

**Addendum to response to National Assembly for Wales Petitions Committee regarding Roath Flood Scheme, 24 April 2018.**

Key concerns regarding representation of NRW's Roath Flood Scheme at National Assembly for Wales Petitions Committee on 27 February 2018.

**1) Consultation**

We have undertaken extensive consultation since 2013, which has shaped the project. Please refer to the "Key Consultation Events" document: [https://nrwcms001.azurewebsites.net/media/683562/roath-flood-scheme-key-public-consultation-events\\_dec-17.pdf](https://nrwcms001.azurewebsites.net/media/683562/roath-flood-scheme-key-public-consultation-events_dec-17.pdf). This summarises our consultation events, such as public drop in sessions, stalls at the annual Waterloo Gardens summer fete, newsletters and press coverage, alongside an online and social media presence, which we planned to be as effective as possible. Assembly Members and local Councillors were also involved throughout.

Whilst this was an extensive consultation process it is unfortunate that it has not been as effective as we had thought, and that the campaigners did not raise their concerns at an earlier, more opportune time in the process.

It was incorrectly stated that "initial consultation was incorrect".

We have however acknowledged that an error existed on some consultation material between October 2016 and March 2017 about the number of properties at risk during a 1 in 5 annual probability flood. The project began in 2012 and we stress that information included in the 2015 detailed planning application and in extensive consultation material leading up to this was correct.

Therefore, we do not believe that this error, which was apparent for less than 6 months, impacted the consultation process significantly, as the majority of project planning was complete by this time. Planning permission for this scheme had already been granted in April 2016 despite some key campaigners objecting to the planning application.

We believe that during the committee's proceedings it was incorrectly stated that NRW changed the flood risk from a 1 in 20 chance to a 1.7% annual probability, (1 in 60).

Aside from the error we recognise, we are not aware of any other errors in our extensive consultation materials, so this statement is erroneous. The pre-scheme risk of properties flooding remains at a 1 in 20 chance – for clarity these properties are at Waterloo Gardens, and not Roath Brook Gardens. We have tried to be transparent

throughout the consultation process, with the production of flood maps from the outset of the scheme clearly showing the areas at Low, Moderate, and High flood risk in the area. We have always shown the High flood risk around Waterloo Gardens, with a Medium flood risk at Roath Brook Gardens, and this has not changed throughout the scheme's progression. We have certainly not tried to mislead people as has been claimed.

We are pleased to see how passionate some of the community are regarding the Park Gardens and their environment. But there are also others in the community who are deeply concerned about the risk of flooding. It is likely that equally passionate people would be concerned about any alternative option. Through our appraisal process we have chosen the option that we believe has the least overall impact.

Whilst the committee has seen the petition, please bear in mind that signatories are not restricted to local Pen-y-Lan residents. Hence the statement that the scheme is clearly not supported by the bulk of the population cannot be verified. The numbers of local and affected residents for or against the scheme has not been quantified.

We have been contacted by local residents stating that the silent majority of residents at flood risk support the scheme, however this is similarly unverified.

## **2) Flood Risk Prioritisation**

It was stated that there are 150 schemes in Wales that are ahead of the Phase 3 works. We are not aware of any evidence to support this statement and would welcome understanding the basis of this claim. The Roath scheme in its entirety, that is all three phases, is ranked 17<sup>th</sup> on the Communities at Risk Register. The Phase 3 works have not been assessed individually, as this tool is not suitable for a street by street assessment.

## **3) Roath Flood Scheme Proposal**

The statement that half of Roath Brook Gardens and Roath Mill Gardens are to be ripped out is untrue. We would advise the committee to view the approved planning application in detail, which shows only soft 'green' engineering works proposed in Roath Brook Gardens and Roath Mill Gardens (i.e. there are no concrete walls). It is our ambition to ensure that the parks will remain an oasis for people and wildlife, with several environmental enhancements installed as part of the scheme, such as kingfisher nesting boxes and bat boxes, and the replacement of trees, many of which are nearing the end of their life.

We do not believe we have "got it wrong" but have correctly assessed the flood risk, selected the best option and designed it sensitively, to improve Pen-y-Lan and the Park Gardens for future generations.