

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004512/25
to the Commission
Cristina Guarda (Verts/ALE)
(13 November 2025)

Subject: ANAS' San Vito di Cadore bypass

The San Vito di Cadore on the SS51 Alemagna state road formed part of the 2017 commissarial plan for upgrading the road network for the 2021 Alpine World Ski Championships. Acceptance testing was scheduled for 31 December 2022 ⁽¹⁾, but work is still incomplete and dogged by serious problems.

The bypass is being contested by the citizens' committee '*NO Variante ANAS San Vito di Cadore*' (NO to ANAS's San Vito di Cadore bypass).

On 22 March 2023, the Accounting Office for the Veneto Region opened an investigation into the lack of legislative backing for the work.

The Western Alps Basin Authority (*Autorità di bacino Alpi Orientali*) issued a favourable opinion for the bypass, subject to specific requirements ⁽²⁾ relating to flood safety being met, which would not seem to be the case.

On 4 August 2015, a landslide in the area concerned claimed three victims, highlighting the hydrogeological vulnerability of the site.

The municipality of San Vito di Cadore was covered by the national declaration of a state of emergency ⁽³⁾ following the exceptional weather events of June 2025.

The bypass is not part of the works for the 2026 Winter Olympics ⁽⁴⁾ and will not be completed in time for them ⁽⁵⁾, despite a delivery deadline of 14 November 2025.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state whether the construction of this bypass without proper assessment of the hydrogeological risks and without legislative backing is in line with EU legislation ⁽⁶⁾ and what initiatives it plans to take in this regard?

Submitted: 13.11.2025

Answer given by Ms Roswall on behalf of the European Commission
(21 January 2026)

The 'Construction of roads [...]' is included in point 10(e) of Annex II of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) ⁽¹⁾ Directive.

Under Article 4(2) of the EIA Directive, 'Subject to Article 2(4), for projects listed in Annex II, Member States shall determine whether the project shall be made subject to an assessment in accordance with Articles 5 to 10.

Member States shall make that determination through: (a) a case-by-case examination; or (b) thresholds or criteria set by the Member State'.

Flood risk management is addressed at EU level by the Floods Directive (FD) ⁽²⁾. The FD establishes a framework to reduce flood risks via the elaboration of Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) ⁽³⁾ by the Member States ⁽⁴⁾. Flood risk management objectives and measures are determined at national level based on local or regional circumstances ⁽⁵⁾.

¹ Article 61(21) of Decree-Law No 50/2017.

² At the Conference of Services of 30 November 2020.

³ Decision of the Prime Minister's Office of 28 August 2025.

⁴ Report of the Italian Court of Auditors, Central Audit Chamber, of 10 November 2025, p. 130 — Table 33.

⁵ Report of the Italian Court of Auditors, Central Audit Chamber, of 10 November 2025, p. 143 — Table 47.

⁶ In particular, with Directive 2011/92/EU on environmental impact assessment, Directive 2007/60/EC on flood risks and the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (codification), OJ L 26, 28.1.2012, p. 1-21; Directive 2014/52/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 amending Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 124, 25.4.2014, p. 1-18.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007, p. 27-34.

⁽³⁾ The FD does not address individual projects as such.

⁽⁴⁾ SWD(2005) 18 final.

⁽⁵⁾ Even where an area is labelled as a potentially significant flood risk area in the FRMPs drawn up under the FD, national authorities are responsible for deciding whether an activity should take place in that area, based for example on costs and benefits and/or town planning rules.

Under Article 3(4) of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive ⁽⁶⁾, ‘Member States shall determine whether plans and programmes, other than those referred to in paragraph 2, which set the framework for future development consent of projects, are likely to have significant environmental effects’. FRMPs fall within the scope of this provision.

In addition, when assessing the environmental impact of a new project under the EIA Directive, the competent national authorities may also assess the compatibility of the project with the FRMP adopted for that district.

Without prejudice to the Commission’s role as guardian of the Treaties, it is for the Italian competent authorities to apply the above rules and procedures to this project. The Commission may decide to intervene if systemic issues with the application of these provisions of EU law arise ⁽⁷⁾.

⁽⁶⁾ Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment OJ L 197, 21.7.2001, pp. 30-37.

⁽⁷⁾ As set out in Communication of 19 January 2017 ‘EU law: Better results through better application’, C/2016/8600, OJ C 18, 19.1.2017, and in Communication of 13 October 2022 ‘Enforcing EU law for a Europe that delivers’, COM(2022) 518 final.