

# **PERTH & KINROSS COUNCIL**

## **Environment and Infrastructure Committee**

**30 October 2019**

### **Flood Protection Studies - Pitlochry & Aberfeldy**

#### **Report by Executive Director (Housing & Environment) (Report No. 19/309)**

This report describes the Council's flood protection studies at two separate locations - Pitlochry and Aberfeldy. The report also recommends that flood protection schemes are taken forward in both areas as they are deemed to be economically viable using relevant assessment criteria. In addition, the report recommends that the schemes are submitted to SEPA for national prioritisation and inclusion in the next Tay Flood Risk Management Strategy and Local Flood Risk Management Plan.

#### **1. BACKGROUND / MAIN ISSUES**

- 1.1 Under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009, SEPA and lead local authorities published new Flood Risk Management (FRM) Strategies and Local FRM Plans in December 2015 and June 2016 respectively. These documents set out a range of actions that SEPA and responsible local authorities are taking to manage and, where possible, reduce the risk of flooding over a six year period.
- 1.2 The Environment Committee, at its meeting on 1 June 2016, approved the content and publication of the Tay Local FRM Plan (Report No 16/241 refers). Subsequently, the Environment and Infrastructure Committee approved the content of an interim report on the progress made in implementing the Tay Local FRM Plan on 23 January 2019 (Report No 19/16 refers). Both of these published documents can be viewed at the following link:  
<http://www.pkc.gov.uk/frmplans>
- 1.3 The Tay FRM Strategy and Local FRM Plan identify various flood studies as a means of further improving the understanding of flood risk in certain locations. The two highest priority flood studies in the Tay catchment were identified for Pitlochry and Aberfeldy.
- 1.4 The purpose of these flood studies was to investigate what further action is required to manage flood risk in these locations. Such action can be implemented through flood protection schemes, where these are found to be technically feasible and economically viable.
- 1.5 The 2009 Act provides local authorities with discretionary powers to promote flood protection schemes. Only those flood schemes which have been included in the FRM Strategies, the Local FRM Plans and the national priority list are taken forward in the subsequent 6 year period.

- 1.6 Although public authorities are expected to take a proactive role in managing and, where achievable, lowering flood risk, the primary responsibility for avoiding or managing flood risk still remains with land and property owners. The 2009 Act does not alter this. Individuals, businesses and communities must, therefore, play a critical role in ensuring their own resilience and helping to reduce the impact of flooding.

### **Pitlochry**

- 1.7 Pitlochry is located in the River Tay catchment within Potentially Vulnerable Area (PVA) 08/03.
- 1.8 The main potential source of flooding to Pitlochry is the River Tummel. Other smaller watercourses including the Moulin Burn, Wester Kinnaird Burn, Kinnaird Burn and Edradour Burn also present a risk of flooding. The flood study has also given consideration to the small watercourses to the south east of Pitlochry in the vicinity of Westhaugh of Dalshian, Easthaugh of Ballyoukan and the Altrory Burn.
- 1.9 In February 2017, consulting engineers, AECOM, were engaged to carry out a flood study for Pitlochry.
- 1.10 AECOM's investigations involved extensive data gathering and analysis, consultations, topographic surveys, a hydrological assessment, hydraulic modelling, an environmental desk study, an options study, an economic appraisal and the production of final reports.
- 1.11 The flood study analysed the flooding mechanisms affecting Pitlochry and a series of flood hazard maps were produced. The study identified that up to 155 residential properties and 75 commercial properties are potentially at risk during a 1 in 200 year flood event (the flood event with a 0.5% chance of occurring in any one year).
- 1.12 In managing flood risk, the Council is required to have regard to the economic, social and environmental impact of its actions. The Scottish Government's guidance recommends that decision making in flood risk management should be supported by an options appraisal.
- 1.13 The options appraisal includes a cost-benefit analysis and other techniques to determine whether a flood protection scheme meets its objectives, is sustainable and represents best value for money. In general, the cost of flood damage avoided over time must be greater than the cost of building the flood defences, i.e. they must achieve a benefit/cost ratio of greater than 1.0.
- 1.14 AECOM initially considered a long list of potential options to manage the risk of flooding. This long list was refined by a technical, environmental and economic appraisal until a short list of 13 options was selected for more detailed analysis. This short list of potential options, together with the estimated costs and benefit/cost ratios, is shown in Appendix 1.

- 1.15 Due to the complexity and nature of the flooding mechanisms in Pitlochry, it was not possible to identify a single solution to protect the entire town. Instead, the following collection of actions was selected to provide flood protection to as many properties and businesses, whilst still maintaining an economically viable flood scheme:
- (i) the removal of the existing watercourse diversion between the upper reaches of the Kinnaird Burn and the Moulin Burn;
  - (ii) woody debris structures (tree traps) on the upper reaches of the Moulin and Kinnaird Burns - to reduce the future risk of blockage at culverts and bridges further downstream within the town;
  - (iii) a flood wall on the eastern bank of the Moulin Burn at Kirkmichael Road;
  - (iv) increasing flood storage at the Cuilc Pond;
  - (v) a flood storage wall on the Moulin Burn at the Craigmhor Lodge pond
  - (vi) a new watercourse diversion channel on the Wester Kinnaird Burn at Tomcroy Terrace
  - (vii) culvert and headwall improvements at the culvert that conveys the Moulin Burn past the Co-op supermarket on West Moulin Road
  - (viii) a flood wall on the eastern bank of the Kinnaird Burn at Blair Atholl Distillery
- 1.16 The locations of these actions are shown on the drawing in Appendix 2.
- 1.17 Unfortunately, AECOM have not recommended some of the actions that were considered, e.g. flood defences on the River Tummel. The flood study has confirmed that flood defences in some areas adjacent to the Tummel would require to be more than 2.0m high and residents would be unlikely to accept this. At present the onset of flooding along the River Tummel is relatively rare and so residents already have some degree of flood protection. These actions will not be taken forward as part of a flood scheme.
- 1.18 Some individual actions with benefit/cost ratios of less than 1.0 have been selected as the overall benefit/cost ratio for all of the measures when grouped together is 3.6. However, if some of the larger options were to be included, e.g. defences on the River Tummel, then the overall benefit/cost ratio would drop below 1.0.
- 1.19 The collection of selected actions is estimated to have a capital cost of £2.73m and an overall benefit/cost ratio of 3.6. The flood study has, therefore, recommended that this flood protection scheme be implemented.
- 1.20 If these actions were to be implemented, then a total of 104 properties would be protected up to the 1 in 200 year flood risk, including a further allowance for future climate change (a 20% increase in peak river flow). These actions would also mitigate flood risk to other properties in the area but not to the same design standard.
- 1.21 The flood scheme proposals will be developed in more detail in future. There may be scope to add further actions, provided the overall scheme remains economically viable.

- 1.22 A flood protection scheme for the Dalshian area was not recommended by the flood study. The number of properties here is very small, compared to expensive nature of works required to reduce the risk of flooding. However, the study recommends localised works to improve existing culvert headwalls, including the installation of trash screens, to help mitigate flood risk in the area.
- 1.23 In order to disseminate the findings of the flood study and to outline how flood risk is being managed in the area, two community drop-in events were held in the Pitlochry Town Hall on 20 and 27 February 2019. Further details are provided in Section 4 of the Annex to this report.

### **Aberfeldy**

- 1.24 Aberfeldy is located within the River Tay catchment and is also contained within Potentially Vulnerable Area (PVA) 08/03.
- 1.25 Aberfeldy is at risk from two main sources of river flooding – the River Tay and Moness Burn. There is also a risk from minor watercourses, such as the Tomchulan Burn, as well as surface water flooding at various locations, including the areas around Old Crieff Road and Farragon Drive.
- 1.26 In January 2018, consulting engineers, RPS Group Ltd, were engaged to carry out a flood study for Aberfeldy.
- 1.27 RPS's investigations involved extensive data gathering and analysis, consultations, topographic surveys, a hydrological assessment, hydraulic modelling, an environmental desk study, an options study, an economic appraisal and the production of final reports.
- 1.28 The flood study analysed the flooding mechanisms affecting Aberfeldy and a series of flood hazard maps were produced. The study identified that up to 128 residential properties and 40 commercial properties at potentially at risk during a 1 in 200 year flood event (the flood event with 0.5% chance of occurring in any one year).
- 1.29 RPS initially considered a long list of potential options to manage the risk of flooding. This long list was refined by a technical, environmental and economic appraisal until a short list of 6 options was selected for more detailed analysis. This short list of potential options, together with the estimated costs and benefit/cost ratios, are summarised in Appendix 3.
- 1.30 Two different alignments for flood defences at Aberfeldy Caravan Park were considered. One alignment provided flood defences for the caravan park and the other did not, with the latter alignment being the recommended option. This was due to the difficulty of providing a suitable level of flood defence and the potential impact on the business use and operation of the site. The leaseholder of the caravan park has been consulted regarding this and has

already taken action to make the site more resilient to flooding. The site also closes in winter and only takes mobile caravans. All figures and costs presented in this report, therefore, relate to the recommended alignment detailed in this paragraph.

- 1.31 Of the six options considered, Option 5 was selected. This proposed option involves the following flood defences for the River Tay and the Moness Burn along with culvert improvements on the Tomchulan Burn:
- (i) flood walls at Tayside Place, Tayside Crescent and the Industrial Estate;
  - (ii) a flood embankment adjacent to the former slaughterhouse site at Appin Place;
  - (iii) flood Walls on the east bank of the Moness Burn at Burnside and Bank Street;
  - (iv) increasing existing culverts on the Tomchulan Burn at Old Crieff Road, Moness Avenue and in the field above Old Crieff Road.
- 1.32 This option is set out on the plan in Appendix 4.
- 1.33 The other potential options were ruled out due to technical, environmental, social and/or economic reasons. RPS have therefore not recommended taking these forward as part of a flood scheme.
- 1.34 If the flood scheme were to be implemented, then a total of 164 properties would be protected up to the 1 in 200 year flood.
- 1.35 The proposed option has an estimated capital cost of £5.3m and a benefit/cost ratio of 1.44. The flood study has therefore concluded that this flood protection scheme should go ahead.
- 1.36 However, the flood scheme proposals and cost estimates will still require to be developed in more detail in future. This will involve a detailed process of further investigations, outline design, the statutory process, detailed design, tendering and construction. Experience on other similar flood schemes has invariably shown that the costs estimated at feasibility stage can increase.
- 1.37 The benefit cost ratio of 1.44 is, therefore, considered to be marginal and there is a risk that this figure could reduce following further investigations, if costs increase. The scheme proposals and costs will therefore have to be carefully monitored going forward.
- 1.38 A number of surface water flooding issues were reported by residents during community consultation. A separate surface water flooding assessment was, therefore, also carried out by RPS as part of the flood study. Areas of surface water flood risk have been identified and simple measures proposed to help manage this in the future.
- 1.39 In order to disseminate the findings of the flood study and to outline how flood risk is being managed in the area, two community drop-in events were held in

the Aberfeldy Town Hall on 20 and 25 June 2019. Further details are provided in Section 4 of the Annex to this report.

## **2. PROPOSALS**

- 2.1 The Council's consulting engineers have recommended flood protection schemes for Pitlochry and Aberfeldy. It is proposed that these schemes are taken forward by the Council.

### **Pitlochry**

- 2.2 The Council's consulting engineers, AECOM, have recommended a flood protection scheme involving a collection of various localised actions as set out at section 1.15 of this report.
- 2.3 The proposed flood protection scheme is shown in Appendix 2 of this report.

### **Aberfeldy**

- 2.4 The Council's consulting engineers, RPS, have recommended a flood protection scheme for Aberfeldy as set out at section 1.31 of this report.
- 2.5 The proposed flood protection scheme is shown in Appendix 4 of this report.
- 2.6 The proposed scheme includes the provision of approximately 1 km of flood walls and 25m of flood embankment on the River Tay and Moness Burn and increasing culvert sizes on the Tomchulan Burn.

### **Next Steps**

- 2.7 SEPA has set a deadline of the end of December 2019 for local authorities to identify new flood schemes for inclusion in the second cycle of FRM Strategies and Local FRM Plans covering the period from 2022-2028. The flood schemes identified across Scotland will then be prioritised and added to an updated national priority list.
- 2.8 It is, therefore, proposed that the recommended flood schemes for Pitlochry and Aberfeldy are put forward to SEPA for prioritisation, and are included in the next Tay FRM Strategy and Local FRM Plan, which will cover the period 2022-2028.
- 2.9 The next Tay Local FRM Plan will set out the proposed implementation arrangements for the flood schemes in Pitlochry and Aberfeldy, including timescales and how they will be funded. The next phases of work to develop the flood scheme proposals will therefore not commence until after 2022.

## **3. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 This report provides an update on the outcome of separate flood protection studies in Pitlochry and Aberfeldy.

- 3.2 The Council engaged consulting engineers to carry out separate flood protection studies in Pitlochry and Aberfeldy. These communities were identified as locations for the Council's highest priority flood studies within the Tay Flood Risk Management Strategy and Local Flood Risk Management Plan.
- 3.3 In both instances, the Council's consulting engineers have recommended flood protection schemes. The proposed schemes are economically viable. The preliminary proposals consist of various measures to reduce the risk of flooding in both communities.
- 3.4 The report seeks the Committee's approval that the consulting engineers' recommended proposals be promoted as flood schemes for Pitlochry and Aberfeldy.
- 3.5 It is recommended that the Committee:
- (i) notes the completion of the Pitlochry and Aberfeldy Flood Protection Studies as required by the Tay Flood Risk Management Strategy and Local Flood Risk Management Plan.
  - (ii) notes that separate public engagement events have been held to disseminate the findings of both flood protection studies.
  - (iii) approves the recommended proposals for flood protection schemes in Pitlochry and Aberfeldy.
  - (iv) agrees that details of the recommended flood schemes be submitted to SEPA for national prioritisation and inclusion in the next Tay Flood Risk Management Strategy, which is due to be published in December 2021.
  - (v) agrees that the recommended schemes be included in the next Tay Local Flood Risk Management Plan, due for publication in June 2022.

#### Authors

Name	Designation	Contact Details
Peter Dickson	Senior Engineer Structures & Flooding Team	<a href="mailto:HECommitteeReport@pkc.gov.uk">HECommitteeReport@pkc.gov.uk</a> 01738 475 000
Russell Stewart	Engineer (Flooding) Structures & Flooding Team	
Gavin Bissett	Technician (Flooding) Structures & Flooding Team	

#### Approved

Name	Designation	Date
Barbara Renton	Executive Director (Housing & Environment)	4 October 2019

If you or someone you know would like a copy of this document in another language or format, (on occasion, only a summary of the document will be provided in translation), this can be arranged by contacting the Customer Service Centre on 01738 475000.

You can also send us a text message on 07824 498145.

All Council Services can offer a telephone translation facility.



## 1. IMPLICATIONS, ASSESSMENTS, CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

<b>Strategic Implications</b>	<b>Yes / None</b>
Community Plan / Single Outcome Agreement	<b>Yes</b>
Corporate Plan	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Resource Implications</b>	
Financial	<b>Yes</b>
Workforce	<b>None</b>
Asset Management (land, property, IST)	<b>None</b>
<b>Assessments</b>	
Equality Impact Assessment	<b>Yes</b>
Strategic Environmental Assessment	<b>Yes</b>
Sustainability (community, economic, environmental)	<b>Yes</b>
Legal and Governance	<b>Yes</b>
Risk	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Consultation</b>	
Internal	<b>Yes</b>
External	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Communication</b>	
Communications Plan	<b>Yes</b>

### 1. Strategic Implications

#### Community Plan/Single Outcome Agreement

- 1.1 The proposals relate to the delivery of the Perth and Kinross Community Plan/Single Outcome Agreement in terms of the following priorities:

- (i) Promoting a prosperous, inclusive and sustainable economy
- (ii) Supporting people to lead independent, healthy and active lives
- (iii) Creating a safe and sustainable place for future generations

#### Corporate Plan

- 1.2 The proposals relate to the achievement of the following priorities in the Council's Corporate Plan:

- (i) Promoting a prosperous, inclusive and sustainable economy;
- (ii) Supporting people to lead independent, healthy and active lives; and
- (iii) Creating a safe and sustainable place for future generations.

## **2. Resource Implications**

### Financial

- 2.1 Is should be noted that the proposed flood protection schemes will not be implemented at this time. The implementation arrangements will be set out in the next round of Flood Risk Management (FRM) Strategies and Local FRM Plans, due for publication in December 2021 and June 2022 respectively. At some point during the subsequent six years, consulting engineers will be re-engaged to carry out further investigations and develop the flood scheme proposals. As a result, there are no immediate resource implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.
- 2.2 However, the flood risk management planning process will have future financial implications. The Local FRM Plans will contain the implementation arrangements including a timetable for the proposed food schemes, who will be responsible for implementing them, as well as how they will be funded and coordinated by SEPA and the responsible authorities over the next six year cycle from 2022-2028.
- 2.3 The 2009 Act requires the Scottish Government to have regard to the FRM Strategies and Local FRM Plans when allocating funds to SEPA and responsible authorities. The Scottish Government, CoSLA and SEPA will agree the distribution of capital funding to the actions identified nationally in the next FRM Strategies and Local FRM Plans. The following arrangements currently apply:
- (i) Only works and schemes that are prioritised in the FRM Strategies and Local FRM Plans are eligible for capital funding.
  - (ii) Flood protection schemes attract capital grant assistance of up to 80% of their estimated project cost at tender stage from the Scottish Government. Local authorities are required to fund the remainder of the cost of flood schemes.
  - (iii) The Scottish Government allocates capital funding to local authorities engaged in flood risk management across Scotland. 80% of this capital funding will continue to be allocated to flood protection schemes with the remaining 20% to other actions within the FRM Strategies, as detailed in the Local FRM Plans. This 20% is distributed to the 32 Scottish local authorities based on the number of properties at risk of flooding and the estimated annual average flood damages.
- 2.4 The Scottish Government and the Council would therefore have to make capital allocations for these flood schemes. At present, the allocated capital grant is adjusted as the flood scheme proposals are developed. The estimated costs of flood schemes across Scotland will therefore continue to be reported to the Scottish Government by local authorities on an annual basis.

- 2.5 The proposals and cost estimates for both flood schemes still have to be developed through a long process of further investigations, consultation, outline design, the statutory process, detailed design, tendering and construction. Experience on other similar schemes has invariably shown that the costs estimated at feasibility stage always increase. The scheme costs noted in this report are therefore subject to change and will have to be carefully monitored going forward.
- 2.6 There are no current revenue funding implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

#### Workforce

- 2.7 There are no workforce implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

#### Asset Management (land, property, IT)

- 2.8 The proposals in this report have no asset management implications.

### **3. Assessments**

#### Equality Impact Assessment

- 3.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, the Council is required to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between equality groups. Carrying out Equality Impact Assessments for plans and policies allows the Council to demonstrate that it is meeting these duties. The Equality Impact Assessment undertaken in relation to this report can be viewed clicking [here](#).
- 3.2 The proposals in this report have been considered under the Corporate Equalities Impact Assessment process (EqIA) with the following outcome.
- (i) It was determined that the proposals be assessed as **relevant** with the following actions taken to reduce or remove the following negative impacts:
- The construction works for the flood schemes could temporarily have a greater impact on mobility impaired, sight impaired, blind people or disabled people, on children and the elderly and infirm, and on pregnant women or nursing mothers, in relation to adverse psychological, physical and health impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures will be adopted to minimise disruption, noise, dust and vibration and to ensure adequate safe access throughout the construction works.
- (ii) The proposals be assessed as **relevant** with the following positive outcomes expected following implementation:

- The flood schemes will have the same positive impact for all equality groups as the reduction in flood risk to both communities will provide benefits for all (improved safety, health & wellbeing through the avoidance of flood impacts and damages) in the long term.

### Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 3.3 The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 places a duty on the Council to identify and assess the environmental consequences of its proposals.
- 3.4 The matters presented in this report were considered under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 and no further action is required as it does not qualify as a PPS as defined by the Act and is therefore exempt.
- 3.5 It is likely that Environmental Impact Assessments will be required to support the proposed flood schemes described in this report. These assessments will be progressed once consulting engineers have been engaged.

### Sustainability

- 3.6 Under the provisions of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 the Council has to discharge its duties in a way which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 the Council also has a duty relating to climate change and, in exercising its functions must act:
- in the way best calculated to delivery of the Act's emissions reduction targets;
  - in the way best calculated to deliver any statutory adaptation programmes; and
  - in a way that it considers most sustainable.
- 3.7 Following an assessment using the Integrated Appraisal Toolkit, it was previously determined that the proposal is likely to contribute positively to the following corporate sustainable development principles:
- (i) Climate Change  
Efficient use of resources now and in the future in the built environment and service provision (e.g. energy efficiency, land, water resources, flood defence, waste minimisation) (*Principle 2*) Mitigation and adaptation to manage the impact of climate change & reduce the production of greenhouse gases (*Principle 3*)

### **Justification**

The flood schemes proposed in this report will help to manage the increased flood risk to Pitlochry and Aberfeldy brought about by climate change.

(ii) Community

Creating a sense of place (e.g. a place with a positive 'feeling' for people, and local distinctiveness) (*Principle 22*)

**Justification:**

The flood schemes will help to make the local communities safer and more sustainable for residents, through a reduction in flood risk. This will help the communities to thrive in the longer term despite the temporary construction impacts.

- 3.8 Following an assessment using the Integrated Appraisal Toolkit, it was previously determined that the proposal is likely to contribute negatively to the following corporate sustainable development principles:

(iii) Consumption and Resources

Efficient use of resources now and in the future in the built environment and service provision (e.g. energy efficiency, land, water resources, flood defence, waste minimisation) (*Principle 2*). Mitigation and adaptation to manage the impact of climate change & reduce the production of greenhouse gases (*Principle 3*)

**Justification:**

There will be a short term increase in the use of materials and resources during construction of the flood schemes, but a future reduction due to reduced flood risk.

**Mitigation:**

The Environmental Impact Assessment and eventual Construction Environmental Management Plan will consider energy consumption and waste management practices during construction.

Legal and Governance

- 3.9 The Head of Legal and Governance Services has been consulted on this report.
- 3.10 The legal basis for the proposals set out in this report is the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009.

Risk

- 3.11 Flooding is a natural phenomenon that can never be entirely prevented. However, the Council is required to manage and, where possible, reduce flood risk.

- 3.12 The flood schemes proposed in this report will reduce flood risk in Pitlochry and Aberfeldy. The risks associated with the proposals set out in this report will be identified and managed through individual projects.

#### **4. Consultation**

##### Internal

- 4.1 The Head of Legal and Governance and the Head of Finance have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

##### External

##### **Pitlochry**

- 4.2 Pitlochry Community Council, the Forestry Commission, SEPA, SNH, Scottish and Southern Energy and all relevant landowners and occupiers were consulted during the development of the proposals.
- 4.3 Two community drop-in sessions were held in Pitlochry Town Hall on 20 and 27 February 2019. The aim of these events was to provide the local community with further information on:-
- the risk of flooding in Pitlochry;
  - the outcome of the Council's flood study;
  - work to raise awareness of flooding and to help the local community to become more prepared and resilient to deal with flooding.
- 4.4 A letter was issued to the local elected members, the Community Council and the local resilience group summarising the work carried out by the consulting engineers and how flood risk might be managed in the future. 242 letters were sent to local residents and businesses within the community to advertise the events. Approximately 30 people attended the community drop-in sessions.
- 4.5 The drop-in sessions included a central display, a flood simulation video, a series of plans setting out the proposals and a rolling presentation. Representatives from the Council's flooding team, AECOM, SEPA, and the Scottish Flood Forum were available to answer questions and provide further information. Those attending were given an opportunity to record their views and questions on comment forms. Six comment forms and e-mails were returned to the Council after the sessions.
- 4.6 In general, the impression received from the drop-in sessions was positive. The flood study did not recommend flood defences on the River Tummel and some residents of Fonab Crescent and Tummel Crescent noted their concerns about this. Works were recommended to increase flood storage at the Culic pond and some concerns were also raised by residents regarding the potential impact on the scenic nature of the area. Further consultation with the community will therefore be required if the proposals are to be taken forward.

- 4.7 The Council has issued a response to the community to answer any questions raised during the drop-in sessions or on comment forms.

### **Aberfeldy**

- 4.8 Aberfeldy Community Council, Aberfeldy Community Resilience Group, the Tayside Waders, SEPA, SNH, Scottish Forestry, Scottish Water and all relevant landowners and residents were consulted during the development of the proposals.
- 4.9 Two community drop-in sessions were held in Aberfeldy on 20 and 25 June 2019. The aim of these events was to provide the local community with further information on:-
- the risk of flooding in Aberfeldy;
  - the findings from the Aberfeldy flood study;
  - a review of surface water flooding; and
  - other actions to raise awareness and improve community flood resilience.
- 4.10 A letter was issued to the local elected members, the Community Council and local resilience groups summarising the work carried out by the consulting engineers and how flood risk might be managed in the future. 385 letters were sent to local residents and businesses within the community to advertise the events. Approximately 60 people attended the community drop-in sessions, including two local elected members.
- 4.11 The drop-in sessions included a central display, a flood simulation video, a series of plans setting out the proposals and a rolling presentation. Representatives from Perth & Kinross Council's flooding team, RPS Group Ltd and the Scottish Flood Forum were also available to answer questions and provide further information. Those attending were given an opportunity to record their views and questions on comment forms. Ten comment forms were returned to the Council after the sessions.
- 4.12 In general, the impression received from the drop-in sessions was somewhat mixed. Some concerns were raised about the need for, and scale, of the proposed flood defences although there was a general acceptance of the significant flood risk in Aberfeldy and the need for action to manage this. Further consultation with the community will therefore be required if the proposals are to be taken forward.
- 4.13 The Council has issued a response to the community to answer any questions raised during the drop-in sessions or on comment forms.

## **5. Communication**

- 5.1 The communication arrangements to date were as noted in Section 4 above.
- 5.2 The Council will continue to communicate with the local community, statutory consultees, local landowners and other stakeholders as the scheme proposals are developed.

## **2. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 2.1 The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in the preparation of the above report:
  - PKC – Environment Committee – 9 September 2015, The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009, Selected Actions and Prioritisation (Report No. 15/359)
  - PKC – Environment Committee – 1 June 2016, The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009, Publication of Local Flood Risk Management Plans (Report No 16/241)
  - PKC – Environment and Infrastructure Committee – 23 January 2019, The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009, Publication of Interim Report (Report No 19/16)

## **3. APPENDICES**

- 3.1 Appendix 1 – Pitlochry Flood Study - Short List - Flood Risk Management Options.
- 3.2 Appendix 2 – Plan of Proposed Flood Scheme – Pitlochry.
- 3.3 Appendix 3 – Aberfeldy Flood Study - Short List - Flood Risk Management Options.
- 3.4 Appendix 4 – Plan of Proposed Flood Scheme – Aberfeldy.