

Location: Athleague, Co. Roscommon		Unique ID: 265481 (from PFRA database)	
Initial OPW Designation	APSR <input type="checkbox"/>	AFRR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IRR <input type="checkbox"/>
Co-ordinates	Easting: 182846	Northing: 257436	
River / Catchment / Sub-catchment	Suck / Shannon		
Type of Flooding / Flood Risk (identify all that apply)	Fluvial non-tidal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fluvial tidal <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal <input type="checkbox"/>		

Stage 1: Desktop Review	
1.1 Flood History (include review of Floodmaps.ie)	<p>River Flow Path The River Suck flows around and through the west end of Athleague.</p> <p>Flood Event Records Seven flood events are recorded on floodmaps.ie. The most significant of which relates to the November 2009 event.</p>
1.2 Relevant information on flooding issues from OPW and LA staff	<p>PFRA database comments (<i>in italics</i>):</p> <p>OPW comments <i>Not designated APSR as failed to reach predictive analysis threshold. Includes groundwater flooding, not part of CFRAM. Strongly recommended by LA as APSR. Did not agree with APP_Comment</i></p> <p>LA comments <i>Athleague / Rockwood (house flooded) Business Premises Turlough system - rockwood area Lot of agricultural land National secondary route More prolonged Compare with satellite imagery. 18 Properties flooded in '09. Local Authority study carried out. Strongly recommended as APSR. Weir in town requires management on River Suck</i></p> <p>Meeting / discussion summary comments:</p> <p>OPW comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional OPW staff had no information on flood risk in Athleague. <p>LA comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the 2009 event 30 properties and some businesses flooded. Feasibility study carried out and has proposed solutions. Some minor works carried out since November 2009, however, these are not designed to mitigate for large flood events. There are weirs in the town, however gradient of the river and out of bank flow paths results in the water level on one side of the town being the same as the other. Flood defences are the most likely solution with a pump for surface water, no surface water drainage in town and this also causes flooding. Mill rights in the town are a cause for local concern.

1.4 PFRA Data			
1.4.1 PFRA hazard mapping	PFRA mapping available in GIS layer:		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
	PFRA mapping included on FRR map:		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.2 Summary of Principal Receptors	Type	FRI score (if available)	
	Receptors not considered as part of the PFRA process. FRI score not calculated in PFRA.		
1.7 Stage 1 Evaluation	Aspect	Clearly APSR	Uncertain
	Flood History (1.1)	X	
	OPW / LA Information (1.2)	X	
	PFRA Evaluation (1.4)		X
	Overall Desktop Evaluation (if any above aspect is uncertain then overall designation is uncertain)		X
1.8 Proposed level of assessment for Stage 2 site visits	Level A Site Visit		X
	Level B Site Visit		

Stage 2: Site Inspection		Level A Assessment		
Date and Time of Inspection		Date: 11/05/11		
		Time: 17:00		
Names of inspection team (including OPW/LA staff if present)		Peter Smyth		
		James Murray		
2.1 Ground-truthing of Hazard Mapping	Fluvial non-tidal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fluvial tidal <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal <input type="checkbox"/> Not available <input type="checkbox"/>			
	PFRA mapping may underestimate the flood risk in Athleague.			
2.2 Spot check ground-truthing of selected receptor vulnerability (also note any key receptors noted during visit that are not identified by PFRA)	Receptor Type	Location description (if not obvious)	Exists?	Overall Vulnerability / Risk (L / M / H)
	Properties	Left bank	Yes	High
	Retail	Right bank	Yes	High
2.3 Local knowledge - on-site comments (OPW, LA and any info volunteered by local residents during visit)	No on-site comments.			
2.4 Comments on hydraulic constrictions (bridges, etc.) and conveyance routes	The bridge over the Suck at Athleague has 4 arches and two relief arches. There is a weir and sluices upstream of the bridge. There is also an inoperable mill wheel on the left bank just upstream of the bridge.			

2.5 SVRS Assessment Matrix												
Weightings: A - x1 - reasonable expectation of flooding B - x2 - high expectation of flooding C - x5 - risk to life												
Approx. Number	1 to 4				5 to 20				>20			
Weighting		A	B	C		A	B	C		A	B	C
Property (domestic)	10				100				200	X		
Property (small retail or business)	20	X			200				400			
Property (large retail or business)	50				500				1000			
Road or Rail Infrastructure	30	X			300				600			
Critical Infrastructure (local) [hospital, school, police/fire/ambulance station, substation, WTW/WWTW, gov bldg, other (specify)]	50				500				1000			
Critical Infrastructure (national importance)	250				1000				2000			
Cultural Heritage Site	20				200				400			
Environmental Designated Site	20				200				400			
Hazardous Substances Site	50				500				1000			
Total SVRS									250			
2.6 Defence Assets												
Formal and Informal Flood Defence Assets <i>(include effective and ineffective assets to inform asset survey and potential mitigation measures)</i>	Open Channel Watercourses Man-made river channel <input type="checkbox"/> Flood relief channel <input type="checkbox"/> Canal <input type="checkbox"/> Mill leat <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drainage channels / back drains <input type="checkbox"/>											
	Bridges and Culvert crossings Single Arch bridge <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Arch bridge <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single Span bridge <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Span bridge <input type="checkbox"/> Box culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Pipe culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Arch Culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/>											
	Culverted Watercourses (culvert length is greater than just a crossing) Box culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Pipe culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Arch Culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Irregular Culvert(s) <input type="checkbox"/>											
	Walls and Embankments Embankment(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Raised wall(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Retaining wall(s) <input type="checkbox"/>											
	Control Structures – weirs, gates, dams Fixed crest weir <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustable weir <input type="checkbox"/> Dam / Barrage <input type="checkbox"/> Sluice gates <input type="checkbox"/> Lock gates <input type="checkbox"/> Radial gates <input type="checkbox"/>											
	Storage On-line storage (natural) <input type="checkbox"/> On-line storage (artificial) <input type="checkbox"/> Off-line storage <input type="checkbox"/>											
	Outfalls Flapped outfall(s) into watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> Unflapped outfall(s) into watercourse <input type="checkbox"/> <i>i.e. from smaller watercourses, drains etc. into river / estuary / sea</i> Tidal flap(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Tidal sluice(s) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>i.e. from main watercourse into estuary / sea</i>											

	Other Pumping Station <input type="checkbox"/> Erosion Protection <input type="checkbox"/> Sand Dunes <input type="checkbox"/> Additional notes (if required):
2.8 Initial Potential Mitigation Measures	
Non-structural measures	Planning and Development control <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems <input type="checkbox"/> Flood forecasting / warning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in Operating Procedures for water level control: <input type="checkbox"/> Public awareness campaign <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual property protection <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land use management <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Structural measures	Strategic development management for floodplain development: <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(integration of measures into strategic development proposals)</i> Storage: On-line <input type="checkbox"/> Off-line <input type="checkbox"/> Flow diversion: Flood relief channel <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood relief culvert <input type="checkbox"/> Increase conveyance: Bridge works <input type="checkbox"/> Channel works <input type="checkbox"/> Floodplain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood defences: Walls <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Embankments <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Localised works: Defence raising <input type="checkbox"/> In-fill gaps <input type="checkbox"/> Trash screen <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance works: Culvert / channel clearance <input type="checkbox"/> Asset maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> Relocation of properties: <input type="checkbox"/> Improve existing defences: <input type="checkbox"/> (describe) Other (describe):

Outcomes				
PFRA Designation	APSR <input type="checkbox"/> not an APSR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRR <input type="checkbox"/> FRI Score: Not scored			
Site Ground-truthing of PFRA Assessment (hazard mapping and receptors)	High Confidence (good)	Uncertain	Low Confidence (poor)	Not available
		X		
Site Visit Review Score	250			
Recommended Designation	APSR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not an APSR <input type="checkbox"/> IRR <input type="checkbox"/>			
Summary Comments (if required)	Athleague is recommended as an APSR on the historical evidence of flooding, particularly in November 2009, and the number of critical receptors significantly at risk of fluvial flooding.			



Photo1: Right bank upstream of bridge in Athleague.



Photo 2: Sluice gates upstream of bridge in Athleague.



Photo 3: River Suck downstream of Bridge in Athleague.



Photo 4: Properties on right bank of River Suck downstream of bridge, potentially at risk.

