

# HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## Decision Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Executive Member for Policy and Resources
<b>Date:</b>	18 July 2017
<b>Title:</b>	Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Simon Cramp

**Tel:** 01962 832348

**Email:** [simon.cramp@hants.gov.uk](mailto:simon.cramp@hants.gov.uk)

### 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. Further to the decision of Full Council on 16 February 2017 to allocate additional capital of £6million to Flood Defence Schemes, the purpose of this paper is to seek the Executive Member for Policy and Resources approval to the virement of £6million to the ETE capital programme. This is to enable all Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme funding to be managed within one department in order to maximise delivery against the schedule of prioritised and potential schemes outlined in appendices 1 and 2. This paper seeks to briefly set out the background to the current position, the outcome of a review of the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme and funding requirements, and the arrangements for managing the programme.

### 2. Background

- 2.1. Since 2011, the County Council has committed over £7.0million of capital resources to fund works for flood defence and coastal sites through its Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme.
- 2.2. Following the flooding in 2013/2014, in March 2014 the County Council submitted 33 bids to the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) for inclusion in the national Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) investment programme for 2015 – 2021.
- 2.3. The final outcome of the bids to Defra was confirmed in March 2015 with the publication of the FCERM programme for the next six years (2015/16 to 2020/21). Within Hampshire, 7 projects submitted by the County Council were allocated indicative Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) or funding, with 5 projects having indicative Local Levy (LL) funding via the relevant Regional Flood and Coastal Committee. So far, the County Council has been able to supplement local capital resources by drawing down in excess of £2million of funding from these, and other partnership funding sources.

- 2.4. A significant amount of work has taken place during the last 2 years to develop measures to improve flood risk management. This includes improvements undertaken by the County Council in its role as the Highway Authority to improve drainage or in its Emergency Planning role to help develop risk management at the local level, and many similar initiatives carried out by the County Council's district partners and local communities. However, towards the end of 2016 it had become increasingly apparent that a significant level of additional capital funding would be needed to support the development and delivery of schemes within the County Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme.

### **3. Programme and Funding Review**

- 3.1. In response to the large number of locations that had been identified for inclusion in the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme, and the potentially high demand for resources and funding, a prioritisation process was undertaken. As a result of this, the Executive Member for Environment and Transport approved on 15 September 2016 the restructuring of the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme as a 'Main Programme' and a 'Pipeline Programme' reflecting the overall priorities. Please see Appendix 1 and 2 for further details.
- 3.2. The 'Main Programme' includes the priority locations such as Buckskin in Basingstoke, Romsey and Winchester and these continue to be the main focus for the County Council. Locations in the 'Pipeline Programme' will be brought forward into the 'Main Programme', and be investigated further, as the higher ranked schemes are either shown not to be viable, additional resources become available or other circumstances such as a flood event cause a review of priorities.
- 3.3. At the same time as the prioritisation process an assessment was undertaken of the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme schemes in both the 'Main' and 'Pipeline' programme to identify the funding resources that would be needed to support the programme. This identified that a significant level of additional capital funding would be required.
- 3.4. This assessment was informed by the County Council's experience of the national FDGiA funding process since 2015. This had shown that the proportion of funding available from this source had reduced from the 60% originally anticipated to between 30-40%, with a proportionally higher balance therefore falling to the County Council and other funding partners.
- 3.5. The development of detailed designs has also shown higher costs for schemes compared to the estimates generated to meet the tight FDGiA bid submission deadlines in 2014. This has been highlighted with regards to the proposals for key priority works at Romsey and Buckskin in Basingstoke which, in addition to any further funding from partners locally, are expected to use almost all of the remaining County Council funding to proceed.

- 3.6 A summary of the original FDGiA bid process, the funding challenge facing the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme, and a request to provide additional capital investment of £6million was therefore presented to Full Council on 16th February 2017. The additional approved investment will allow the County Council to maintain a leading role in progressing delivery of further existing priority schemes in the 'Main' programme (see Appendix 1), to provide match funding to support bids and continue to engage other potential funding partners for other identified schemes (see Appendix 2).
- 3.7 Based on the County Council's present knowledge of the 50 plus locations represented by the 'Main' and 'Pipeline' programmes, current assessment of the extent and cost of flood risk reduction work that might be required at each, and understanding of the funding that could be available from national and local sources, it is estimated that the additional £6million investment would support the delivery of schemes listed in the 'Main' programme. The funding will also enable significant in-roads to be made into the implementation of measures at the locations identified in the 'Pipeline' programme.

#### **4. Programme Management**

- 4.1. Since 2011, the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme has been managed by the Economy, Transport and Environment Department on behalf of the County Council.
- 4.2. In response to the 2013/14 flood events, Cabinet set out in July 2014 provision for an additional £4.46million for flood related activities being led by the County Council. This was subsequently vired to the ETE capital programme with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport making decisions on the programme of works that the additional funding supported. It is proposed that a similar course of action is now taken in respect of the £6million approved on 16 February 2017.
- 4.3. On 16 June 2017, the Executive Member for Policy and Resources approved the proposal for a revised Rural Communities Fund including grant aid for the implementation of small scale community led flood alleviation schemes. First established in 2015, the fund provides an opportunity for rural communities to access financial support, commonly in the region of £5,000, to undertake local action to improve resilience. Unlike the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme, the Rural Communities Fund is promoted externally and has established a good level of visibility amongst rural parishes. This has enabled the County Council to help parishes to develop self-help initiatives more quickly, reduce the pressure on the County Council's resources to become involved, and to identify synergies with other rural initiatives. The fund complements the Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme where the focus is on those locations, urban and rural, where because of the level of risk, complexity, value and priority, the County Council is best placed to take the lead.

## **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1. That the Executive Member for Policy and Resources approves the virement of £6million to the Environment and Transport capital programme to enable all Flood Risk and Coastal Defence programme funding to be managed within one budget, and to maximise delivery against the schedule of prioritised and potential schemes outlined in Appendices 1 and 2.

**CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:****Links to the Corporate Strategy**

<b>Hampshire safer and more secure for all:</b>	yes
<b>Maximising well-being:</b>	no
<b>Enhancing our quality of place:</b>	yes

**Other Significant Links**

<b>Links to previous Member decisions:</b>		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date</u>
Cabinet Report - Capital programme 2014/15 to 2016/17	5893	21 July 2014
<a href="#">2016-09-15-EMET Decision Day-Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme - Priorities</a>	7526	15 September 2016
<a href="#">2017-02-02 Cabinet Decision - Revenue Budget &amp; Precept 2017/18</a>	7885	16 February 2017
2017-06-16 EMPR RPT Rural Delivery - Rural Grants		16 June 2017
<b>Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives</b>		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	

**Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents**

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

DocumentLocation

None

## **IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:**

### **1. Equality Duty**

1.1. The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

**Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:**

- a) The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- c) Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

### **1.2. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

It is considered that the proposal will have no impact on groups with protected characteristics as the priorities within this proposal are based on the risk of flooding in a geographical location and is not based on groups or individuals.

### **2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:**

2.1. The development of the priorities contained within this proposal has no impact on Crime and Disorder.

### **3. Climate Change:**

a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

The proposals seek to reduce the high demand for resources including energy that is typical of individuals, communities and risk management authorities impacted by a flood emergency and / or in a recovery phase

- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

The outcomes of the work supported by this proposal will help communities to become more resilient to flooding events, and considers the effects of extreme events.

**Appendix 1 – Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme – ‘Main’ Programme**

<b>Location</b>	<b>District</b>
Buckskin, Basingstoke.	Basingstoke and Deane
Romsey	Test Valley
Winchester (incl. Littleton, Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy)	Winchester
Bourne Rivulet (incl. St. Mary Bourne, Stoke, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Vernham Dean, Upton and Ibthorpe)	Basingstoke and Deane / Test Valley
Hursley	Winchester
Calmore Road, Totton	New Forest
Copythorne	New Forest
Candover Brook (Preston and Brown Candover).	Basingstoke and Deane
Wickham	Winchester
Lower Farringdon and Chawton	East Hants
Ringwood	New Forest
Sutton Scotney	Winchester
Beeches Lane, Bishops Waltham	Winchester
River Lavant (Finchdean, Rowlands Castle).	East Hants
Twyford	Winchester
Rectory Road, Farnborough	Rushmoor
School Lane, Chandlers Ford	Eastleigh

**Appendix 2 - Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme – ‘Pipeline’ Programme**

<b>Location</b>	<b>District</b>
Wallington	Fareham
Fleet Road, Cove, Farnborough	Rushmoor
Fordingbridge and Breamore	New Forest
The Pentons and Monxton	Test Valley
Pitt, Winchester	Winchester
Watery Lane, Upper Clatford	Test Valley
Spencer Road, New Milton	New Forest
Sycamore Road, Farnborough	Rushmoor
Monks Brook, Chandler's Ford.	Eastleigh
Goodworth and Clatford	Test Valley
Upper Test (Deane, Cole Henley).	Basingstoke
West Tytherley	Test Valley
Chandlers Lane, Yateley	Hart
Longparish	Test Valley
Bishops Sutton	Winchester
Church Lane East, Aldershot	Rushmoor
Appleshaw	Test Valley



## Appendices

Micheldever	Winchester
Mapledurwell	Basingstoke
Owslebury	Winchester
Butts Ash Lane, Hythe	New Forest