
 Greg Guthrie (GG), Royal HaskoningDHV (RHDHV)
 Louise Pennington (LP), Natural Resource Wales (NRW)
 Keith Ivens (KI), Natural Resource Wales (NRW)
 Richard Weston (RW), Natural Resource Wales (NRW)

Apologies: Kerry Kierle (KK), Welsh Government (WG)
 Richard Williams (RW), Welsh Government (WG)
 LM had informed ACC of meeting, no response received.

ITEM NO	MINUTES	ACTION	TARGET DATE
1.0	Introductions		
1.1	HW welcomed all to the meeting and individuals introduced themselves.		
1.2	HW left the meeting early and the chair was passed to LM.		
2.0	Minutes and Actions Arising From Last Meeting 28th August 2013		
2.1	The minutes of the meeting dated 27 th of June 2014 were taken as being accurate. Several of the actions will be covered by the relevant Task and Finish Group Items		
2.2	(Item 2.3) Questions were asked about the flood insurance issue. KK stated that negotiations are ongoing with ABI, Defra and Welsh Government to ensure an agreement for flood insurance going into future. KK to provide an update at the next Project Board Meeting. Still awaiting information from KK.	KK	Next PB Meeting
2.3	(Item 2.5) PC stated that FFC recognise the importance of a ground water monitoring regime, but that it was not their responsibility to apply for any funding to complete the work as highlighted in bullet point three.		

ITEM NO	MINUTES	ACTION	TARGET DATE
3.0	Fairbourne Moving Forward : Project Remit and Intent Discussion Paper		
3.1	<p>GG has prepared a project remit and intent document which has been circulated for comments. GG stated that its aim was to clarify the role of the Project Board. SS stated that she required more time to digest its contents and to respond accordingly.</p> <p>It was agreed that the document should be developed to provide an annual report of achievements and that interim reports be produced to supplement the main report.</p> <p>The final report would be forwarded to WG/NRW for review.</p>	All	End of October 2014
4.0	Task and Finish Groups – Chairs Update Reports		
4.1	Communication Task and Finish Group - LM		
4.1.1	<p>LM provided feedback on the last public meeting held on the 29th of August 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The turnout was much lower than at the inaugural meeting with only 70 attendees, however, it was perceived that this was not due to apathy but to the fact that people were becoming more informed. • 83% of attendees felt that they were better informed after attending the meeting. • A post event surgery had been arranged and the results would be circulated as soon as the information had been collated. <p>GG questioned the low turnout and asked the question – is there consultation overload?</p> <p>SS responded by stating that the Project Board should re-focus on the more pertinent issues and produce an action plan.</p>	LM	End of October 2014
4.1.2	<p>There was a general agreement that the surgery style format had been a success and had overcome the perception that people were being ‘talked to’ rather than ‘talked with’.</p> <p>It was agreed that future public meetings should utilise the same format but potentially on a smaller scale and to discuss individual issues e.g. care. Ultimately this will be led by the requirements of the community and feedback from the public meeting. The details to be discussed within the Communications Task and Finish Group.</p> <p>PC stated that FFC will collate questions from the community and forward within next three weeks.</p>	<p>Coms. T&F Group</p> <p>FFC</p>	<p>Before Next Meeting</p> <p>End of October 2014</p>
4.1.3	The date of the next Project Board and subsequent Public Meeting was discussed. PC stated that FFC would not object to the date of the next Public Meeting slipping – this would be dependent on the timing of the next Project Board. LM to discuss detail with HW	HW/LM	ASAP

ITEM NO	MINUTES	ACTION	TARGET DATE
4.1.3	PC enquired whether a Saturday would be an acceptable day to hold the Public Meeting – this would ultimately be dependent on the availability of the required personnel.		
4.1.4	LM stated that the Fairbourne Website (fairbourne.info) is live. PC informed the board that FFC had included a link on their Website.		
4.2	Emergency Planning Task and Finish Group -HD		
4.2.1	HD reported that the group had met three times since the last Project Board and that, generally attendance had been good. However, it was felt that the group lacked some key players, which had hindered progress.		
4.2.2	<p>It was apparent from the outset that the Fairbourne Community Flood Plan was not fit for purpose. The plan depends on a group of Flood Wardens, led by a Head Flood Warden, to gather local information that will provide vital information to and assist the emergency services when a flood incident occurs.</p> <p>There is also a lack of understanding regarding the role of Flood Wardens; nomenclature is a problem. Wardens should not be active during a flood event and clarity is required in terms of role and responsibility.</p>	E.P. Task and Finish Group	Ongoing
4.2.3	<p>HD stated that Arthog Community Council have now become involved in reviewing the current situation regarding flood wardens. A new Head Flood Warden is to be appointed and work is ongoing to recruit additional and new wardens to bring the group up to strength.</p> <p>On completion a meeting will be arranged to clarify roles, duties and responsibilities.</p> <p>KI stated that, overall, there were 28 Community Flood Plans in North Wales and that the level of engagement varied from community to community and was, perhaps, dependant on the perception of vulnerability.</p> <p>RW stated that NRW can offer support to the community to develop their plans.</p> <p>HD asked whether FFC would be willing to take responsibility for the Plan. PC responded in the negative.</p> <p>GG asked whether the plan will be monitored. RW stated the it will require more than one person to overview it and that continuity is vital to ensure that the document is relevant and live. It needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit for Purpose • Up to date • Audited regularly 	<p>ACC/HD/ NRW</p> <p>NRW</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
4.2.4	RW stated that a Flood Exercise will be undertaken in the near future.	NRW	2014
4.2.5	HD sated that he had met with Hugh Harrison (HH), the nominated FFC member for ‘drainage matters’. Several issues and general principles were discussed in relation to responsibility for watercourses. HH provided a number of written queries which required a more formal response. The responses were provided during August 2014.		

ITEM NO	MINUTES	ACTION	TARGET DATE
4.2.6	<p>The bid for grant aid from WG to undertake a monitoring regime has been successful with GC being awarded £111k over the next 5 years. This will cover 85% of the required budget and GC will contribute the further 15% necessary to complete the work.</p> <p>A survey company has been appointed to carry out the laser survey of the shingle bank.</p> <p>The inter-tidal topographic survey will be completed by GC'S in-house team and the two surveys will be done simultaneously during the one or two favourable spring tides in October 2014.</p>		
4.2.7	<p>HD stated he had obtained quotations to carry out water level measuring and to purchase associated logging equipment.</p> <p>HD has approached professional partners and local organisations who have a land interests in Fairbourne and has secured, in principle, locations for boreholes.</p> <p>HD has also approached a private landowner who is willing for a borehole to be installed on his land but would require a legal agreement before any work can take place. These costs would have to borne by GC and would be in the region of £500.</p> <p>HD suggested that it may be necessary to identify private householders that would be prepared to have a borehole installed in their gardens. HD has approached FFC to have an item included in their newsletter and has also approached ACC for their assistance.</p>	<p>HD</p> <p>HD</p> <p>HD</p> <p>HD</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
4.3	Learn from Others Task and Finish Group - GG		
4.3.1	<p>GG reiterated the remit of the group, namely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information to focus on • Identify issues from the other Task and Finish Groups • Push the boundaries and look to the future 		
4.3.2	<p>SS stated that it was essential any reports should be presented in a user friendly language. All agreed with this premise. GG informed the board that a narrative is being developed to pre-empt and supplement technical aspects e.g. explaining return periods.</p>	GG	Ongoing
4.3.3	<p>GG stated that DEFRA are producing a research document relating to 'Buy and Lease Back' schemes based on the English Pathfinder Projects. This information is being tracked and there is the potential for a two-way sharing of information.</p>	LFM Task and Finish Group	Ongoing
4.3.4	<p>GG stated that LP had produced an update on where current research is focused. It also highlights the potential for submitting bids for funding in the summer of 2015. These would need to be in place by the Spring of 2015. Successful bids would provide funding to address gaps in research. All Task and Finish Groups have the potential to identify areas of research or value.</p>	All	Spring 2015

ITEM NO	MINUTES	ACTION	TARGET DATE
4.3.5	<p>GG stated that the group would review the STEAM document and that results will be forwarded to Project Board for further comment. A bid for funding has been made to further investigate the premises contained within the STEAM document.</p> <p>HD informed the board that he had requested information from GC in relation to car park usage in Fairbourne.</p> <p>PC stated that FFC are looking into other data sources and will report at next Project Board meeting.</p> <p>PC stated that the future of the RAF Centre was uncertain and the potential effects of this on the fabric of the village needed to be considered.</p>	<p>LFM Task and Finish Group</p> <p>HD</p> <p>FFC</p> <p>LFM Task and Finish Group</p>	<p>Project Board Meeting</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Project Board Meeting</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
4.4	Socio-Economic Task and Finish Group - LM		
4.4.1	LM reported that a number of issues had been resolved.		
4.4.2	LM reported that there was an issue with an Estate Agent in Dolgellau and a possible Breach of Code Of Conduct. This is being investigated by the Property Ombudsman and there is an ongoing dialogue.	LM	Ongoing
4.4.3	There was a general discussion as how results can be fed to the outside world with the potential to trigger a positive approach from other agencies such as NRW and WG. It was agreed that an Annual Report should be produced to gather information from all Task and Finish Groups. See also Item 3.1 above.	All	Ongoing
4.4.4	The potential for anxiety related illnesses and depression was discussed at the meeting. It was suggested that a voluntary organisation could provide support for this. However, this should be carefully communicated and delivered in order to avoid creating a problem where potentially one may not exist. LM to ask medical professionals about rise in medical issues and feed back to the Task and Finish Group.	LM	Ongoing
4.5	Property Values, Planning & Insurance Task and Finish Group - RW		
4.5.1	ND has produced a Planning Guidance Note, with input from NRW, which outlines the types of planning applications to be supported in Fairbourne.		

ITEM NO	MINUTES	ACTION	TARGET DATE
6.0	Report From FFC		
6.1	<p>PC stated that FFC had produced an Action and Priority Plan which had been to the community for comments and will be placed on the FFC Website when completed.</p> <p>PC stated that a number of key members of FFC are co-ordinating with NRW and WG with the aim of aiding the flow of information.</p>	<p>FFC</p> <p>FFC</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
7.0	Public Meeting 24th October 2014 – Content and Format		
7.1	Discussed under Items 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 above.		
8.0	Funding – WG Bids and Future Bids.		
8.1	<p>LM informed the Board that 5 bids for funding had been submitted; 4 to WG with a total value of £122k and 1 to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation for a value of £54k. LM will report on the success or otherwise of these bids.</p> <p>Refer also to Item 4.3.4 above.</p>	LM	Ongoing
9.0	Any Other Business		
9.1	<p>KI informed the Board that the work to create a natural breach at Morfa Friog would be completed by the end of October. The aim of the project is to create a natural saltmarsh habitat and it forms part of environmental mitigation associated with the main scheme. It will not compromise the main scheme in any way.</p> <p>PC/SS requested further information so that they can inform the community; KI/LP to forward.</p>	KI/LP	
10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6th November 2014, 10:30 AM at Gwynedd Council Offices, Dolgellau. This date to be reviewed and board members to be informed if rescheduled. 	HW/LM	ASAP