

Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director for Environment & Economy

| | |
|------------|---|
| Report to: | Flood and Drainage Management Scrutiny Committee |
| Date: | 11 December 2015 |
| Subject: | Common Works Programme & Lincolnshire County Council Capital Schemes 2015-16 |

Summary:

The report provides the Committee with the latest position on the Common Works Programme for 2015-16, including the current programme for surface water management schemes.

Actions Required:

To consider actions in progress to deliver the current programme of works to manage local flood risk.

1. Background

The Joint Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Drainage Management Strategy is delivered through a Common Works Programme, which encompasses the full range of work undertaken by flood risk management authorities across Lincolnshire. The Common Works Programme is fully updated annually, but is also sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes as opportunities and circumstances change throughout the year.

In line with the Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Drainage Management Partnership's policy of maintaining the greatest possible public openness, the Common Works Programme for 2015-16 is published on Lincolnshire County Council's website. It distinguishes between 'core' activities, which are those that Risk Management Authorities undertake in the normal course of their duties, and 'joint' activities which are those where two or more authorities have come together to deliver a solution.

A 'core' activity, for example, might be the regular maintenance and repairs carried out on watercourses by the Environment Agency or Internal Drainage Boards. In contrast, joint activities would include schemes such as the fluvial flood relief schemes at Louth and Horncastle. While management of main rivers is an operational responsibility for the Environment Agency, the need for funding from partners to ensure the work takes place makes it part of the joint programme.

This principle means that partners are not precluded from assisting each other in delivering 'core' works should the need for co-operation arise, and should the priority of the activity require such additional support.

For this reason, while the County Council's responsibility for surface water flood risk (among other matters), falls within the 'core' section of the Common Works Programme, the Council has developed a programme of such works in consultation with its partners and with an eye to opportunities for joint working. Government funding is obtained through the Environment Agency Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) process, with schemes being assessed on a cost benefit basis with the County Council making contributions and delivering the schemes.

A business case was submitted in December 2012 identifying a spend profile over the three years 2013/14 to 2015/16 requiring contributions from the County Council totalling £1.7M. An overall capital allocation of £1.3M was approved for the 2014/15 and 2015/16 financial years, with the revenue allocation being used in support. A similar business case was submitted in June this year for a further capital allocation for the 2016/17 financial year, with £630,000 being approved as a contribution to an indicative programme value of just over £2 million.

The Environment Agency's FDGiA process is a complex process requiring Project Appraisal Board approval before final scheme allocations are approved. The annual spend profile also has to be aligned with the Environment Agency's Medium Term Plan (MTP), which is approved in January each year by the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC). Consequently the programme of Lead Local Flood Authority works has to be adapted. It should also be noted that some schemes intentionally span financial years.

Conclusion

The attached Appendix A identifies the latest projected spend profile for this financial year and the programme of surface water schemes that are planned. It is important to note, however, that details of the programme (including financial forecasts) may change should there be changes to the MTP as a result of further investigation work and the FDGiA approval process.

3. Consultation

There are no policy proofing actions required.

4. Appendices - These are listed below and attached at the back of the report

| |
|---|
| Appendix A: Lincolnshire County Council Latest Programme of Local Flood Risk Management Works for 2015-16 |
|---|

5. Background Papers - No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by Mark Welsh & David Hickman, who can be contacted on
01522 782070 or via email: Mark.Welsh@lincolnshire.gov.uk
or David.Hickman@lincolnshire.gov.uk

Lincolnshire County Council - Latest Programme of Local Flood Risk Management Works for 2015-16

| Scheme title | Investigation & feasibility | Work carried out on site | Current est number of properties at risk of internal flooding | Est overall scheme cost | Est overall LCC total contribution | Est overall scheme spend in 2015/16 | Est FDGiA & other contribution in 2015/16 | Est LCC contribution in 2015/16 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | | £ | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Boston, Marsh Lane | ✓ | ✓ | TBC | 8,000 | 4,000 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 2,000 |
| Cherry Willingham, Sycamore Rd | ✓ | | 6 | 95,000 | 57,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 0 |
| Crowland | ✓ | ✓ | TBC | 68,000 | 34,000 | 4,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 |
| Digby | ✓ | | 20 | 173,000 | 50,000 | 23,000 | 13,000 | 10,000 |
| Folkingham | ☐ | ✓ | | 124,700 | 62,350 | 3,000 | 0 | 3,000 |
| Heighington, Fen Lane | ☐ | ✓ | 5 | 84,000 | 64,000 | 58,500 | 0 | 58,500 |
| Holbeach | ✓ | | 40 | 230,000 | 138,000 | 15,000 | 0 | 15,000 |
| Horncastle | ✓ | | 26 | 300,000 | 100,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 10,000 |
| Keelby | ✓ | | TBC | 30,000 | 30,000 | 20,000 | 0 | 20,000 |
| Kirkby on Bain | ✓ | | 13 | 175,000 | 77,000 | 35,000 | 0 | 35,000 |
| Lincoln, Bunkers Hill | ✓ | | 3 | 98,000 | 43,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 10,000 |
| Lincoln, Stamp End | ✓ | | 82 | 830,000 | 265,000 | 630,000 | 509,000 | 121,000 |
| Middle Rasen | ✓ | | 15 | 235,000 | 168,000 | 25,000 | 5,000 | 20,000 |
| Morton nr. Bourne, Station Rd | ✓ | | 16 | 430,000 | 237,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 10,000 |
| Nettleham | ✓ | | 2 | 22,000 | 7,000 | 5,000 | 0 | 5,000 |
| Newton nr. Haceby | ✓ | | 7 | 150,000 | 105,000 | 25,000 | 0 | 25,000 |
| Ruskington | ✓ | | 12 | 100,000 | 50,000 | 35,000 | 25,000 | 10,000 |
| Scopwick, Scothern Road | ✓ | | 2 | 20,000 | 10,000 | 15,000 | 10,000 | 5,000 |
| Spalding | ✓ | | 19 | 225,000 | 70,000 | 50,000 | 0 | 50,000 |
| Sturton by Stow, Fleets Road | ✓ | | 6 | 77,000 | 77,000 | 20,000 | 0 | 20,000 |
| Timberland | ✓ | | TBC | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 0 | 15,000 |
| Toynton St Peter | ✓ | | TBC | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 0 | 15,000 |
| Ripingale | ✓ | ✓ | TBC | 65,000 | 65,000 | 65,000 | 0 | 65,000 |
| Walcott, High Street & The Drift | ✓ | ✓ | 10 | 260,000 | 209,000 | 11,500 | 0 | 11,500 |
| Washingborough, Keeble Drive | | ✓ | 40 | 740,000 | 555,200 | 109,000 | 104,000 | 5,000 |
| 25 SCHEMES TOTAL | | | 324 | 4,569,700 | 2,507,550 | 1,218,000 | 674,000 | 544,000 |