

Sandfields Primary School, Flood Consequences Assessment

Draft Report

May 2024

Prepared for:
CB3 Consult Ltd
7 St James Crescent
Swansea
SA1 6DP

www.jbaconsulting.com

Document Status

Issue date	May 2024
Issued to	CB3 Consult Ltd
BIM reference	MPE-JBA-XX-XX-RP-Z-Sandfields_Primary_FCA
Revision	S3-P01
Prepared by	Harry Wightman BSc Assistant Analyst
Reviewed by	Faye Tomalin BSc (Hons) MSc C.WEM MCIWEM Principal Analyst
Authorised by	Hannah Evans BSc (Hons) Project Manager

Carbon Footprint

The format of this report is optimised for reading digitally in pdf format. Paper consumption produces substantial carbon emissions and other environmental impacts through the extraction, production and transportation of paper. Printing also generates emissions and impacts from the manufacture of printers and inks and from the energy used to power a printer. Please consider the environment before printing.

Contract

JBA Project Manager	Hannah Evans
Address	Suite 1B, First Floor, Coleshill House, 1 Station Road, Coleshill, Warwickshire, B46 1HT
JBA Project Code	2024s0364

This report describes work commissioned by CB3 Consult Ltd, by an instruction dated 4th March 2024. The Client's representative for the contract was Dylan Gravell of CB3 Consult Ltd. Harry Wightman of JBA Consulting carried out this work.

Purpose and Disclaimer

Jeremy Benn Associates Limited ("JBA") has prepared this Report for the sole use of CB3 Consult Ltd and its appointed agents in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed.

JBA has no liability for any use that is made of this Report except to CB3 Consult Ltd for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by JBA. This Report cannot be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of JBA.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by JBA has not been independently verified by JBA, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

Certain statements made in the Report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the Report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. JBA specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimates or projections contained in this Report.

Unless otherwise stated in this Report, the assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant changes.

Copyright

© Jeremy Benn Associates Limited 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Terms of Reference	1
1.2	FCA Requirements	1
2	Site Description	2
2.1	Site Summary	2
2.2	Site Topography	3
2.3	Soils and Geology	4
2.4	Watercourses	4
2.5	Development Proposal	5
3	Planning Policy and Flood Risk	7
3.1	Planning Context	7
3.2	Vulnerability Classification	7
3.3	Development Advice Map Classification	8
3.4	Flood Map for Planning Classifications	9
3.5	Local Development Plan	12
3.6	Justification Test	13
4	Flood Risk Assessment	14
4.1	Review of Existing Flood Risk Data	14
4.2	Historical Flooding	14
4.3	Flood Risk from Rivers	14
4.4	Flood Risk from the Sea	15
4.5	Flood Risk from Surface Water and Small Watercourses	15
4.6	Flood Risk from Groundwater	16
4.7	Flood Risk from Reservoirs	16
4.8	Flood Risk from Sewers	16
5	Detailed Fluvial Flood Risk Assessment	17
5.1	Hydraulic Modelling Availability	17
5.2	Fluvial Flood Risk	17
5.3	Tidal Flood Risk	20
5.4	Access and Egress	22

6	Assessment of Acceptability Criteria	23
7	Conclusions and Recommendations	25
A	Proposed Development Plan	A-2
B	Updated Hydraulic Model	B-3

List of Figures

Figure 2-1: Site Location	3
Figure 2-2: Site Specific Topographic Data from NPTCBC with sample points	4
Figure 2-3: Nearby Watercourses	5
Figure 2-4: Extract of development proposals (Neath Port Talbot Borough Council)	6
Figure 3-1 Development Advice Map	9
Figure 3-2 Flood Map for Planning - Rivers	10
Figure 3-3 Flood Map for Planning - Sea	11
Figure 4-1 FRAW - Flood Risk from Rivers	15
Figure 5-1 1% AEP Fluvial Event Plus Climate Change Flood Depths	18
Figure 5-2 0.1% AEP Fluvial Event Flood Depths	19
Figure 5-3 0.5% AEP Tidal Event Plus Climate Change Flood Depths	20
Figure 5-4 0.1% AEP Tidal Event Plus Climate Change Flood Depths	21
Figure 5-5 Access and Egress within the 0.1% AEP plus climate change tidal event	22

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Site Summary	2
Table 3-1 Development Categories Defined by TAN-15	8
Table 3-2 Justification Test applied to the proposed development	13
Table 4-1 Summary of Flood Risk	14
Table 6-1 Assessment of accessibility criteria	23

Abbreviations

1D	One Dimensional (modelling)
2D	Two Dimensional (modelling)
AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
Ha	Hectares
BGS.....	British Geological Survey
NPTCBC	Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
FCA.....	Flood Consequence Assessment
FFL.....	Finished Floor Level
FMfP.....	Flood Map For Planning
LDP	Local Development Plan
LiDAR.....	Light Detection And Ranging
NGR	National Grid Reference
NRW.....	Natural Resources for Wales
OS.....	Ordnance Survey
OS NGR.....	Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference
PFR.....	Property Flood Resilience
PFRA.....	Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment
TUFLOW	Two-dimensional Unsteady FLOW (a hydraulic model)

1 Introduction

1.1 Terms of Reference

JBA Consulting (JBA) were commissioned by CB3 Consult Ltd to undertake a Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) to support a planning application for a development at Sandfields Primary School, Port Talbot.

1.2 FCA Requirements

This FCA follows Welsh Government guidance on development and flood risk set out in Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk (TAN-15). Where appropriate, the following aspects of flood risk should be addressed in all planning applications over their expected lifetime:

- The likely mechanisms of flooding
- The likely source of flooding
- The depths of flooding through the site
- The speed of inundation of the site
- The rate of rise of flood water through the site
- Velocities of flood water across the site
- Overland flow routes
- The effect of access and egress and infrastructure, for example, public sewer outfalls, combined sewer outflows, surface water sewers and effluent discharge pipes from wastewater treatment works
- The impacts of the development in terms of flood risk on neighbouring properties and elsewhere on the floodplain.

2 Site Description

2.1 Site Summary

The proposed development site is located at Sandfields Primary School, Lillian Street, Port Talbot. The red line boundary of the proposed development area is located towards the western extent of the school site, south of the school access from Pendarvis Steet, as shown in Figure 2-1.

The development site is approximately 0.02ha and is currently comprised of a shelter building located within the perimeter of Sandfields Primary School.

The development site is set within a primarily residential area of Port Talbot, with residential dwellings surrounding Sandfields Primary School to the east, south and west. Neath Port Talbot Hospital is located to the north of the Primary School.

Table 2-1 summaries the key characteristics of the site.

Table 2-1 Site Summary

Parameter	Description
Site Name	Sandfields Primary School
Site area	0.02ha (hectares)
Existing land use	Temporary Building within Sandfields Primary School
Purpose of development	Educational premises
OS NGR	SS 75525 90099
Local Planning Authorities	Neath Port Talbot
Lead Local Flood Authority	Neath Port Talbot



Figure 2-1: Site Location

2.2 Site Topography

A topographic survey undertaken by Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council (NPTCBC) in February 2024 and is provided within the post development site layout in Appendix A. This highlights that the general site area is relatively flat with a slight decline from the northeast (6.99mAOD) to the southwest (6.73mAOD), as shown in Figure 2-2.




Figure 2-2: Site Specific Topographic Data from NPTCBC with sample points

2.3 Soils and Geology

The geology of the site has been assessed using the British Geological Survey (BGS) GeoIndex Onshore Viewer¹. The bedrock is shown to be Coal Measures Group (South Wales) comprised of mudstone, siltstone and sandstone. The superficial geology is formed of Tidal Flat Deposits (clay, silt and sand).

The soils on site have been assessed on the Cranfield University Soilscape viewer² and are shown to be naturally wet soils.

2.4 Watercourses

No watercourses cross the proposed development site.

The nearest watercourse, the River Afan, flows in a south-westerly direction, approximately 500m east of the site (Figure 2-3). The River Afan is an NRW designated Main River.

1 <https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/geoindex-onshore/>

2 <https://www.landis.org.uk/soilscape/index.cfm>

The site is located approximately 650m west of a fluvial flood defence wall along the northwestern boundary of the River Afan (Figure 2-3). The fluvial flood defence wall is owned and maintained by Natural Resource Wales (NRW).




Figure 2-3: Nearby Watercourses

2.5 Development Proposal

Development proposals for the demolition of the existing on site temporary building, and construction of a new education facility, with associated minor landscaping work. An extract of the development proposals is contained in Figure 2-4, with the full plans contained in Appendix A.

It is envisaged that development proposals shall consist of minor amendments to local ground levels to facilitate construction.




Figure 2-4: Extract of development proposals (Neath Port Talbot Borough Council)

3 Planning Policy and Flood Risk

3.1 Planning Context

Planning Policy Wales (PPW) sets out the land use planning policies of the Welsh Government. It is supplemented by a series of Technical Advice Notes (TANs), Welsh Government Circulars, and policy clarification letters, which together with PPW provide the national planning policy framework for Wales. These policies have the aim that all development in Wales is sustainable and improve the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of Wales as set out in the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015.

Technical Advice Note 15 (TAN-15), introduced by the Welsh Government in 2004, provides technical guidance relating to development planning and flood risk in Wales. The initial requirements of TAN-15 are to identify the vulnerability classification(s) and flood zones relevant to the proposed development, and to apply this information to the application of the justification tests.

An update to TAN-15 was released in October 2021 and was due to come into force on the 1st December 2021. However, Welsh Government subsequently suspended the implementation of the new TAN-15. Although the new TAN-15 is not a material consideration, Welsh Government and NRW advise that some consideration is given to the draft Flood Map for Planning (FMfP) as best available information. Therefore, where a site is located in a FMfP flood risk zone it is recommended that an FCA is carried out.

As a result of the above, both the DAM and the FMfP are considered as part of this FCA.

3.2 Vulnerability Classification

TAN-15 assigns one of three flood risk vulnerability classifications to a development, as shown in Table 3-1. The proposed development is for a public building (school) and is consequently classified as 'Highly Vulnerable' development.

Table 3-1 Development Categories Defined by TAN-15

Development category	Types
Emergency services	Hospitals, ambulance stations, fire stations, police stations, coastguard stations, command centres, emergency depots and buildings used to provide emergency shelter in time of flood.
Highly vulnerable development	All residential premises (including hotels and caravan parks), public buildings , (e.g., schools , libraries, leisure centres), especially vulnerable industrial development and waste disposal sites.
Less vulnerable development	General industrial, employment, commercial and retail development, transport and utilities infrastructure, car parks, mineral extraction sites and associated processing facilities, excluding waste disposal sites.

3.3 Development Advice Map Classification

The Development Advice Map (DAM) is used to trigger different planning actions based on a precautionary assessment of flood risk.

Figure 3-1 shows that the site is located within DAM Zone C1. Zone C1 is described as “areas of the floodplain served by significant infrastructure, including flood defences”. Highly vulnerable development within Zone C1 can occur subject to the application of the Justification Test, including the acceptability of consequences.




Figure 3-1 Development Advice Map

3.4 Flood Map for Planning Classifications

The new TAN-15 will replace the DAM with the Flood Map for Planning (FMfP), which shall define the appropriate planning actions under the new TAN-15 when it comes into effect. Whilst the new TAN-15 is not a material consideration until implemented, it does illustrate the current policy thinking of Welsh Government and in some cases the FMfP may constitute best available information. Consequently, information on the FMfP is provided for information only.

3.4.1 Flood Map for Planning - Rivers

As shown in Figure 3-2, the site is located within Flood Zone 3 of the Flood Map for Planning for Rivers. Flood Zone 3 represents an area with greater than a 1 in 100 (1%) chance of flooding in a given year, including climate change.

The site is located within a TAN-15 Defended Zone for Rivers. TAN-15 Defended Zone for Rivers represents areas where risk management infrastructure provides a minimum standard of protection against 1 in 100-year flooding from rivers (1% AEP plus climate change and freeboard).




Figure 3-2 Flood Map for Planning - Rivers

3.4.2 Flood Map for Planning - Sea

As shown in Figure 3-2, the site is partially located within Flood Zone 2 of the Flood Map for Planning for Sea. Flood Zone 2 represents an area with greater than a 1 in 1000 (0.1%) chance of flooding in a given year, including climate change.

The site is partially located within a TAN-15 Defended Zone for Sea. TAN-15 Defended Zone for Sea represents areas where risk management infrastructure provides a minimum standard of protection against 1 in 200-year flooding from rivers (0.5% AEP plus climate change and freeboard).




Figure 3-3 Flood Map for Planning - Sea

3.4.3 Flood Map for Planning - Surface Water and Small Watercourses

The Flood Map for planning for surface water and small watercourses shows that the site is not within an area at risk of surface water and small watercourse flooding and is therefore located within Flood Zone 1. Flood Zone 1 represents areas which have less than a 1 in 1000 (0.1%) chance of flooding in a given year, including climate change.

Flood Zone 1 is presented as a transparent layer and is therefore no figure is included in this report.

3.5 Local Development Plan

The Local Development Plan (LDP) is used to guide how the city will develop in the future. The plan also provides policies to guide decisions on development proposals and planning applications until 2026, over a minimum of a 15-year plan period. The current LDP for Neath Port Talbot Council provides a framework to guide future development and set out where, when, and how much new development can take place within the plan period. The updated LDP³ for 2023 - 2038 is currently under review. Until the Revised LDP is adopted, the 2011-2026 LDP⁴ will remain in place for all planning decisions and is therefore applied to this proposal.

Strategic Policy 2 (SP2) states that the provision of new employment opportunities will be promoted to reduce unemployment, economic inactivity rates and the overall health of Neath Port Talbot.

Strategic Policy 4 (SP4) states that the council will support developments that make use of existing infrastructure, ensuring that there are no detrimental effects on the area and community. The LDP highlights that emphasis will be placed on the efficient use of existing infrastructure and where the need arises, authority will seek to secure improvements to existing facilities.

3 <https://beta.npt.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/replacement-local-development-plan-rldp-2023-2038>

4 <https://beta.npt.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/adopted-ldp-2011-2026>

3.6 Justification Test

Development in Zone C1 is subject to the Justification Test. TAN-15 states that development will be justified if it can be demonstrated that:

Its location in zone C is necessary to assist, or be part of, a local authority regeneration initiative or a local authority strategy required to sustain an existing settlement;

or

Its location in zone C is necessary to contribute to key employment objectives supported by the local authority, and other key partners, to sustain an existing settlement or region;

and

It concurs with the aims of Planning Policy Wales and meets the definition of previously developed land;

and,

The potential consequences of a flooding event for the particular type of development have been considered and found to be acceptable.

The proposed development has been assessed against the requirements of the Justification Test, with the results summarised in Table 3-2. All the criteria have been satisfied with regards to the proposed development.

Table 3-2 Justification Test applied to the proposed development

TAN 15 Justification Criteria	Comments	Achieved
Its location is necessary to assist a local authority regeneration initiative or strategy, or contribute to key employment objectives, necessary to sustain an existing settlement or region.	The proposed development contributes to SP2, and SP4, of the LDP providing additional educational premises in an urban area.	✓
The site meets the definition of previously developed land (i.e. it is not a Greenfield site) and concurs with the aims of Planning Policy Wales (i.e. the presumption in favour of sustainable development)	The site meets the definition of previously developed land as set out in PPW.	✓
The potential consequences of a flooding event for the particular type of development have been considered and found to be acceptable.	Detailed flood modelling has been examined to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed development. See Sections 4 and 5.	✓

4 Flood Risk Assessment

This section assesses the risk to the proposed development site from all sources of flooding, based solely on a desk-based analysis of existing flood risk data.

4.1 Review of Existing Flood Risk Data

The latest available information on flood risk at the site, published by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) is summarised in Table 4-1 below.

Table 4-1 Summary of Flood Risk

Source of Flooding	Onsite Presence	Description
Flood Risk from Rivers	✓	The site is at low risk of river flooding.
Flood Risk from the Sea	✗	The site is at very low risk of tidal flooding.
Flood Risk from Surface Water and Small Watercourses	✗	The site is at very low risk of surface water flooding.
Flood Risk from Groundwater	✗	The site is at very low risk of flooding from groundwater.
Flood Risk from Reservoirs	✗	The site is at very low risk of flooding from reservoirs.
Flood Risk from Sewers	✗	The site is at low risk of flooding from sewers.

4.2 Historical Flooding

NRW maps of recorded flood extents indicate that the proposed development site is not located within recorded flood extents and is therefore not shown graphically.

Therefore, the risk of reservoir flooding is considered to be **very low**.

4.3 Flood Risk from Rivers

NRW's Flood Risk Assessment Wales (FRAW) flood mapping indicates that the site is located within an area at **low risk** of flooding in the Flood Risk from Rivers mapping, as shown in Figure 4-1. Areas at low risk of flooding have between a 1 in 1000 and 1 in 100 (0.1% - 1% AEP) chance of flooding in any given year.

As previously discussed in Section 2.4 the site is also shown to be located within an Area Benefiting from Flood Defences for Rivers.




Figure 4-1 FRAW - Flood Risk from Rivers

4.4 Flood Risk from the Sea

The NRW FRAW Flood Risk from the Sea mapping indicates that the site is not located within an area at risk of flooding in the Flood Risk from Sea mapping and is therefore not presented graphically in this report. Areas at **very low risk** of flooding have less than a 1 in 1000 a (0.1% AEP) chance of flooding in any given year. However, FRAW does not consider the effects of climate change uplift and when considered (see Section 3.4.2) there is a risk from tidal flooding to the site. Therefore, tidal risk is considered further in Section 5.

4.5 Flood Risk from Surface Water and Small Watercourses

NRW's Flood Risk Assessment Wales (FRAW) flood mapping indicates that the site is not located within an area at risk of flooding in the Flood Risk from Surface Water and Small Watercourses mapping and is therefore not presented graphically in this report. Areas at **very low risk** of flooding have less than a 1 in 1000 a (0.1% AEP) chance of flooding in any given year.

4.6 Flood Risk from Groundwater

Groundwater flooding is caused by unusually high groundwater levels. It occurs as excess water emerges at the ground surface or within manmade structures such as basements. Groundwater flooding tends to be more persistent than surface water flooding, in some cases lasting for weeks or months, and can result in damage to property. This risk of groundwater flooding depends on the nature of the geological strata underlying the site and the local topography.

The Neath Port Talbot Council Local Flood Risk Management Strategy⁵, states that the risk of groundwater flooding is not a major concern in Neath Port Talbot County, and it is therefore concluded that the risk of groundwater flooding at the site is **very low**.

4.7 Flood Risk from Reservoirs

NRW flood maps indicate that the proposed development site is not located within an area at risk of reservoir flooding and is therefore not presented graphically in this report. Therefore, the risk of reservoir flooding is considered to be **very low**.

4.8 Flood Risk from Sewers

The Neath Port Talbot Council Local Flood Risk Management Strategy^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} suggests there is no evidence to suggest flooding from this source at the proposed development site. However, it is unknown as to the extent of sewerage infrastructure is present across the site. Therefore, we conclude that the risk of flooding from sewers is **low**.

⁵https://www.npt.gov.uk/media/4930/lfrms_npt_local_flood_risk_management_strategy.pdf?v=20170627002244

5 Detailed Fluvial Flood Risk Assessment

As identified in Section 4, the main sources of flood risk to the development site are tidal and fluvial. To better understand the risk across the lifetime of the development, further assessment using results from the latest flood model for Port Talbot are discussed below.

5.1 Hydraulic Modelling Availability

To provide an improved understanding of flood risk to a nearby development site, a detailed flood modelling exercise was completed in January 2024 and the model results have been used to inform this assessment. The model was updated to align the model with current best practice and methods and the updates are summarised below:

- Updated version of Tuflow (Version 2023-03-AA)
 - There have been subsequent software releases by TUFLOW but there is a known bug issue in these versions associated with water level lines incorrectly projecting results within the channel. This has been discussed with NRW on other studies and agreed that the 2023-03-AA version should be used in preference.
- Updates to the flood hydrology to comply with current methods, technical guidance, and data sources.
 - New inflows have been provided to all three watercourses within the modelled study area (Afon Afan, Ffrwd Wylt and Balgan Brook)
- Updates to the tidal boundary to apply the latest coastal extreme estimates and climate change allowances.
 - The CFB data node point 480, located in the mouth of the Afon Afan estuary has been used to extract the extreme sea levels for use within the hydraulic model. The CFB data has a base year of 2017 and therefore this has been uplifted to 2023 to represent present day conditions.
- Improvements to 1D schematisation
 - Updates to the model representation of Green Park Weir
 - Updates to the model representation of Newbridge Weir and bridge structures.

5.2 Fluvial Flood Risk

5.2.1 1% AEP Fluvial Event Plus Climate Change

Figure 5-2 shows that the site is predicted to be flood free during the 1% AEP plus climate change event. The site is therefore compliant with A1.14 of TAN-15.




Figure 5-1 1% AEP Fluvial Event Plus Climate Change Flood Depths

5.2.2 0.1% AEP Fluvial Event

Figure 5-2 2 shows that the site is not at risk of fluvial flooding during the 0.1% AEP event. The site is therefore flood free and is compliant with A1.14 of TAN-15.




Figure 5-2 0.1% AEP Fluvial Event Flood Depths

5.3 Tidal Flood Risk

5.3.1 2098 0.5% AEP Tidal Event

Figure 5-2 3 shows that the site is not at risk of tidal flooding during the 2098 0.5% AEP event. The site is therefore flood free and is compliant with A1.14 of TAN-15.




Figure 5-3 0.5% AEP Tidal Event Plus Climate Change Flood Depths

5.3.2 2098 0.1% AEP Tidal Event

Figure 5-2 4 shows that the site is not at risk of tidal flooding during the 2098 0.1% AEP event. The site is therefore flood free and is compliant with A1.14 of TAN-15.




Figure 5-4 0.1% AEP Tidal Event Plus Climate Change Flood Depths

5.4 Access and Egress

During the Majority of flood events, access and egress from the site shall be unrestricted. The exception to this, is the 2098 0.1% AEP tidal event.

During the 2098 0.1% AEP tidal event, flood depths to the southeast of the site will exceed 600mm and the tolerable thresholds of TAN-15, as shown in Figure 5-4.

However, it is evident that a large area of Port Talbot will experience significant flooding and be inaccessible by vehicle during this event. Given the tidal nature of flood risk, flood durations are likely to be short, and therefore residents may be best advised to 'stay put' during a flood event.

In the event of a medical emergency, whilst vehicles may not be accessing the site, a flood free pedestrian route to the hospital is possible to the west of the site, as shown in Figure 5-5.

It is recommended that residents sign up to NRW flood warnings service and prepare a flood plan for what to do in the event of flooding.




Figure 5-5 Access and Egress within the 0.1% AEP plus climate change tidal event

6 Assessment of Acceptability Criteria

Table 6-1 assesses the proposed development against the acceptability criteria set out in TAN-15.

Table 6-1 Assessment of accessibility criteria

TAN 15 Justification Criteria	Comments	Achieved
Developer is required to demonstrate that the site is designed to be flood free for the lifetime of development for either a 1 in 100 (1%) chance (fluvial) flood event, or a 1 in 200 (0.5%) chance (tidal) flood event including an allowance for climate change in accordance with TAN-15 table A1.14.	The proposed development site is located outside both the fluvial 1% AEP plus climate change flood extent and the tidal 0.5% AEP plus climate change flood extent.	Yes
The development should be designed so that in an extreme (1 in 1000 chance) event there would be less than 600mm of water on access roads and within the property.	As discussed in Section Error! Reference source not found. and Section 5.3.2, the proposed development site is not predicted to flood during the 0.1% AEP fluvial and 0.1% AEP tidal events, respectively.	Yes
No flooding elsewhere.	N/A	Yes
Flood defences must be shown by the developer to be structurally adequate particularly under extreme overtopping conditions (i.e. that flood with a 1 in 1000 chance of occurring in any given year).	The site is protected by the presence of NRW flood defences along the River Afan. These are key NRW assets owned and maintained by a statutory authority for the protection of Port Talbot.	Yes
The developer must ensure that future occupiers of development are aware of the flooding risks and consequences.	The developer shall provide purchasers/tenants with information on the flood risk in the form of this report.	Yes
Effective flood warnings are provided at the site.	The site is located within the River Afan and Kenfig NRW Flood Warning Area.	Yes

TAN 15 Justification Criteria	Comments	Achieved
Escape/evacuation routes are shown by the developer to be operational under all conditions.	Significant flood depths are present along the main road adjacent to the site, and therefore no vehicular access will be available during the 0.1% AEP plus climate change tidal event. However, a flood free pedestrian path is located to the northwest of the site.	Yes
The development is designed by the developer to allow the occupier of the facility for rapid movement of goods/possessions to areas away from flood waters.	It is recommended that the occupiers sign up to the NRW flood warning service so that they are aware of the potential for any flooding to the surrounding area.	Yes
Development is designed to minimise structural damage during a flooding event and is flood proofed to enable it to be returned to its prime use quickly in the aftermath of the flood.	N/A	Yes

7 Conclusions and Recommendations

JBA Consulting (JBA) were commissioned by CB3 Consult Ltd to undertake a Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) to support a planning application for a small educational premise in Port Talbot, Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council.

The proposed development site is located at Sandfields Primary School, Lillian Street, Port Talbot. The proposed development area is located towards the western extent of the school site, south of the school access from Pendarvis Steet. The development site is approximately 0.02ha and is currently comprised of a shelter building located within the perimeter of Sandfields Primary School. The development site is set within a primarily residential area of Port Talbot, with residential dwellings surrounding Sandfields Primary School to the east, south and west. Neath Port Talbot Hospital is located to the north of the Primary School.

The site is relatively flat with a slight decline from the northeast (6.99m AOD) to the southwest (6.73m AOD).

The River Afan flows in a south westerly direction approximately 500m southwest of the site. Approximately 650m west of the site, along the northwestern boundary of the River Afan is a fluvial defence wall. The defence wall is owned and maintained by Natural Resource Wales.

The site is located within DAM Zone C1. Zone C1 is described as “areas of the floodplain served by significant infrastructure, including flood defences”. Highly vulnerable development within Zone C1 can occur subject to the application of a Justification Test, including the acceptability of consequences.

The site is at little or no risk of surface water, groundwater, sewer, and reservoir flooding.

The site is shown to be at risk of fluvial and tidal flooding.

The site is predicted to be flood free during all modelled flood events. However, access and egress of the site will be affected during the 2098 0.1% tidal event.

The proposed development is not predicted to flood during the 0.1% AEP fluvial and 2098 0.1% AEP tidal event and are therefore compliant with the tolerable conditions stated in A1.15 of TAN-15.

All aspects of the Justification Test and Acceptability Criteria set out in TAN-15 have been assessed and shown to be satisfied. Consequently, we conclude that on the grounds of flood risk, the proposed development meets the requirements set out in TAN-15 and the aims of Planning Policy Wales.

A Proposed Development Plan

[illegible]

PROPERTY & REGENERATION
Nicola Pearce BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION
THE QUAYS, BRUNEL WAY
BAGLAN ENERGY PARK SA11 2GG
www.npt.gov.uk

Project

<u>Drawing Title</u>
Location Plans & Floor Plans

File No. A1286	Property Ref. No. Sandfields Primary School, Port Talbot			
Drawn	TP	Checked	WH	Approved -
Date		Date		Date
Scales	As indicated			
Drawing No.	101			Rev. B

B Updated Hydraulic Model

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

1 Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference

JBA Consulting were commissioned by ALDI Stores Limited in October 2023 to undertake flood modelling works to support proposals to redevelop the former Burrows Yard site, Port Talbot, for a new retail development.

This report has been produced to summarise the flood modelling work completed, outlining the updates applied to the existing NRW model, the representation of the site as it is currently, the post-development modelling of the site including mitigation measures, and relevant assumptions and limitations associated with the model outputs.

1.2 Site description

The former Burrows Yard site is located southwest of Port Talbot town centre, as shown in Figure 1-1. The site is bound to the south by the A4241, with residential streets on the eastern, western, and northern boundaries. The site consists of brownfield land with historical industrial use and aborted re-development.




Figure 1-1 Site Location

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

1.3 Development proposals

The proposed development is for a new ALDI supermarket and Starbucks drive-through coffee shop. The plans are shown in Figure 1-2, an extract of Drawing 1310 (Project 170466, Kendall Kingscott). This drawing shows the proposed site levels and the finished floor levels (FFL) of the development.

Both retail units will have dedicated parking, as well as associated landscaping (including SUDS) and new access arrangements. The ALDI will be built along the Isaac's Place street boundary, with the Starbucks near the road intersection of Water Street and Afan Way. Public vehicle access to the site will be from Afan Way, with pedestrian and HGV delivery vehicle access from Water Street.



Figure 1-2 Site development plan

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

2 Baseline flood modelling

To provide an improved understanding of flood risk for the proposed Aldi development site, a detailed flood modelling exercise has been completed. NRW's product 7 model of Port Talbot has been licensed and used for this assessment with a series of updates applied to align the model with current best practice and methods. This section of the technical note summarises the updates applied to produce a new baseline model scenario.

2.1 General Schematisation

The model has been updated to use the TUFLOW executable 2023-03-AA. There have been subsequent software releases by TUFLOW but there is a known bug issue in these versions associated with water level lines incorrectly projecting results within the channel. This has been discussed with NRW on other studies and agreed that the 2023-03-AA version should be used in preference.

The model grid resolution and model timesteps have been retained from the original model as these are considered appropriate and provide an acceptable balance between model run times and providing a detailed representation of overland flow routes.

New LIDAR data has been collected for much of Wales and consideration has been given for including this data within the new model. This analysis found that the new LIDAR had significant inaccuracies that incorrectly influenced the overland flow routes throughout the modelled study area. The limitations associated with the new LIDAR data have been discussed with NRW and it has been agreed that the older LIDAR data (collected in March 2014) should be used in preference for the Port Talbot model.

2.2 Hydrological Assessment

A new hydrological assessment has been completed to derive new peak flow estimates and inflow hydrographs for the Port Talbot model. Full details of this can be found in the FEH Calculation Record in Appendix A.

The hydrological assessment has produced new inflows for all three watercourses within the modelled study area (Afon Afan, Ffrwd Wyllt, and Baglan Brook). The FEH Statistical method has been used for the Afon Afan, and the ReFH2 method has been used for the Ffrwd Wyllt and the Baglan Brook. For the Afon Afan inflows, the ReFH2 ratio method has been used to derive the peak flow estimate for the 0.1% AEP event in line with NRW's flood estimation guidelines¹.

The previous NRW modelling applied individual storm durations to each of the three catchments, and it was decided to retain this approach. The Afon Afan has adopted a storm duration of 10.5 hours, the Ffrwd Wyllt has adopted a storm duration of 5.25 hours, and the Baglan Brook has adopted a storm duration of 4.25 hours. Model testing was completed to understand the impact of using a uniform storm duration across the model, but this showed only negligible differences to model flood extents and flood depths. Therefore, individual durations for each catchment have been used to ensure consistency with previous studies in Port Talbot.

Climate change has been applied to the model for the 1% AEP event. In line with Welsh Government's Flood Consequences Assessments climate change guidance², an uplift of 30% has been applied to each of the model inflows.

¹ Flood estimation – technical guidance – GN 008. November 2021. Natural Resources Wales.

² Flood Consequences Assessments: Climate change allowances. September 2021. Welsh Government. LINK

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

The peak flow estimates applied to the model are provided in Table 2-1 and a map showing the locations of the model inflows is provided in Figure 2-1.

Table 2-1: Fluvial peaks for annual exceedance probabilities

Site code	AEP events (%)			
	50%	1%	1%+CC	0.1%
AFAN02	99.32	206.9	268.97	339.03
AFAN01_IA	5.58	12.46	16.19	21.30
BAG_01	0.77	1.95	2.53	3.88
BAG_02	0.86	2.10	2.73	4.02
BAG_03	0.42	1.08	1.41	2.20
BAG_04	0.49	1.12	1.99	2.59
FF_01	4.79	10.99	14.28	19.38
FF_02	3.28	7.59	9.87	13.45
FF_03	11.94	26.89	34.95	46.70




Figure 2-1: Map of 1D fluvial boundaries

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AIEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

2.3 Tidal Boundary Conditions

The Port Talbot model is a fluvial – tidal model that can represent both sources of flooding. Since the construction of the original model, the extreme sea level coastal flood boundary (CFB) dataset³ and the Welsh government climate change guidance² for sea level rise have been updated and therefore the tidal boundary conditions applied to the model have been amended accordingly.

The CFB data node point 480, located in the mouth of the Afon Afan estuary has been used to extract the extreme sea levels for use within the hydraulic model. The CFB data has a base year of 2017 and therefore this has been uplifted to 2023 to represent present day conditions.

In line with Welsh Governments climate change guidance, the UKCP18 user interface has been used to generate new tidal boundary conditions for the epochs 2023 and 2098. A climate change epoch of 2098 has been adopted to represent the 75-year design life of the proposed development. The RCP 8.5 scenario has been used to download the projected sea level rise estimates with the 70th percentile (higher central allowance) estimates used to uplift the tidal boundary conditions for the required epochs.

The updated present day and climate change maximum tidal levels are shown in Table 2-2 and the model implementation is shown in Figure 2-4.

For reference, the fluvial design event simulations use the Mean High Water Spring tide curve for the downstream boundary conditions, and the tidal design events use the QMED inflows as the fluvial inflow boundary conditions. For climate change simulations, climate change has been applied to both the fluvial and tidal boundary conditions.

Table 2-2: Extreme sea level estimates

	MHWS	T0200	T1000
2017	4.49	6.37	6.69
2023	4.52	6.40	6.72
2098	5.23	7.11	7.43

³ Coastal Design Sea Levels - Coastal Flood Boundary Extreme Sea Levels (2018). December 2023. Environment Agency.

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation



Figure 2-4 Map of 1D and 2D tidal boundaries

2.4 Improvements to 1D Schematisation

The 1D domain has been updated to provide an improved representation of key structures on the Afon Afan watercourse. The following sections discuss the updates that have been made to these 1D elements.

2.4.1 Green Park Weir

Green Park weir was rebuilt in 2017 to strengthen the degraded structure and provide additional water security to Port Talbot dock which is fed by the Afon Afan.

The weir is made up of three components, the north weir acting as a crump weir, the south weir acting as stepped revetment, and a fish pass. The previous NRW model adopted a simplistic approach to modelling the structure with a single 1d_nwke line representing the full weir crest. Following construction of the new weir, it was deemed appropriate to update the representation of this structure within the model. The updated representation of Green Park weir has been completed using the 'as built' design drawings.

The model now uses three separate 1d_nwke lines to represent the three core elements of the weir, as discussed below:

North weir: A 'WW' weir unit has been used to represent the north weir (AFAN0867N) with an XZ table used to specify the weir crest geometry and an ESTRY weir factor of 1.19 has been specified to represent the efficient crump structure type. The smolt chute that is located between the north and south weir has been represented within the north weir XZ table.

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

South weir: This has been modelled using the 1d_nwke line AFAN0867S. The 1d_nwke line has been used to represent the smolt screen structure. This has been given an invert level of 6.36mAOD and weir crest width of 18m. An ESTRY weir factor of 0.69 has been used to represent the inefficient nature of the smolt screen.

Fish pass: The fish pass is located at the most northerly part of Green Park weir and has been represented within the model using an open channel section with an XZ table to represent the opening geometry. The structure is very challenging to model accurately due to the presence of baffles within the structure. To account for the turbulence expected within this structure, a high roughness value of 0.8 has been specified within the 1d_nwke layer.

2.4.2 Newbridge Weir and Bridge

The new flood modelling of Port Talbot has updated the representation of the Newbridge weir and Newbridge bridge structures which are located near to the downstream model extent of the Afon Afan.

The Newbridge weir schematisation has been amended using the new river channel survey data collected by Storm Geomatics in May 2023. The weir has been represented within the model using a 'WW' weir unit and an XZ table to represent the weir crest. An ESTRY weir factor of 0.88 has been used to represent the uneven nature of the weir crest due to the presence of the concrete pillars.

Upstream of Newbridge weir, there is the Grade II listed Newbridge bridge which has also been updated. The 2023 Storm Geomatics survey included this bridge structure and therefore this data has been incorporated into the model. The model has represented this structure using three 1d_nwke 'BB' Bridge units with Height-Width (HW) tables used to specify the geometry for each of three openings. A skew angle of 41° has been applied to this structure as specified in the survey data deliverables. The bridge length is 11.6m and therefore, overtopping of this structure has been modelled in the 1D domain using a separate 1d_nwke 'WW' weir unit. The bridge parapet has been represented using an XZ table and an ESTRY weir factor of 0.88 has been specified to represent the inefficient nature of bridge deck overtopping.

2.5 Site topography

A Review of the modelled site topography identified areas for improvement to better assess how overland flow interacts with the site. Two low walls have been added to the model along its southern boundary and to the neighbouring ATS garage located immediately to the south. The walls have been represented within the model using a 2D zline layer with the 'THICK' command specified. The location of the two walls is shown in Figure 2-2.

The elevations of the wall have been determined using the topographical survey data extracted from the Kendall Kingscott Architects site plan (Drawing Number 170466-1310) and are shown in Figure 2-2. The survey data of the southern wall that runs adjacent to the ATS garage has spot height elevations at the base of the wall along with annotation indicating a wall height of 100mm. Therefore, the spot height elevations have been used within the model with a 100mm increase applied.

The northern wall that runs along the site boundary is a brick wall that ranges in height between 200-350mm. The wall crest was not included in the topographical survey deliverables, but pavement elevations have been included. The modelled zline zpt elevations have used the pavement levels with a 300mm increase applied based on estimates of the wall height.

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code 2023s1306
 Contract Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
 Client ALDI Stores Ltd
 Date January 2024
 Author Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
 Reviewer / Sign-off George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
 Subject Hydraulic Modelling Documentation



Figure 2-2: Baseline model site walls

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

3 Post-development flood modelling

This section of the technical note provides a summary of the post-development flood modelling focusing on the proposed site topography, site land use, and mitigation measures.

3.1 2D site topography

The client provided a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) of the proposed site topography in Ascii grid format. This has been read directly into the model using the 'Read Grid Zpts' command. The site DTM sets the Aldi supermarket building footprint to an elevation of 6.975mAOD and the Starbucks coffee shop to an elevation of 6.4mAOD.

During model development, it became apparent that the Starbucks finished floor level (FFL) would need to be raised to 6.45mAOD for it to be flood free in the tidal 0.5% AEP plus climate change design event. This design amendment has there been represented within the model using a 2D zshape layer.

The low wall that runs along the southern boundary which was included within the baseline scenario has been shortened by approximately 21 metres in the post-development scenario. This is to allow for the primary road and pedestrian access into the site.




Figure 3-1: Post-development site topography

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

3.2 Proposed site land use

As well as updating the proposed site topography for the post-development scenario, the land use type and corresponding 2D roughness needed to be altered. The proposed development will consist primarily of two buildings, car parking / hardstanding areas, and landscaped / greenspace areas.

Figure 3-2 shows the modelled DEM_M check file for the post-development model scenario, which specifies the different material land use classifications throughout the 2D study area. The building footprint outlines were also applied to a post0development flow constriction layer.



Figure 3-2: Post-development site roughness

3.3 Mitigation measures

The post-development model testing identified that the development proposals could potentially lead to an adverse impact on flood risk to neighbouring third parties. To mitigate for the change in site elevations and land use, a small alteration is proposed to the adjacent ATS site.

The mitigation looks to reduce the volume of water leaving the Afon Afan at this key location and will take the form of a low wall feature as shown in Figure 3-3. This feature is between 100mm and 540mm above existing ground levels. It is assumed that the external wall of the ATS building facing the river will be able to provide an equivalent level of protection (only approximately 110mm above the existing finished floor level). This feature has been represented within the model by a zline set to a level of 7.15mAOD.

These proposals have been discussed and agreed with the ATS landowner.

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

Figure 3-4 shows the proposed implementation of the wall within the model using a Z-line feature, as well as pre-development ground levels along the line of the feature derived from LiDAR data.



Figure 3-3 Drawing of proposed post-development mitigation




Figure 3-4 Model implementation of post-development mitigation

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

4 Model performance, assumptions, and limitations

4.1 Model performance

The model exhibits 1D negative depths in each of the design event simulations. In the fluvial scenarios, there are 387 and 391 1D negative depths for the 1% AEP plus climate change and 0.1% AEP events respectively. For the tidal scenario these increase to 1158 in the 0.5% AEP plus climate change event and to 1295 in the 0.1% AEP plus climate change event. These are located at AFAN0197.1 on the Afon Afan watercourse which is approximately 50m upstream of Newbridge bridge. Attempts have been made to address these using interpolate sections and improved initial conditions, but the negative depths remain.

Analysis of the model outputs shows that the negative depths are occurring at a range of different times throughout the simulation, but importantly they are not influencing the peak water levels, as shown in Figure 4-1.




Figure 4-1: 1D water level at Afan_0197 for the 2098T0200 event

There are no 2D negative depths present in any of the design event simulations and the mass error is within the recommended $\pm 1\%$ tolerance for all design events. This indicates that the 2D model is stable, and the outputs can be used with confidence.

4.2 Assumptions and limitations

Developing a hydraulic model requires the application of simplifications and generalisations. As such, several assumptions were made when building the model. This can lead to model uncertainties and subsequent limitations in the results. Some of the key assumptions, limitations, and uncertainties specific to this study are listed below:

- A new hydrological assessment has been completed that adopts the latest available data and uses the latest methods. A hybrid approach has been used with the FEH statistical estimates used on the Afon Afan and ReFH2 used on the Ffrwd Wylt and Baglan Brook watercourses. The new hydrology is considered an improvement on the previous inflow estimates and inflow hydrographs but it should be noted that the hydrology typically accounts for the largest uncertainty with the model outputs.

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

- The decision to not adopt the new LIDAR data is a limitation as it means that any areas of new development may not be accounted for within the model topography. However, the new LIDAR data within Port Talbot was found to inaccurately represent key overland flow paths and therefore its inclusion could not be justified. Previous discussions with NRW have indicated that they are happy with this approach and any future users of the model should consider the merits of using the new LIDAR data.

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code 2023s1306
 Contract Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
 Client ALDI Stores Ltd
 Date January 2024
 Author Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
 Reviewer / Sign-off George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
 Subject Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

5 Model runs

5.1 Baseline model scenario

Run reference	Baseline - PTH_~s1~_~s2~_~e1~_~e2~_153_6_Indiv_SD_~s4~
Purpose of runs:	To model required TAN15 design storms for flood depth and hazard maps
TUFLOW file names:	PTH_~s1~_~s2~_~e1~_~e2~_153_6_Indiv_SD_~s4~.tcf PTH_~s1~_~s2~_~e1~_~e2~_153_6_Indiv_SD_~s4~.ecf PT_153_5.tgc PT_105.tbc
Run time:	Fluvial: 28 hours Tidal: 36 hours
AEP events:	0.1% AEP plus climate change (2098) 1% AEP fluvial event plus climate change for 2098 epoch (75-year design life as non-residential site) 0.1% AEP fluvial for present day conditions 0.5% AEP tidal event plus climate change for 2098 epoch (75-year design life as non-residential site) 0.1% AEP tidal event plus climate change for 2098 epoch (75-year design life as non-residential site)
Boundary conditions:	bc_dbase_PT_Indiv_SD_150.csv
Run settings:	TUFLOW version: 2023-03-AA-iSP-w64

5.2 Post-development model scenario

Run reference	Post-dev - PTH_~s1~_~s2~_~e1~_~e2~_186_2_Indiv_SD_~s4~
Purpose of runs:	To model required TAN15 design storms for the post development scenario for flood depth, depth change and hazard maps
TUFLOW file names:	PTH_~s1~_~s2~_~e1~_~e2~_186_2_Indiv_SD_~s4~.tcf PTH_~s1~_~s2~_~e1~_~e2~_186_2_Indiv_SD_~s4~.ecf PT_186.tgc PT_105.tbc
Run time:	Fluvial: 28 hours Tidal: 36 hours
AEP events:	0.1% AEP plus climate change (2098) 1% AEP fluvial event plus climate change for 2098 epoch (75-year design life as non-residential site) 0.1% AEP fluvial for present day conditions 0.5% AEP tidal event plus climate change for 2098 epoch (75-year design life as non-residential site) 0.1% AEP tidal event plus climate change for 2098 epoch (75-year design life as non-residential site)
Boundary conditions:	bc_dbase_PT_Indiv_SD_150.csv
Run settings:	TUFLOW version: 2023-03-AA-iSP-w64

TECHNICAL NOTE

JBA Project Code	2023s1306
Contract	Burrow Yard Flood Risk Modelling
Client	ALDI Stores Ltd
Date	January 2024
Author	Paul Redbourne BSc PGCert, MCIWEM, C.WEM
Reviewer / Sign-off	George Baker BEng AEMA CEnv IEng MCIWEM C.WEM
Subject	Hydraulic Modelling Documentation

A **Appendix A – FEH Calculation Record**

Flood estimation report: Port Talbot Flood Modelling

Introduction

This report template is a supporting document to the Environment Agency's flood estimation guidelines. It provides a record of the hydrological context, the method statement, the calculations, and decisions made during flood estimation and the results.

Contents

1	Summary of assessment	1
2	Method statement	2
3	Locations where flood estimates required	10
4	Statistical method	16
5	Revitalised flood hydrograph 2 (ReFH2) method	21
6	Discussion and summary of results	24
7	Annex	30

Approval

Revision stage	Analyst / Reviewer name & qualifications	Date
Method statement preparation	Jenni Essex BSc MSc PhD CEnv MCIWEM C.WEM	31/03/2023
Method statement sign-off	Vicky Shackle BSc PhD MCIWEM C.WEM	11/04/2023
Calculations preparation	Jenni Essex BSc MSc PhD CEnv MCIWEM C.WEM	31/03/2023
Calculations sign-off	Vicky Shackle BSc PhD MCIWEM C.WEM	11/04/2023

Revision History

Revision reference	Date issued	Amendments	Issued to
V1.0	23/01/2024	-	NRW

Abbreviations

AEP	annual exceedance probability
AM.....	annual maximum
AREA	catchment area (km ²)
BFI	Base Flow Index
BFIHOST	Base Flow Index derived using the HOST soil classification
BGS	British Geological Survey
CPRE	Council for the Protection of Rural England
FARL.....	FEH index of flood attenuation due to reservoirs and lakes
FEH	Flood Estimation Handbook
FSR	Flood Studies Report
GEV	Generalised Extreme Value (distribution)
GL	Generalised Logistic (distribution)
HOST	Hydrology of Soil Types
KAP3.....	Kappa 3 (distribution)
NRFA	National River Flow Archive
NRW	Natural Resources Wales
OS.....	Ordnance Survey
P3	Pearson Type 3 (distribution)
QMED	median annual flood
ReFH2	Revitalised Flood Hydrograph 2 (method)
SAAR	standard average annual rainfall (mm)
Tp	time to peak of the instantaneous unit hydrograph
URBEXT ₂₀₀₀	index of urban extent
WINFAP-FEH	Windows Frequency Analysis Package

1 Summary of assessment

1.1 Summary

This table provides a summary of the key information contained within the detailed assessment in the following sections.

Catchment location	Port Talbot, South Wales
Purpose of study and scope	Flood modelling to provide an improved understanding of flood risk throughout Port Talbot. The existing NRW hydraulic model, including the hydrological assessment, will be updated for the purposes of this study. This model also includes the Ffrwd Wylt and Baglan Brook watercourses. The hydrology for these watercourses will be updated, as well as the hydrology for the Afon Afan. Moderately complex hydrological assessment.
Key catchment features	The lower parts of the catchments are urbanised and generally very flat. There are large areas of forestry / woodland and the catchments have been historically mined / quarried. It is not within the scope of the study to investigate the impact that these features have on the catchment hydrology. For the Afon Afan, the gauge data at Marcroft Weir may, to some degree, account for this influence.
Flooding mechanisms	Peak flows exceeding channel capacity is likely to be the predominant source of flood risk to Port Talbot. Tide-locking at the outfall into the Afon Nedd may increase flood risk from Baglan Brook and flood volumes may be important on this watercourse. Sewer flooding and surface water flooding could also contribute to flood risk in the urban areas. Only fluvial flooding is being considered for this study.
Gauged / ungauged	Good quality flow gauge (Marcroft Weir) on the Afan within the model reach plus two other level / daily flow gauges. Two level gauges on the Ffrwd Wylt.
Final choice of method	Afon Afan – FEH Statistical. Ffrwd Wylt and Baglan Brook – ReFH2.
Key limitations / uncertainties in results	The complex drainage system for Baglan Brook leads to difficulties in accurately defining the catchment boundary. There are no flow gauges on the Ffrwd Wylt and Baglan Brook with which to improve and / or verify estimates.

1.2 Note on flood frequencies

The frequency of a flood can be quoted in terms of a return period, which is defined as the average time between years with at least one larger flood, or as an annual exceedance probability (AEP), which is the inverse of the return period.

Return periods are output by the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) software and can be expressed more succinctly than AEP. However, AEP can be helpful when presenting results to members of the public who may associate the concept of return period with a regular occurrence rather than an average recurrence interval.

The table below is provided to enable quick conversion between return periods and annual exceedance probabilities.

Annual exceedance probability (AEP) and related return period reference table

AEP (%)	50	20	10	5	3.33	2	1.33	1	0.5	0.1
AEP	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.05	0.033	0.02	0.0133	0.01	0.005	0.001
Return period (yrs)	2	5	10	20	30	50	75	100	200	1,000

2 Method statement

2.1 Requirements for flood estimates

Overview	Updates will be made to the existing Natural Resources Wales (NRW) flood model of Port Talbot, developed by JBA in 2016. This will require a range of amendments to the hydrology and hydraulic model to bring it in line with current guidance and good practice. The study will look at both fluvial and tidal sources of flooding to provide an improved understanding of baseline flood risk to the study area. The existing NRW model includes the Afon Afan, Ffrwd Wyllt, and Baglan Brook watercourses. This document details the hydrological assessment completed to update the hydraulic model inflows. The hydrology undertaken to provide inflows to the existing NRW model dates from 2016 / 2017. Due to the time which has elapsed since the previous hydrological assessments were completed, new datasets, methods, software, and guidance have been released and the calculations require updating to use these. Design event peak flow estimates and hydrographs are required for the following annual exceedance probability (AEP) events: 50%, 3.33%, 2%, 1.33%, 1% and 0.1%. However, peak flow estimates for the full suite of design events (also including 20%, 10%, 5% and 0.5%) are presented within this document, for reference. The effects of climate change will be assessed by applying an increase of 30% to the 3.33%, 1% and 0.1% AEP events, as per the latest guidance¹ and requested by the Client. This represents the change factor / central estimate for the 2080s epoch for the West Wales River basin district.
----------	--

2.2 The catchment

Description	Afon Afan The Afon Afan is a medium-sized watercourse (approximately 90km²) which drains from Werfa, to the west of Treorchy, to discharge into Swansea Bay at Port Talbot. It has two key tributaries, Afon Corrwg Fechan, which joins at Cymer and Afon Pelenna which joins at Pontrhydyfen. Several smaller tributaries join the Afan along its length. The catchment topography is steep with generally limited floodplain extent even in the lower reaches. Throughout the catchment there is a significant amount of forestry and some rough grazing. The catchment has been historically mined. There are several small settlements in the upper and mid-catchment (Blaengwynfi, Croeserw, Cymer, Glynccorwg, Tonmawr, Pontrhydyfen) and in the lower catchment the larger settlements of Cwmafan and Port Talbot. There is an offtake to Port Talbot Docks a short distance upstream of the Afan Way roundabout (approximate grid reference: 276034, 189697). The British Geological Survey (BGS) website 1:625,000 mapping shows the catchment to be underlain by the South Wales Upper Coal Measures Formation which consists of mudstone, siltstone, sandstone, coal, ironstone and ferricrete. There are some superficial deposits of peat and till. Soils were assessed using the Soilscales website. Over the upland area there are slowly permeable, wet, upland soils with a peaty surface. Freely draining loamy soils over rock overlie the rest of the catchment, with loamy and clayey soils at the coast. Ffrwd Wyllt The Ffrwd Wyllt rises near Bryn to the north-east of Port Talbot and flows in a south-westerly direction to Port Talbot Docks. The catchment area to the upstream extent of the docks is approximately 24km². The docks discharge to
-------------	---

¹ Welsh Government. September 2021. Flood Consequences Assessments: Climate change allowances. 2023s1306 - Hydrology_Report_v1.0

the Afon Afan just upstream of the entrance to Swansea Bay.

The catchment topography is steep, with generally limited floodplain extent. There is a significant amount of forestry throughout the catchment and some rough grazing. The catchment is predominantly rural with only the village of Bryn located in the upper catchment. The lower catchment includes the village of Goytre and the eastern part of Port Talbot, including the docks, industrial estates, and steelworks.

The BGS website 1:625,000 mapping shows the catchment to be underlain by the South Wales Upper Coal Measures Formation and Pennine Middle Coal Measures Formation. There are some superficial deposits of till in the upper catchment, and sand and gravel and river terrace deposits in the lower catchment. In the upper catchment soils are loamy upland with a peaty surface, and slowly permeable wet upland with a peaty surface. Freely draining loamy soils over rock, and loamy and clayey soils of coastal flats with naturally high groundwater, overlie the lower catchment.

Baglan Brook

Baglan Brook is the smallest of the study watercourses, with a catchment area of about 6.5km² at the downstream extent. The catchment characteristics are complex due to significant human alteration including mining, urbanisation, and industrialisation. It rises to the east of Baglan and flows towards the M4 motorway. The watercourse follows the M4 north for about 1.4km, before passing beneath it to discharge into the Afon Nedd, just upstream of the entrance to Baglan Bay. The Baglan Moors area to the west of the M4 also drains into Baglan Brook where it reaches the M4.

The catchment topography is steep to the east of the M4, with limited floodplain extent. West of the M4, the topography is much shallower, forming coastal flats. The upper catchment is rural, with areas of forestry. However, most of the catchment is urbanised, covering Baglan and Sandfields.

The underlying geology is the same as for the Ffrwd Wyllt catchment. There are some superficial deposits of alluvium (clay, silt and sand) and blown sand (sand and gravel) to the west of the M4. In the upper catchment (most of the catchment east of the M4) soils are slowly permeable and seasonally wet loamy and clayey, and freely draining loamy over rock. In the lower catchment (generally west of the M4), soils are loamy and clayey of coastal flats with naturally high groundwater, and sand dune soils.

Figure 2-1 provides an overview of the study area, including the modelled reaches and locations of Newbridge Weir and hydrometric gauges. Full catchment boundary extents are provided in Figure 2-2, which also shows the catchment topography.




Figure 2-1: Study area overview map




Figure 2-2: Catchment topography

2.3 Source of flood peak data

Source	National River Flow Archive (NRFA) peak flows dataset, Version 11, released September 2022. This contains data up to water year 2020-21. * Note: The FEH Statistical method assessment was completed prior to the release of NRFA v11.1 on 6 th March 2023. The newer version of the dataset represents only a minor update.
--------	--

2.4 Gauging stations (flow or level)

Watercourse	Station name	Gauging authority number	NRFA number	Catchment area (km ²)	Type	Start of record and end if station closed
Afon Afan	Greenpark Weir	Unknown	N/A	91.4	Level	08/2013 - Present
Afon Afan	Marcroft Weir	058012	58012	89.7	Rated	10/1977 – Present
Afon Afan	Cwmafan	058S0014W	58004	81.5	Level (and daily flow)	09/1989 - Present
Ffrwd Wylt	Westend	Unknown	N/A	24.2	Level	07/2015 - Present
Ffrwd Wylt	Taibach	058S0667W	N/A	19.7	Level	05/2000 - Present

2.5 Data available at each flow gauging station in Table 2.4

Station name	Start and end of NRFA flood peak record	Update for this study?	OK for QMED ?	OK for pooling ?	Data quality check needed ?	Other comments on station and flow data quality
Marcroft Weir	1977-2020	No	Yes	Yes	No	High velocities due to steep gradients. Weir refurbishment 03/09/2012 – 01/07/2013, data infilled using data from upstream gauging station Cwmafan. Gaugings have confirmed no significant impact of refurbishment on the rating. Weir remains modular to at least 2.5m (AMAX1 at the time of writing). Not gauged to within 30% of QMED but Crump weir expected to perform well at QMED and beyond AMAX3. All flows have been contained within bank and the channel profile remains consistent to top of bank.

2.6 Other data available and how it has been obtained

Type of data	Data relevant to this study?	Data available ?	Source of data	Details
Check flow gaugings	No	N/A	N/A	Rating review / development is not within the scope of this study.
Historical flood data	Yes	No	N/A	An Internet search revealed no readily available information on flooding in Port Talbot from the study watercourses. It is thought that flood defences in the town were constructed in response to flooding from the Afan in December 1979 (AMAX1), however no information could be found on the impacts of this event on the town.
Flow or river level data for events	No	N/A	N/A	See Section 2.8.
Rainfall data for events				
Potential evaporation data				
Results from previous studies	Yes	Yes	JBA Consulting	Afon Afan FEH Calculation Record ² Ffrwd Wyllt & Baglan Brook Calculation Record ³
Other data or information	No	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.7 Hydrological understanding of catchment

Conceptual model	Peak flows in the three study watercourses exceeding channel capacity is likely to be the predominant source of flood risk to Port Talbot. Tide-locking at the outfall into the Afon Nedd may increase flood risk from Baglan Brook and flood volumes may be important on this watercourse. Sewer flooding and surface water flooding could also contribute to flood risk in the urban areas. It should be noted that only fluvial flooding is being considered for this study.
Unusual catchment features	The lower parts of the catchments are urbanised and generally very flat. There are large areas of forestry / woodland and the catchments have been historically mined / quarried. It is not within the scope of the study to investigate the impact that these features have on the catchment hydrology. For the Afon Afan, the gauge data at Marcroft Weir may, to some degree, account for this influence. Defining the catchment boundary accurately for Baglan Brook will be difficult due to the complex drainage system.

2.8 Initial choice of approach

Is FEH appropriate ?	Yes
Initial choice of	Both the ReFH2 method and the FEH Statistical method are suitable for flood flow estimation for the study catchments. For the previous hydrological

² JBA Consulting. February 2017. 2016s4827 - FEH calculation record_Afon Afan_v2.0 (Feb 2017).pdf

³ JBA Consulting. October 2016. 2016s4827 - FEH Calculation Record_v3.0 (Feb 2017).pdf
2023s1306 - Hydrology_Report_v1.0

method(s) and reasons	assessments peak flow estimates were derived using both methods and compared to determine the most suitable method. The FEH Statistical method estimates were taken forward as the preferred peak flow estimates for the Afon Afan. For Ffrwd Wyllt hydraulic model results showed the Statistical method peak flow estimates to be substantially overestimating flooding. Due to this the ReFH2 method peak flows were taken forward as the preferred estimates. The ReFH2 method peak flows were also selected for Baglan Brook due to catchment characteristics which lead to this approach being favoured. For the current study both methods will be applied for all catchments for completeness and comparison with the previous study estimates. The intention would be to retain the preferred approaches taken forward for the previous hydrological assessments. However, the updated results will be checked to confirm that this is still appropriate. Surface water sewer network details will not be used to define catchment and sub-catchment boundaries in the urban parts of the catchments. One of the simplest approaches (and the published approach) for urban catchments is to assume that there are no 'sewers in' or 'sewers out', i.e., all runoff from the topographic catchment reaches the watercourse for all design events and no additional water enters from outside the catchment. This approach is supported by the Environment Agency Flood Estimation Guidelines⁴ which state that unless there is a major export of water from the catchment via urban drainage systems, it may be simpler to assume that exports and imports roughly balance. In addition to this the process for deriving catchments / sub-catchments from the surface water sewer network and the approach for generating peak flow estimates is complex and time-consuming, and the study scope does not allow for this. There may also be little benefit in undertaking a detailed analysis of the sewer network for the purposes of generating fluvial peak flow estimates when there is no flow gauge data against which to verify the results and / or where there is uncertainty about the capacity of the sewer network. The hydrograph shape will be derived using the ReFH2 method. Catchment descriptors for the intervening areas between flow estimation points will be generated using a back-calculation of the area-weighting method derived in the FEH Volume 5. These will be used within the ReFH2 method to generate lateral inflows to be applied to the hydraulic model. It is not within the scope of this study to undertake a detailed flood history investigation for the purposes of incorporating historical information into frequency analysis at the Marcroft Weir gauge. Analysis of river gauge data to improve rainfall-runoff model parameters is also not within the scope of the study. In addition to this it would be unlikely to significantly improve confidence in the results. There is no recording raingauge within the Ffrwd Wyllt catchment which could be used as part of a lag analysis to improve the Tp model parameter estimate. This means that confidence in any results of the lag analysis would be reduced. Although there are recording raingauges in the Afon Afan catchment, the Statistical method will be preferred to estimate peak flows for this watercourse due to the availability of a peak flow record at Marcroft Weir. Estimating Tp from lag analysis could be used to adjust the hydrograph shape, but this is thought unlikely to have a substantial impact on the hydraulic model results. It should be noted that FEH22 rainfall statistics are now available (released December 2022), although it is not possible to use them within the current version of the ReFH2 software. The ReFH2 model is currently being updated to use FEH22 and is expected to be released in early Spring 2023 (after completion of this assessment). The Environment Agency position statement on this is that there would be no expectation that calculations submitted up to and including 31st August 2023 would need to be updated to use FEH22. There is no known
-----------------------	--

⁴ Environment Agency, December 2022. Instruction: LIT 11832. Flood Estimation Guidelines. 2023s1306 - Hydrology_Report_v1.0

	formal equivalent guidance issued by NRW. As such, as hydrology calculations are programmed to be submitted well before this date, and for the project to be completed by mid-September, it has been assumed that there will be no requirement for FEH22 rainfall statistics and the new version of the ReFH2 software to be used in this study.
Software to be used	FEH Web Service ⁵ / WINFAP 5 ⁶ / ReFH2.3

⁵ CEH 2015. The Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) Online Service, Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Wallingford, UK.

⁶ WINFAP 5 © Wallingford HydroSolutions Limited 2021.
2023s1306 - Hydrology_Report_v1.0

3 Locations where flood estimates required




Figure 3-1: Flow estimation point catchments




Figure 3-2: Flow estimation point locations

The flow estimation points selected for the previous study were reviewed and retained for Ffrwd Wylt and Baglan Brook. It should be noted that the FEH Web Service watercourse lines for Baglan Brook do not match those on Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping. Therefore, flow estimation points were selected to represent approximate areas draining to these locations for the purpose of deriving hydrographs to add flow to the hydraulic model.

For the Afon Afan flow estimates were previously made at the location of Greenpark Weir and input at the upstream model extent. As part of the current study, it was decided to amend the catchment schematisation for the Afon Afan. Flow estimates were made at the upstream model extent and at the tidal limit defined by the FEH Web Service, with an intervening area between the two flow estimation points.


Figure 3-1 shows the full catchments draining to the flow estimation points. In Figure 3-2 the map is zoomed in on the flow estimation points to show their location more clearly. These figures show the adjusted FFRWD01 catchment boundary rather than the FEH Web Service boundary (see Section 3.3). The table in Section 3.1 lists the locations of subject sites. The site codes listed below are used in all subsequent tables to save space.

3.1 Summary of subject sites

Site code	Type of estimate	Watercourse	Name or description of site	Easting	Northing	AREA on FEH Web Service (km ²)	Revised AREA (km ²) if altered
FFRWD01	L	Ffrwd Wylt	Confluence with Docks	277000	188800	24.2	25.2
FFRWD02	L	Ffrwd Wylt	Start of urban area	278000	189700	19.3	-

Site code	Type of estimate	Watercourse	Name or description of site	Easting	Northing	AREA on FEH Web Service (km ²)	Revised AREA (km ²) if altered
FFRWD03	L	Ffrwd Wylt	Upstream model extent	279400	190000	14.5	-
BAG01	L	Baglan Brook	Confluence with Afon Nedd	273250	193300	6.4	-
BAG02	L	Baglan Brook	Confluence with BAG03 and BAG04 tributaries at Baglan Moors	274950	192000	1.4	-
BAG03	L	Baglan Brook	Confluence with Baglan Brook at Baglan Moors	274900	191950	1.6	-
BAG04	L	Baglan Brook	Confluence with Baglan Brook at Baglan Moors	274750	191950	1.3	-
AFAN01	L	Afon Afan	FEH tidal limit	275850	189700	93.0	-
AFAN02	L	Afon Afan	Upstream model extent	278700	192350	83.2	-
FFRWD01_IA	S	Ffrwd Wylt	Intervening area between FFRWD01 and FFRWD02	-	-	-	5.9
FFRWD02_IA	S	Ffrwd Wylt	Intervening area between FFRWD02 and FFRWD03	-	-	-	4.8
BAG01_IA	S	Baglan Brook	Intervening area between BAG01, BAG02, BAG03 and BAG04	-	-	-	2.1
AFAN01_IA	S	Afon Afan	Intervening area between AFAN01 and AFAN02	-	-	-	9.7

Note: Lumped catchments (L) are complete catchments draining to points at which design flows are required. Sub-catchments (S) are catchments or intervening areas that are being used as inputs to a semi-distributed model of the river system. There is no need to report any design flows for sub-catchments, as they are not relevant: the relevant result is the hydrograph that the sub-catchment is expected to contribute to a design flood event at a point further downstream in the river system. This will be recorded within the hydraulic model output files. However, catchment descriptors and ReFH model parameters should be recorded for sub-catchments so that the results can be reproduced. The schematic diagram illustrates the distinction between lumped and sub-catchment estimates.



3.2 Important catchment descriptors at each subject site

Site code	FARL	PROPWET	BFIHOST19	DPLBAR (km)	DPSBAR (m/km)	SAAR (mm)	URBEXT ₂₀₀₀	FPEXT
FFRWD01	1.000	0.52	0.482	5.90	201.5	1,596	0.0439	0.031
FFRWD02	1.000	0.52	0.465	4.78	201.5	1,651	0.0134	0.010
FFRWD03	1.000	0.52	0.440	4.04	194.9	1,703	0.0080	0.008
BAG01	0.908	0.52	0.678	3.53	114.9	1,276	0.2463	0.317
BAG02	1.000	0.52	0.545	1.51	176.8	1,386	0.0692	0.037
BAG03	1.000	0.52	0.715	1.18	132.4	1,229	0.1846	0.486
BAG04	1.000	0.52	0.826	1.71	8.5	1,170	0.4589	0.682
AFAN01	1.000	0.53	0.393	14.99	208.3	2,008	0.0364	0.029
AFAN02	1.000	0.53	0.367	11.66	211.1	2,083	0.0155	0.014
FFRWD01_IA	-	0.52	0.538	1.38	201.5	1,416	0.1437	-
FFRWD02_IA	-	0.52	0.541	1.19	221.5	1,493	0.0298	-
BAG01_IA	-	0.52	0.651	1.17	124.8	1,301	0.2820	-
AFAN01_IA	-	0.53	0.615*	1.57	184.4	1,367	0.2149	-

Note: FARL and FPEXT values are not provided for the intervening areas. These areas only require the generation of hydrographs and not peak flow estimates, and the ReFH2 model does not use these descriptors. Any descriptors which were adjusted from the FEH Web Service values are given in red text. URBEXT₂₀₀₀ was updated to the current year at the time of the study (2023).

* The AFAN01_IA BFIHOST19 value perhaps seems a little high given the lumped catchment values. However, the calculation is correct. This anomalous value may be due to the limitations of the back-calculation of the area-weighting method for smaller intervening areas. It is thought unlikely that this will have a substantial effect on the hydraulic model results, but modelled flows will be checked and reconciled to target flows, where necessary.

3.3 Checking catchment descriptors

Catchment boundary checks	Afon Afan The previous study found only minor discrepancies between the FEH Web Service catchment boundary and contours, spot heights and watercourse lines from mapping. No changes were made to the catchment boundary. Checks undertaken as part of the current study showed this decision to be reasonable and the FEH Web Service catchment boundary and area was retained without amendment. Ffrwd Wylt A detailed assessment of the Ffrwd Wylt catchment boundary was carried out for the previous study, making use of sewer network information. This found that the boundary for the lower part of the catchment, affecting FFRWD01 only, looked incorrect in several locations. The catchment boundary was amended accordingly. As this made a relatively small difference to the catchment area only this descriptor and DPLBAR were updated. DPLBAR was calculated using the UK average power term given in Volume 5 of the FEH. The adjustments made to the FFRWD01 boundary were checked as part of the current study. Part of the amendment assumes that Arnallt Brook drains to Ffrwd Wylt, following the railway line from Margam north to join the Ffrwd Wylle just upstream of the Docks. It is difficult to tell from mapping if this is the case, but it seems a reasonable assumption and the adjustments are conservative as
---------------------------	---

	the catchment area is increased. Therefore, the adjusted catchment boundary from the previous study was taken forward for the current study. A figure showing the FEH Web Service and adjusted catchment boundary is provided in Section 7.1, for reference. As for the previous study, only DPLBAR was updated in addition to catchment area. However, for the current study, rather than using the UK average power term, the value was derived by the simple approach of applying an area-weighting (new AREA / old AREA) to the 'old' DPLBAR value. This approach was deemed reasonable for the scope of the study and uses 'local' information rather than a generalised power term. In this case the derived DPLBAR was very similar to that used in the previous study. Baglan Brook No changes were made to the Baglan Brook catchment boundary in the previous study. For the upper and rural parts of the catchment the FEH Web Service was deemed reasonable, with only minor discrepancies compared to contours, spot heights and watercourse lines. The boundary is difficult to verify in the lower part of the catchment as it lies on a flat coastal area and is predominantly urbanised. The channels appear to have been substantially changed from the natural drainage. Due to all other uncertainties in flood flow estimation for this catchment, the FEH Web Service catchment boundary was accepted as reasonable. Checks undertaken as part of the current study verified these findings, and no changes were made to the catchment boundary or area.
Other catchment descriptor checks	The FEH Web Service BFIHOST19 values show the Ffrwd Wyllt catchment to be moderately impermeable, with values increasing from upstream to downstream, showing a slight increase in permeability. This seems reasonable given the changes in soils described in Section 2.2. BFIHOST19 values for the Afan catchment follow a similar trend, although values are slightly smaller than for Ffrwd Wyllt, indicating a more impermeable catchment. This seems reasonable based on the soils and geology. The Baglan Brook BFIHOST19 values are much larger than for the other two watercourses. BAG01, BAG03 and BAG04 have BFIHOST19 ≥ 0.65, indicating highly permeable / groundwater-dominated catchments. This ties in with soils developed from sand dunes becoming dominant in the parts of the catchment closest to the coast. No changes were made to any of the BFIHOST19 values. FARL values are 1.000 at all flow estimation points except BAG01. This indicates no attenuation due to lakes and reservoirs, which is supported by mapping. For BAG01 the FEH Web Service shows a 'lake' area along Baglan Brook downstream of the A4241 road. There is a small reservoir shown on mapping in this area to the west of the M4, although it is not as extensive as the lake area shown on the FEH Web Service. The reservoir is not directly online but OS MasterMap mapping indicates that there may possibly be both an inflow from and outflow to Baglan Brook. The previous study amended the FARL value to 1.000 for BAG01. However, due to the potential for the reservoir to have an influence on flood attenuation it was deemed preferable to retain the FEH Web Service value for the current study. In addition to this, ReFH2, which was the preferred method in the previous study, does not utilise the FARL descriptor. Urban coverage shown by the FEH Web Service URBEXT₂₀₀₀ layer was compared to current OS mapping. This showed that there are no significant developments unaccounted for by the URBEXT₂₀₀₀ layer. No changes were made to the URBEXT values except to update them to the current year (2023). Catchment descriptors for the intervening areas were derived using a back-calculation of the area-weighting approach described in Volume 5 of the FEH. DPLBAR was derived using the same approach detailed for updating the FFRWD01 DPLBAR value following catchment boundary amendment.

Source of URBEXT	URBEXT ₂₀₀₀
Method for updating URBEXT	CPRE formula from 2006 CEH report on URBEXT ₂₀₀₀

4 Statistical method

4.1 Overview of estimation of QMED at each subject site

Site code	QMED (rural) from CDs (m ³ /s)	Final method	Data transfer			Urban adjustment factor UAF	Final estimate of QMED (m ³ /s)
			NRFA numbers for donor sites used (see 4.3)	Distance between centroids d _{ij} (km)	Moderated QMED adjustment factor, (A/B) ^a		
FFRWD01	19.6	DT	58012	7.35	1.004	1.050	20.6
FFRWD02	17.0	DT		6.69	1.004	1.015	17.4
FFRWD03	14.8	DT		6.04	1.004	1.008	15.0
BAG01	1.6	DT		10.31	1.003	1.479	2.4
BAG02	1.2	DT		9.31	1.003	1.090	1.3
BAG03	0.55	DT		10.59	1.003	1.390	0.77
BAG04	0.25	DT		11.46	1.003	2.756	0.70
AFAN01	96.1	DT		0.35	1.008	1.036	100
AFAN02	96.1	DT		0.64	1.007	1.014	98.2
Are the values of QMED spatially consistent?				Yes, QMED increases downstream for the Afon Afan and Ffrwd Wyllt. QMED at BAG01 is less than the sum of the upstream flows even though there is about a 50% increase in catchment area to BAG01. However, the characteristics of each catchment are very different, and this result may be expected.			
Method used for urban adjustment for subject and donor sites				WINFAP v4 ⁷			
Parameters used for WINFAP v4 urban adjustment if applicable							
Impervious fraction for built-up areas, IF			Percentage runoff for impervious surfaces, PR _{imp}		Method for calculating fractional urban cover, URBAN		
0.3			70%		From updated URBEXT ₂₀₀₀		
Notes							
Methods: DT – Data transfer (with urban adjustment).							
The QMED adjustment factor A/B for each donor site is moderated using the power term, a, which is a function of the distance between the centroids of the subject catchment and the donor catchment. The final estimate of QMED is (A/B) ^a times the initial (rural) estimate from catchment descriptors.							

4.2 Search for donor sites for QMED

Station 58012 Afan at Marcroft Weir was selected as the donor for the AFAN flow estimation points. The gauge lies within the modelled reach and will be highly representative of the flow estimation points. The moderation term was retained as the distance between catchment centroids is small and QMED at the flow estimation points remains consistent with QMED at the gauge.

The small catchment procedures recommend that for catchments <25km², the single closest donor station should be used to adjust QMED. This recommendation was accepted for this study for Ffrwd Wyllt and Baglan Brook; this is proportionate to the scale of the study. In addition, there is only a small reduction in uncertainty for ungauged sites when donors are used. This will particularly be the case when the donor is on a different watercourse.

For the Ffrwd Wyllt flow estimation points there is a difference in the closest donor station

⁷ Wallingford HydroSolutions (2016). WINFAP 4 Urban adjustment procedures.
2023s1306 - Hydrology_Report_v1.0

when a threshold of $URBEXT_{2000} < 0.03$ and < 0.30 is used. See discussion in Section 4.4 regarding selection of this threshold.

- Threshold < 0.03 : 58012 Afan at Marcroft Weir is the closest donor station, with 6.0km to 7.4km between catchment centroids, $QMED_{ObsDeurbanised} / QMED_{CDRural} = 1.004$.
- Threshold < 0.30 : 58007 Llynfi at Coytrahen is the closest donor station, with 5.2km to 6.0km between catchment centroids, $QMED_{ObsDeurbanised} / QMED_{CDRural} = 0.966$.

Catchment descriptors for Station 58007 are, generally, more similar to those of Ffrwd Wylt than Station 58012. Consideration was given to using this station as a donor for the FFRWD flow estimation points. However, both stations only result in a small change to the catchment descriptor QMED estimate, particularly 58012. Use of either station could be justified and, due to the difference in trend between $QMED_{Obs}$ and $QMED_{CD}$ at the two stations (58012 > 1 and 58007 < 1), using an average of the two adjustments is not sensible. Therefore, 58012 was selected for consistency with the AFAN and BAG flow estimation points.

4.3 Donor sites chosen and QMED adjustment factors

NRFA no.	Method (AM or POT)	Adjustment for climatic variation?	QMED from flow data (A)	QMED from catchment descriptors (B)	Adjustment ratio (A/B)
58012	AM	N/A	97.6 (99.6)	96.8	1.009

The deurbanised value of QMED from flow data was used in this calculation, which is derived by dividing QMED from observed data (given in brackets in the table) by the urban adjustment factor (UAF) which is 1.020 for the gauge.

4.4 Derivation of pooling groups

Where there are multiple flow estimation points the Environment Agency Flood Estimation Guidelines⁴ identify that it is good practice to apply one pooling group to several points along a river. This helps to promote spatial consistency. The key area of interest is Newbridge Weir, within the tidal reach of the Afon Afan. Therefore, the AFAN01 pooling group was selected to provide the growth curve for both Afan flow estimation points. FFRWD01 is within the urban area of Port Talbot and this pooling group was selected to generate the growth curve for all three Ffrwd Wylt flow estimation points. BAG01 was selected to generate the Baglan Brook flow estimation points growth curve. The other flow estimation point catchments are very small and the best estimate of flow is most likely to be derived at the downstream extent.

Small catchment procedures were used to generate the pooling groups for FFRWD01 and BAG01. This was not compared to a 'standard' pooling group for BAG01 as the catchment is $\leq 25\text{km}^2$ and the small catchment pooling group should, in theory, be more appropriate. As the catchment for FFRWD01 is 25km^2 a standard pooling group was also generated for comparison. There was little difference between the growth factors for the small catchment and standard pooling groups, and it was decided to take forward the small catchment pooling group for FFRWD01.

Pooling groups were generated using the default $URBEXT_{2000}$ threshold of 0.03 and a threshold of 0.30. The latter is recommended by NRW⁸ even where the subject site is not urbanised. Growth factors only change by a small amount when using the different thresholds, decreasing when the higher threshold is used. The 0.30 threshold pooling group was selected for this analysis as it follows NRW guidance.

⁸ Natural Resources Wales. November 2021. GN 008. Flood estimation – technical guidance. 2023s1306 - Hydrology_Report_v1.0

Name of group	Site code from whose descriptors group was derived	Subject site treated as gauged?	Changes made to default pooling group	Weighted average L-moments
FFRWD01	FFRWD01	No	None. Checks undertaken on: - Highest ranked three stations: 25012, 49003, 48009. - Stations with FARL <0.95: 48001. - Stations with URBEXT₂₀₀₀ >0.03: 57010, 46006. - Stations with slightly different L-moment ratios to others in the group: 48009, 57010, 206006. There was no strong reason to remove any of these stations from the pooling group and all were retained.	L-CV: 0.200 L-skew: 0.204
BAG01	BAG01	No	None. Checks undertaken on: - Highest ranked three stations: 45816, 28033, 47022. - Stations with FARL <0.95: 47022, 69047, 18014, 48007. - Stations with URBEXT₂₀₀₀ >0.03: 69047, 84035. - Stations with slightly different L-moment ratios to others in the group: 44008, 49005. There was no strong reason to remove any of these stations from the pooling group and all were retained.	L-CV: 0.240 L-skew: 0.239
AFAN01	AFAN01	No	None. Checks undertaken on: - Highest ranked three stations: 58012, 57006, 58005. - Stations with FARL <0.95: 96004, 73017. - Stations with URBEXT₂₀₀₀ >0.03: 57006, 58005. - Stations with slightly different L-moment ratios to others in the group: 73017, 46008, 58006. There was no strong reason to remove any of these stations from the pooling group and all were retained.	L-CV: 0.174 L-skew: 0.151
Note: Pooling groups were derived using the procedures from Science Report SC050050 (2008). Weighted average L-moments quoted above are the 'deurbanised' values.				

4.5 Derivation of flood growth curves at subject sites

Site code	Method	If P, ESS or J, name of pooling group	Distribution used and reason for choice	Note any urban adjustment or permeable adjustment	Parameters of distribution	Growth factor 1% AEP
FFRWD01	P	FFRWD01	Generalised Logistic (GL), Generalised Extreme Value (GEV)	Urban adjustment applied. No adjustment for non-flood years applied. Ratio of	Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.194 Shape: -0.212	2.51

Site code	Method	If P, ESS or J, name of pooling group	Distribution used and reason for choice	Note any urban adjustment or permeable adjustment	Parameters of distribution	Growth factor 1% AEP
FFRWD02	P		and Kappa 3 (KAP3) distributions all had an acceptable fit to the data. GL z-value was closest to zero, indicating the best fit. This is also the recommended distribution for UK catchments.	total non-flood years to total station years is <0.05. This is likely to have an insignificant effect on the growth curves, particularly as the adjustment generally has a fairly small impact on them.	Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.198 Shape: -0.206	2.52
FFRWD03	P				Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.199 Shape: -0.205	2.52
BAG01	P				Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.200 Shape: -0.284	2.89
BAG02	P	BAG01	GL, GEV and KAP3 distributions all had an acceptable fit to the data. GL z-value was closest to zero, indicating the best fit. This is also the recommended distribution for UK catchments.		Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.228 Shape: -0.251	2.97
BAG03	P				Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.209 Shape: -0.272	2.92
BAG04	P				Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.169 Shape: -0.323	2.79
AFAN01	P	AFAN01	GEV and Pearson Type 3 (P3) distributions give an acceptable fit to the data. GEV z-value was closest to zero, indicating the best fit. There was a relatively small difference between the GEV and GL growth factors.		Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.263 Shape: 0.020	2.06
AFAN02	P				Location: 1.000 Scale: 0.267 Shape: 0.026	2.06

Notes

Methods: P – Pooled

Urban adjustments are all carried out using the method of Kjeldsen (2010).

Growth curves were derived using the procedures from Science Report SC050050 (2008).

For the GEV distribution, WINFAP uses a different parameterisation for the location parameter and growth curve equation compared to the equations given in Section 15.4 of FEH Volume 3 (which are used to derive the values presented above). The two methods are algebraically equivalent, giving the same resultant growth curve.

4.6 Flood estimates from the statistical method

Site code	Flood peak (m ³ /s) for the following AEP (%) events									
	50	20	10	5	3.33	2	1.33	1	0.5	0.1
FFRWD01	20.6	27.1	31.8	36.9	40.2	44.8	48.7	51.7	72.0	83.1
FFRWD02	17.4	22.9	26.9	31.3	34.1	37.9	41.2	43.7	60.7	69.9
FFRWD03	15.0	19.8	23.3	27.1	29.5	32.8	35.7	37.8	52.5	60.5
BAG01	2.4	3.2	3.9	4.6	5.1	5.8	6.5	7.0	10.6	12.7
BAG02	1.3	1.8	2.1	2.6	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.8	5.7	6.7
BAG03	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.2	3.4	4.0
BAG04	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.0	3.1	3.8
AFAN01	100	130	149	167	177	190	200	207	245	261
AFAN02	98	127	146	164	174	186	196	203	239	255

5 Revitalised flood hydrograph 2 (ReFH2) method

5.1 Parameters for ReFH2 model

All catchments				
Site code	Method	C _{max} (mm)	Tp _{rural} (hours)	BL (hours)
FFRWD01	CD	356.41	2.07	39.61
FFRWD02	CD	341.02	1.84	37.02
FFRWD03	CD	319.57	1.68	34.51
BAG01	CD	593.02	1.84	43.55
BAG02	CD	419.78	1.00	31.70
BAG03	CD	652.84	1.00	35.41
BAG04	CD	871.02	2.78	41.91
AFAN01	CD	281.71	3.42	42.52
AFAN02	CD	263.32	2.95	38.62
FFRWD01_IA	CD	356.41	1.00	28.85
FFRWD02_IA	CD	415.44	1.00	29.96
BAG01_IA	CD	552.85	1.00	33.39
AFAN01_IA	CD	501.48	1.00	34.10
Link to details of any lag or flood event analysis		N/A		
Version of the ReFH2 model applied		ReFH2.3 using the water balance option. This treats BR (baseflow recharge) as a state variable rather than a parameter, setting it automatically in order to conserve volume. The values of BR vary with return period and so are not reported here.		
Parameters for urban runoff model		Impervious fraction of urban areas (IF): default value of 0.4 retained. Impervious runoff factor (IRF): default value of 0.7 retained. Depression storage: default value of 0.5mm retained. Tp for runoff from areas modelled as positively drained was calculated as 0.75 times Tp _{rural} .		
Methods: CD: Catchment descriptors				

5.2 Design events for ReFH2 method: Lumped catchments

Note: Allocation of urban / rural and the season of the design event is based on the definition in the Environment Agency's Flood Estimation Guidelines⁴. A winter storm is assigned unless $URBEXT_{2000} \geq 0.30$ or $URBEXT_{2000} \geq 0.15$ and $BFIHOST19 \geq 0.65$. All catchments with $URBEXT_{2000} < 0.30$ are treated as rural and the rural results used rather than the urban results. The rural results assume no influence of urbanisation, i.e., $URBEXT_{2000} = 0$. Guidance recommends that for catchments with $0.15 < URBEXT_{2000} \leq 0.30$ a T_p scaling factor of 1 should be used. However, if rural results are used, as per the guidance, the T_p scaling factor is not relevant. Due to this the T_p scaling factor has been left as default for all sites.

Site code	Urban or rural	Season of design event (summer or winter)	Storm duration (hours)
FFRWD01	Rural	Winter	5.50
FFRWD02	Rural	Winter	4.75
FFRWD03	Rural	Winter	4.75
BAG01	Rural	Summer	4.25
BAG02	Rural	Winter	2.30
BAG03	Rural	Summer	2.30
BAG04	Urban	Summer	6.50
AFAN01	Rural	Winter	10.50
AFAN02	Rural	Winter	9.50

5.3 Design events for ReFH2 method: Sub-catchments and intervening areas

Different storms are applied for each watercourse in the existing hydraulic model as an accepted simplification of the modelling. There is little interaction between the watercourses, except for a slight meeting of floodplain flows. It is proposed to retain this approach for the current study.

It should be noted that this is not normal practice. It is usual to apply the same storm duration, areal reduction factor (ARF) and season to all model inflows within the same hydraulic model. Therefore, when looking at the hydraulic model results the watercourses should be considered in isolation. For example, the results for the Afan and Baglan Brook are for different storms which are critical to each catchment, and it would not be expected to see these results occur at the same time on the watercourses.

Site code	Season of design event	Storm duration (hours)	ARF	Reason for selecting storm
All FFRWD	Winter	5.25	0.936	Based on FFRWD01 which is the location in the main area of interest in terms of flood risk. Adjusted slightly from the recommended duration to enable a shorter time interval to be used and produce a finer resolution hydrograph. This storm duration and ARF will be applied for all FFRWD model inflow hydrographs.
All BAG	Summer	4.25	0.956	No specific site of interest for this watercourse for the current study. Recommended storm duration for BAG01 was used as this covers the whole catchment. This also lies between the recommended durations for the other locations. This storm duration and ARF will be applied for all BAG model inflow hydrographs.
All AFAN	Winter	10.5	0.923	Recommended duration for AFAN01 which is the closest location to the site of interest. This storm duration and ARF will be applied for both AFAN model inflow hydrographs.

5.4 Flood estimates from the ReFH2 method

Results provided in the table are rural for all sites except BAG04 where $URBEXT_{2000} > 0.30$, as per guidance. These results are based on the recommended storm duration for individual locations, as detailed in Section 5.2.

Dark red text indicates that the AFAN02 (upstream site) peak flows are larger than those for AFAN01 (downstream site). This may be due to the proportionally small change in catchment area between the two locations and proportionally larger change in other catchment descriptors. The Flood Estimation Guidelines note that the FEH methods are not guaranteed to give spatially consistent results if applied to multiple sites along a river system.

Peak flows for BAG03 and BAG04 are given to two decimal places to better show changes between design events. This does not imply any greater degree of confidence in these results.

Site code	Flood peak (m^3/s) for the following AEP (%) events									
	50	20	10	5	3.33	2	1.33	1	0.5	0.1
FFRWD01	15.1	19.4	22.5	25.5	27.4	29.9	32.0	33.7	38.4	59.0
FFRWD02	13.2	17.1	19.8	22.6	24.3	26.5	28.5	29.9	34.1	52.4
FFRWD03	11.8	15.3	17.8	20.3	21.8	23.8	25.5	26.8	30.5	46.7
BAG01	1.5	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.7	4.4	7.3
BAG02	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.2	3.4
BAG03	0.39	0.54	0.64	0.76	0.83	0.93	1.01	1.08	1.3	2.2
BAG04	0.52	0.66	0.76	0.85	0.92	1.00	1.08	1.14	1.3	2.0
AFAN01	81.0	102	116	131	139	150	160	168	189	276
AFAN02	87.9	111	127	143	153	166	176	185	208	303

6 Discussion and summary of results

6.1 Comparison of results from different methods

Site code	Ratio of peak flow to FEH Statistical peak	
	50% AEP	1% AEP
	ReFH2	ReFH2
FFRWD01	0.73	0.65
FFRWD02	0.76	0.69
FFRWD03	0.78	0.71
BAG01	0.62	0.53
BAG02	0.58	0.49
BAG03	0.50	0.48
BAG04	0.74	0.58
AFAN01	0.81	0.81
AFAN02	0.90	0.91

6.2 Final choice of method

Choice of method and reasons	Afon Afan FEH Statistical is the preferred method to generate peak flow estimates for the Afon Afan. This is consistent with the previous study. QMED has been improved by using a local donor located within the model reach; the ReFH2 results are based on catchment descriptors alone. The Statistical method is also based on a much larger dataset of flood events and has been more directly calibrated to reproduce flood frequency on UK catchments. NRW guidance recommends that a ratio derived from the ReFH2 method results is used to adjust Statistical method peak flow estimates for design events less frequent than the 1% AEP event. For example, the ratio between the ReFH2 method 0.1% AEP and 1% AEP event flows is applied to the Statistical method 1% AEP event flow to generate an adjusted 0.1% AEP event estimate. This was applied for the AFAN flow estimation points (also consistent with the previous study) and the final peak flow estimates with this adjustment applied are given in Section 6.5. Ffrwd Wyllt The reasons for preferring the FEH Statistical method over the ReFH2 method are the same for the Ffrwd Wyllt as those described for the Afan, except that the QMED donor is located on an adjacent watercourse. Section 6.1 shows that the ReFH2 method peak flow estimates are substantially smaller than the Statistical method estimates. Potentially the catchment drainage network geometry descriptors (DPLBAR and DPSBAR) are influencing the ReFH2 method results; these are not used within the Statistical method. A similar difference in the results was found in the previous study and both sets of peak flow estimates were tested using the hydraulic model. This showed that the Statistical method overestimated flooding based on historical flooding evidence (or absence of it). The ReFH2 method results also generated more flooding than expected but to a lesser extent than the Statistical method estimates. It was recommended that the ReFH2 method results were taken forward as the model inflows. This recommendation was retained for the
------------------------------	---

	current study as the differences between the method results are similar to those for the previous study. Baglan Brook There is little to choose between the FEH Statistical and ReFH2 methods for Baglan Brook, as both use catchment descriptors only. For all sub-catchments except BAG02 there are very large floodplain extents and no flood peak data to implicitly account for the effects of storage. Flood volumes may be more important than peak flows for this watercourse. Therefore, a rainfall-runoff approach may be favoured in this case. Comparison of 50% and 1% AEP event flows in Section 6.1 shows that the ReFH2 method flows are substantially smaller than the FEH Statistical method flows. Adjustment to the 50% AEP event for the Statistical method using the donor led to a minimal change to catchment descriptor values, so it is not this that is leading to the difference between the two methods. At this stage, it is recommended that the ReFH2 method flows are taken forward as inflows to the hydraulic model and the model results sense-checked to ensure that flood extents and levels are realistic. It should be noted that permeable urban catchments are outside the range of most catchments from which the FEH methods were developed. For such catchments the only reliable flood estimates are likely to be derived from local flow data. This is consistent with the previous study.
How will the flows be applied to a hydraulic model?	The ReFH2 model will be used to supply the hydrograph shape for the Afon Afan model inflows. A scaling factor was derived for the upstream inflow (AFAN02) and applied to the ReFH2 hydrograph. The ratio between the Statistical peak flow estimate and the ReFH2 peak flow estimate (based on the recommended storm duration for AFAN02 (9.5hr)) was calculated and applied to the selected 10.5hr duration hydrograph. There was only a small deviation in the scaling factor between the design events and it was decided to apply the 50% AEP event scaling factor to all design event hydrographs. If necessary, the intervening area hydrograph will be adjusted to approximate the lumped Statistical peak flow estimate at AFAN01. The lumped catchment FFRWD03 ReFH2 hydrograph will be applied at the upstream extent of the Ffrwd Wylt model. The intervening area catchment hydrographs (FFRWD02_IA and FFRWD01_IA) will be distributed along the relevant model reaches. For Baglan Brook the previous model had BAG02 and BAG03 applied as point inflows. BAG04 was distributed over a short reach just downstream of the BAG02 and BAG03 point inflows. The intervening area inflow was distributed over the reach downstream of the A4241 Seaway Parade to the small reservoir to the west of the M4. It is anticipated that the same approach will be used to apply the ReFH2 hydrographs derived for the current study. Details of how the model inflow hydrographs were generated are provided in Section 7.3.

6.3 Assumptions, limitations, and uncertainty

Assumptions	The main assumptions are: • The ReFH2 method peak flow estimates are more appropriate for the Ffrwd Wylt than the Statistical method estimates, based on testing undertaken in the previous study. • Based on catchment characteristics the ReFH2 method is more appropriate than the Statistical method for Baglan Brook.
-------------	--

	- Using the unamended FEH Web Service FARL value for BAG01 is reasonable, rather than amending to 1.000 as was done in the previous study. - Selecting the geographically closest (and rural) donor for Ffrwd Wyllt and Baglan Brook is appropriate (follows guidance). - Use of the small catchment pooling approach is more appropriate than using a 'standard' pooling group for Ffrwd Wyllt and Baglan Brook. - Generating pooling groups using an URBEXT₂₀₀₀ threshold of 0.30 rather than 0.03 is reasonable to increase the number of stations from which the pooling groups are drawn. - It is reasonable not to adjust pooled L-moments to account for non-flood years as these account for <5% of the total station years and are likely to have little impact on the results.
Limitations	The main limitation is: There is no flow gauge on the Ffrwd Wyllt and Baglan Brook which can be used to adjust QMED at the flow estimation points or against which to check other design event peak flow estimates.
Uncertainty	It is not possible to directly quantify uncertainty for the ReFH2 method. A UK average measure of uncertainty is presented in a technical guidance report⁹ generated by a R&D project which considered use of local data in reducing uncertainty in flood frequency estimation. The 95% confidence limits for the 1% AEP event, with donor adjustment of QMED (one donor) are: - Rural catchment (URBEXT₂₀₀₀ < 0.03), relevant to FFRWD02, FFRWD03 and AFAN02: 0.47 – 2.12 times the best estimate. - Moderately urbanised catchment (0.03 ≤ URBEXT₂₀₀₀ < 0.15), relevant to FFRWD01, BAG02, and AFAN01: 0.34 – 2.94 times the best estimate. Confidence intervals for heavily urbanised catchments URBEXT₂₀₀₀ > 0.15 are not provided because there are not enough suitable catchments with flood peak data to provide reliable statistics. It may be assumed that the confidence intervals will be somewhat wider than those for moderately urbanised catchments.
Suitability of results for future studies	The design event peak flow estimates and hydrographs were derived for the purposes of this modelling study. If peak flow estimates and hydrographs are required for a different purpose it is recommended that, at a minimum, a review of the results is carried out.

6.4 Checks

Are the results consistent?	Yes, for the FEH Statistical method and for the Ffrwd Wyllt and Baglan Brook for the ReFH2 method. Peak flow estimates decrease downstream on the Afon Afan for the ReFH2 method. It is thought that this may be due to a small proportional increase in catchment area and a somewhat larger proportional increase in other catchment descriptors. ReFH2 has only been used to provide the hydrograph shape for the Afan, therefore this is not a concern.
What do the results imply regarding the frequency of	There are no flow gauges at the flow estimation points on any of the watercourses. However, Marcroft Weir lies between the two Afan flow estimation points. The design event peak flow estimates at AFAN01 were area-weighted to Marcroft Weir and compared to the AMAX series. AMAX1

⁹ Environment Agency. 2017. Technical guidance 12_17: Using local data to reduce uncertainty in flood frequency estimation.

floods during the period of record?	(the largest peak flow at the gauge) is 157m ³ /s (27/12/1979). This equates to between the 10% and 5% AEP events from the area-weighted peak flow estimates for the FEH Statistical method. This estimate may seem too frequent given the gauge has a 42-year record, suggesting that the peak flows may be too high. However, it must be remembered that the observed peak flow could also have a high degree of uncertainty associated with it. The ReFH2 method results suggest an AEP of around 1.33%. As no reports of flooding in Port Talbot could be found for the December 1979 event from a brief Internet search this estimate potentially seems too infrequent. It would generally be expected that at least some flooding would be noted for an event of this frequency.
Range of 1% AEP growth factors	The 1% AEP event growth factors are: • FFRWD ◦ FEH Statistical: 2.51 - 2.52 ◦ ReFH2: 2.23 - 2.28 • BAG ◦ FEH Statistical: 2.79 - 2.97 ◦ ReFH2: 2.19 - 2.79 • AFAN ◦ FEH Statistical: 2.06 ◦ ReFH2: 2.07 - 2.10 The typical range is 2.1 - 4.0. Values are generally towards the lower end of this range, with the growth factor for the Afan nodes falling just below the lower end of the range for both methods. Although the values are low this is characteristic of generally impermeable, wet, and steep catchments. Baglan Brook, which has more permeable geology and soils, has slightly larger growth factors than the other catchments.
Range of ratios for 0.1% AEP flow over 1% AEP flow	The 0.1% / 1% event ratios are: • FFRWD ◦ FEH Statistical: 1.60 - 1.61 ◦ ReFH2: 1.74 - 1.75 • BAG ◦ FEH Statistical: 1.76 - 1.92 ◦ ReFH2: 1.75 - 2.02 • AFAN ◦ FEH Statistical: 1.26 ◦ ReFH2: 1.64 - 1.65
How do the results compare with those of other studies?	Peak flow estimates from the current study and 2016 studies are compared in Table 6-1 for the downstream flow estimation points on each watercourse for selected design events. This shows that the current study peak flow estimates for the Afon Afan and Ffrwd Wylt are up to 10% larger than those from the 2016 study. For Baglan Brook the current study peak flow estimates are around half those from the 2016 study. This is predominantly due to the use of the rural results for the current study (which follows guidance for locations where URBEXT₂₀₀₀ is ≤0.30), whereas urban results were used for all Baglan Brook locations in the 2016 study. It should be noted that these large differences are only seen at BAG01 and BAG03. At BAG02 and BAG04 the differences are within 10%. This is due to BAG02 having a much smaller URBEXT₂₀₀₀ value than the other locations, hence the rural and urban results do not differ as much, and urban results being used for BAG04 in the current study as URBEXT₂₀₀₀ is >0.30.

Table 6-1: Comparison of 2023 & 2016 peak flow estimates

Site code (and method)	AEP (%) event	2023 study (m ³ /s)	2016 study (m ³ /s)	Ratio (2023 / 2016)
AFAN01 (Statistical)	50	100	98	1.02
	1	207	189	1.09
	0.1*	340	313	1.09
FFRWD01 (ReFH2)	50	15.1	13.8	1.09
	1	33.7	30.6	1.10
	0.1	59.0	53.7	1.10
BAG01 (ReFH2)	50	1.5	3.0	0.49
	1	3.7	6.9	0.54
	0.1	7.3	12.4	0.59

* ReFH2 0.1% / 1% AEP event ratio applied to Statistical 1% AEP event peak flow.

The current study results are preferred as they use the latest methods, datasets, and guidance. Due to the large differences seen between the studies for some of the Baglan Brook flow estimation points, hydraulic model results for the current study will be checked to ensure predicted flooding looks sensible and not underestimated.

Are the results compatible with the longer-term flood history?	Investigation of longer-term flood history was not within the scope of the study.
Describe any other checks on the results	Hydraulic model results will be sense-checked to ensure that flood extents / depths appear reasonable when compared to reported flooding. However, there is limited detailed historical flooding information on which to base this assessment.

6.5 Final results

For the AFAN flow estimation points the results are those from the Statistical method. The 0.5% and 0.1% AEP event values were derived by applying the ReFH2 0.5%:1% and 0.1%:1% AEP event ratios to the Statistical method 1% AEP event peak flow estimates.

For the FFRWD and BAG Brook flow estimation points the results are from the ReFH2 method using the individual storm duration, ARF and season for each location. Flow reconciliation between hydraulic model flows and target flows (shown in this table) should be undertaken for FFRWD01 and BAG01, the locations for which critical conditions were applied when deriving the hydraulic model inflows.

Site code	Flood peak (m ³ /s) for the following AEP (%) events									
	50	20	10	5	3.33	2	1.33	1	0.5	0.1
FFRWD01	15.1	19.4	22.5	25.5	27.4	29.9	32.0	33.7	38.4	59.0
FFRWD02	13.2	17.1	19.8	22.6	24.3	26.5	28.5	29.9	34.1	52.4
FFRWD03	11.8	15.3	17.8	20.3	21.8	23.8	25.5	26.8	30.5	46.7
BAG01	1.5	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.7	4.4	7.3
BAG02	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.2	3.4
BAG03	0.39	0.54	0.64	0.76	0.83	0.93	1.01	1.08	1.3	2.2
BAG04	0.52	0.66	0.76	0.85	0.92	1.00	1.08	1.14	1.3	2.0

Site code	Flood peak (m ³ /s) for the following AEP (%) events									
	50	20	10	5	3.33	2	1.33	1	0.5	0.1
AFAN01	100	130	149	167	177	190	200	207	233	340
AFAN02	98	127	146	164	174	186	196	203	228	333

6.6 Uncertainty bounds

This table reports the flows derived from the uncertainty analysis detailed in Section 6.3. The 'true' value is more likely to be near the estimate reported in Section 6.5 than the bounds. However, it is possible that the 'true' value could still lie outside these bounds.


This assessment can only be undertaken for the AFAN flow estimation points. Uncertainty bounds are not provided for the 0.1% AEP event as these were adjusted using the ReFH2 ratio. It is not possible to directly quantify uncertainty for the ReFH2 method, which has been used to supply the final peak flow estimates for the FFRWD and BAG flow estimation points.

Site code	Flood peak (m ³ /s) for the following AEP (%) events			
	50		1	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
AFAN01	40.1	252	70.2	607
AFAN02	49.1	198	95.2	429

If flood hydrographs are needed for the next stage of the study, where are they provided?	Hydrographs for model.zip The above zip file is located in the 'Supporting file' folder issued with this report. The zip file contains separate folders for each watercourse which, in turn, contain .csv files for six AEP events.
---	---

7 Annex

7.1 FFRWD01 FEH Web Service & adjusted catchment boundary



7.2 Final pooling groups

7.2.1 FFRWD01

Station	Distance (SDM)	Years of data	QMED AM	L-CV Deurbanised	L-SKEW Deurbanised	Discordancy
25012 (Harwood Beck @ Harwood)	0.040	52	33.4	0.184	0.223	0.368
49003 (De Lank @ De Lank)	0.134	55	13.7	0.213	0.165	1.512
48009 (St Neot @ Craigshill Wood)	0.173	12	8.5	0.245	0.372	1.619
48004 (Warleggan @ Trengoffe)	0.285	52	10.0	0.252	0.257	1.185
48001 (Fowey @ Trekeivesteps)	0.306	52	17.3	0.216	0.275	0.279
27032 (Hebden Beck @ Hebden)	0.324	53	4.1	0.197	0.202	0.270
57010 (Ely @ Lanelay)	0.346	22	39.7	0.152	0.130	2.092
76023 (Dacre Beck @ Dacre Bridge)	0.397	21	35.9	0.189	0.213	0.992
21017 (Ettrick Water @ Brockhoperig)	0.418	56	59.8	0.175	0.220	0.685
47014 (Walkham @ Horrabridge)	0.462	47	40.5	0.219	0.210	0.256

206006 (Annalong @ Recorder)	0.479	48	15.3	0.189	0.052	2.243
46006 (Erme @ Ermington)	0.480	46	47.0	0.170	0.153	0.498
Total		516				
Weighted means				0.200	0.204	

7.2.2 BAG01

Station	Distance (SDM)	Years of data	QMED AM	L-CV Deurbanised	L-SKEW Deurbanised	Discordancy
45816 (Haddeo @ Upton)	0.159	28	3.4	0.294	0.423	1.109
28033 (Dove @ Hollinsclough)	0.225	46	4.1	0.223	0.379	1.091
47022 (Tory Brook @ Newnham Park)	0.643	26	6.6	0.252	0.146	0.688
25011 (Langdon Beck @ Langdon)	0.670	35	15.6	0.226	0.324	0.796
69047 (Roch @ Littleborough)	0.679	25	9.5	0.236	0.138	0.467
84035 (Kittoch Water @ Waterside)	0.790	30	20.0	0.156	0.015	1.281
49005 (Bolingey Stream @ Bolingey Cocks Bridge)	0.925	11	5.8	0.263	0.206	2.575
27032 (Hebden Beck @ Hebden)	1.037	53	4.1	0.197	0.202	0.220
206006 (Annalong @ Recorder)	1.047	48	15.3	0.189	0.052	1.541
18014 (Bannock Burn @ Bannockburn)	1.093	29	16.6	0.225	0.160	0.174
48009 (St Neot @ Craigshill Wood)	1.118	12	8.5	0.245	0.372	0.638
44008 (South Winterbourne @ Winterbourne Steepleton)	1.123	30	0.5	0.422	0.289	3.531
27010 (Hodge Beck @ Bransdale Weir)	1.124	41	9.4	0.224	0.293	0.219
48007 (Kennal @ Ponsanooth)	1.133	53	4.3	0.191	0.212	0.337
48004 (Warleggan @ Trengoffe)	1.140	52	10.0	0.252	0.257	0.333
Total		519				
Weighted means				0.240	0.239	

7.2.3 AFAN01

Station	Distance (SDM)	Years of data	QMED AM	L-CV Deurbanised	L-SKEW Deurbanised	Discordancy
58012 (Afan @ Marcroft Weir)	0.140	42	99.6	0.153	0.040	1.114
57006 (Rhondda @ Trehafod)	0.248	49	115.4	0.171	0.099	0.171
58005 (Ogmore @ Brynmenyn)	0.319	52	53.0	0.203	0.148	0.761
74001 (Duddon @ Duddon Hall)	0.341	54	120.9	0.149	0.228	0.699
47024 (Tavy @ Tavistock Abbey Bridge)	0.361	27	92.6	0.200	0.089	0.915
55004 (Irfon @ Abernant)	0.374	45	56.5	0.160	0.254	0.735

58006 (Mellte @ Pontneddfechan)	0.518	50	89.4	0.177	0.120	0.646
46008 (Avon @ Loddiswell)	0.520	41	63.1	0.172	0.101	2.666
96004 (Strathmore @ Allnabad)	0.593	19	198.5	0.183	0.234	0.505
73017 (Kent @ Bowston)	0.622	22	66.3	0.207	0.354	2.386
60006 (Gwili @ Glangwili)	0.646	53	83.1	0.176	0.158	0.062
47020 (Inny @ Bealsmill)	0.667	38	34.5	0.201	0.109	0.724
79004 (Scar Water @ Capenoch)	0.722	58	140.4	0.122	0.152	1.616
Total		550				
Weighted means				0.174	0.151	

7.3 Model inflow derivation metadata

Table 7-1 provides details of the storm duration, ARF and season used to generate the hydraulic model inflows. It also identifies whether rural or urban results were used – as URBEXT₂₀₀₀ is >0.30 only for BAG04 all other inflows use rural results.

Table 7-1: Model inflow derivation metadata

Inflow	Duration (hr)	ARF	Season	Rural or Urban results
FFRWD01_IA	5.25	0.936	Winter	Rural
FFRWD02_IA	5.25	0.936	Winter	Rural
FFRWD03	5.25	0.936	Winter	Rural
BAG01_IA	4.25	0.956	Summer	Rural
BAG02	4.25	0.956	Summer	Rural
BAG03	4.25	0.956	Summer	Rural
BAG04	4.25	0.956	Summer	Urban
AFAN01_IA	10.5	0.923	Winter	Rural
AFAN02	10.5	0.923	Winter	Rural

Offices at

Bristol
Coleshill
Doncaster
Dublin
Edinburgh
Exeter
Glasgow
Haywards Heath
Leeds
Limerick
Newcastle upon Tyne
Newport
Peterborough
Portsmouth
Saltaire
Skipton
Tadcaster
Thirsk
Wallingford
Warrington

Registered Office
1 Broughton Park
Old Lane North
Broughton
SKIPTON
North Yorkshire
BD23 3FD
United Kingdom

+44(0)1756 799919
info@jbaconsulting.co
m
www.jbaconsulting.com
Follow us:  

Jeremy Benn
Associates Limited

Registered in England
3246693

JBA Group Ltd is
certified to:
ISO 9001:2015
ISO 14001:2015
ISO 27001:2013
ISO 45001:2018