

Response to the Petitions Committee

Petition P-06-1572 – Flooding on the B4318 and the Tenby Catchment

Thank you for providing the Cabinet Secretary's response dated 26 January 2026 for consideration.

I welcome the acknowledgement that flooding at this location is driven by compound factors including surface water run-off, elevated River Ritec levels and tidal locking at the South Beach outfall. I also welcome confirmation that Natural Resources Wales (NRW) is progressing a catchment-level appraisal, with an Outline Business Case anticipated in summer 2026.

1. A Structural Gap in the FCERM Funding Framework

The response confirms that the site does not currently meet Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) capital funding criteria because flooding primarily affects transport infrastructure rather than residential or commercial property.

This highlights a material policy gap. The B4318 is a key access route to Tenby, a major coastal settlement and nationally significant tourism destination. Repeated flooding results in isolation of the town, disruption to emergency access, economic impacts on local businesses and wider network resilience implications.

In the context of increasing extreme rainfall and rising sea levels, the exclusion of strategic transport isolation from funding eligibility appears increasingly difficult to justify.

2. Compound Flooding Requires Integrated Governance

The hydrological mechanism at this location is systemically interconnected. Surface water run-off, highway drainage, river capacity and tidal discharge constraints operate as a single hydraulic system.

I would welcome clarity on whether NRW's Outline Business Case will explicitly model compound flooding, quantify highway closure frequency and incorporate long-term climate projections, and whether the Welsh Government intends to require a formally integrated cross-authority delivery framework.

3. Climate Adaptation: Reactive or Preventative?

The response indicates eligibility for FCERM funding may be reconsidered should risk to homes and businesses increase. If funding is triggered only once damage escalates, the framework becomes reactive rather than preventative.

Flooding at this site is already recurrent and measurable. I respectfully ask what threshold must be reached before transport isolation risk is considered strategically significant, whether the current position is intended to be temporary or acceptable in the long term, and how long affected communities should reasonably be expected to endure repeat closures before coordinated intervention is triggered.

4. Transport Funding as an Alternative Pathway

If transport resilience is excluded from FCERM, yet flood mitigation exceeds transport funding scope, the site risks falling between funding regimes. I would welcome clarification on whether transport funding can be blended with FCERM capital funding and whether joint funding models could be supported.

Conclusion

Communities affected by repeated flooding deserve clarity on whether this is a transitional issue pending structured intervention or an ongoing condition they must accept indefinitely.

Residents and businesses are not asking for exceptional treatment. They are asking for clarity, accountability and a realistic pathway to resolution.

I remain grateful to the Committee for its scrutiny of this matter and am happy to provide further evidence if required.

Cllr Rhys Jordan

St Florence & St Mary Out Liberty

Pembrokeshire County Council