

# ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

## REPORT TO AND DECISION OF CABINET ON 19 OCTOBER 2020

<b>SUBJECT:</b> Engineering Services Annual Review 2020
---

<b>REPORT AUTHOR:</b>	Roger Spencer – Engineering Services Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	07 September 2020
<b>EXTN:</b>	37812
<b>PORTFOLIO AREA:</b>	Technical Services

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The report is presented as an update on the Council's Engineering Service Area and explores the issues addressed in the preceding year and outlines matters that have arisen, or are foreseen for the coming year, across the service area.

Specific matters relating to the Pagham coastal defences, River Arun Internal Drainage Board, Community Flood Fund and Defra / Environment Agency recently published documents are included. This report also recommends that the Council considers designating a Coastal Change Management Area.

The report also seeks to request future budgetary provision for a number of these matters particularly proposed future expenditure at Pagham and a continuation of the Community Flood Fund.

### RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cabinet is requested to:

- (1) Note the report;
- (2) Approve the contributions from the Community Flood Fund noted at Paragraph 1.4.3;
- (3) Endorse a £50,000 'top-up' to the Community Flood Fund in the 2021/22 Budget;
- (4) Support the Council making a bid to the Defra/EA Innovative Flood and Coastal Resilience Programme
- (5) Endorse the inclusion of £50,000 in each of 2021/22 & 2022/23 to be available for the purpose of beach material recycling at Pagham beach;
- (6) Approve the use of the Community Flood Fund to supplement the Coast Protection revenue budget, subject to approval in accordance with the scheme of delegation, not to exceed a total of £50,000 per annum.

- (7 ) authorise the Engineering Services Manager to undertake the necessary preparatory work relating to the three new schemes shown within Appendix 1 to the report, and to make funding applications to the Environment Agency; and
- (8) authorise Officers to enter discussions regarding new arrangements relating to the River Arun Internal Drainage Board in accordance with paragraph 1.10.5 of the report.

Cabinet is also requested to ask Full Council to:

- (9) approve a supplementary estimate of £30,000 (which equates to a band D equivalent of £0.48) with underspends carried forward to future financial years, to investigate the introduction of a Coastal Change Management Area.

## **1. BACKGROUND:**

### **1.1 The review covers:**

- Coastal Defence
- Land Drainage and
- Structural & General
- Other

### **1.2 Coastal Defence**

#### **DEFRA / Environment Agency Matters**

- 1.2.1. As noted in previous Coast Protection Reviews (latterly presented in the form of an Individual Cabinet Member decision), capital schemes identified for future years have been included in the Environment Agency (EA)'s Capital Investment Programme [CIP]. A streamlined approach to populating/updating the CIP has been introduced by the EA, with an online system (Project Application Funding Service – PAFS) which has simplified the system. Three new schemes have been added this year.
- 1.2.2. Local Authorities are tasked with finding 10% efficiency savings on EA Grant aided schemes and to get 15% Partnership Funding across the programme. The criteria for Partnership Funding (PF) have recently changed slightly but the overall concept remains the same: depending on its priority, a proposed scheme will usually require 3rd party / community contributions; the lower the priority the higher the level of local contribution(s) required for the scheme to proceed. Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA or GiA) is only eligible on schemes with a cost:benefit ratio greater than 1.
- 1.2.3. PF will continue to feature as an important and necessary part of the scheme preparation process, as 100% Government funding is unlikely to be forthcoming for future schemes (see 1.4 below).
- 1.2.4. The forward programme is provided as Appendix 1 to this report.

- 1.2.5. Climate Change - The Government's online guidance can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/climate-change-explained>.
- 1.2.6. A report was presented to Cabinet on 3 June 2019 following the production of the Committee on Climate Change's report (<https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/managing-the-coast-in-a-changing-climate/>).
- 1.2.7. The Met Office produces climate change projections; the latest was in 2018 (UKCIP18) and can be found at <https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/approach/collaboration/ukcp/about>. These projections are required to be accounted for in the design of flood and coastal defence risk management schemes.
- 1.2.8. The Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) has recently published its policy for flood and coastal risk management; this is augmented by the EA's strategy for delivery of this Policy.
- 1.3 South East Coastal Group – The Group is Officer based but Elected Members are welcome to attend an annual review meeting of the Regional Monitoring Programme. From this, Members from across the Group's large geographical area are better informed of the Group's work. The meeting is usually late in the calendar year – due to COVID-19, the event this year will be a virtual one, on 14 October 2020.

#### 1.4 Partnership Funding / Community Flood Fund / Local Levy.

- 1.4.1. Arun allocated three annual sums of £250,000 within its Forward Capital Programme (starting in 2016/17), for contributions to a Community Flood Fund, enabling Partnership Funding contributions to be made. This is intended to meet the requirements of a range of coastal erosion and flood risk reduction schemes (coastal and inland) across the District.
- 1.4.2. With the three yearly contributions to the fund, and outgoings (made or committed) of £261,000, and for which approval is sought (£245,000) the fund would stand at £244,000. Contributions have leveraged other funding sources schemes and enabled schemes valued at around £10m to go forward.
- 1.4.3. The following contributions have been made, are put forward for approval or anticipated

Scheme	Contribution Amount £k	Contribution Status	Comment
Pagham Inland Banks	40	complete	EA scheme (£1.5m) to improve risk to 80 properties from Harbour 'back door' flooding

Elmer Flood Alleviation Scheme	40	Approved	EA scheme (£4m) to reduce erosion and flood risk to >200 homes
Arundel Flood Defences	96	Approved	EA scheme (£4.7m to reduce erosion and flood risk to >130 homes
Watercourse Management	20	Approved	ADC package scheme to improve various watercourses (total value £90k)
Western Beach Management	40	Approved	ADC scheme to provide 4 phases of enhanced maintenance to assets (£256k)
Post Storm / Elmer	15	Delegated Approval	Minor works following named storms, taking advantage of EA scheme to 'win' surplus material
Peak Lane	10	Delegated Approval	60K scheme to extend beach outfall and improve ditch system upstream (£60k)
Groyne replacements	75	anticipated	Aldwick. Combined scheme estimates £930k (funding routes / amount under consideration)
Beach Management Plan II	40	Approval requested	ADC scheme to provide 4 phases of enhancement to coastal assets - 79 properties to lower erosion risk band (£256k)
Water Lane, Angmering, Flood Alleviation Black Ditch	50	Approval requested	WSCC (LLFA) scheme with GiA and developer contributions. Final scheme and estimate currently being developed but likely to be in excess of £500k.
Rustington Flood Wall	80	anticipated	£301k moving 80 properties to a lower risk band (flooding)
NB Further commitment requests are likely for next phase of Groyne Replacements (Rustington) and defences to West Bank of River Arun			

- 1.4.4. With further schemes coming forward that will require Partnership Funding in the coming years, likely to exceed £500,000, the fund needs to be ‘topped up’ if it is to continue to fulfil its objective. Reflecting the Council’s financial position, the recommendation of this report is to top-up with a modest £50,000 for 2021/22, whilst recognising that in itself this top-up will be insufficient to continue to fulfil the objective of the fund in the years ahead.

See also 1.7.7 - 1.7.9 where further usage of the Fund is suggested.

- 1.4.5. An alternative funding method is Local Levy; this is a relatively small fund administered by the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee. Local Levy is used where the strict requirements of Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) are not met but the scheme is considered worthwhile nonetheless. It is agreed with the Environment Agency which funding route is appropriate to follow; PF contributions are welcomed as part of Levy funding, which show the promoter’s commitment.

## 1.5 Coastal Monitoring

- 1.5.1. The Council’s frontage can be divided into 6 Survey Units (exc. Pagham Harbour);

- 1.5.2. The Regional Monitoring Project provides volumetric and percentage changes of the beaches. However, these are averaged across the whole unit are typically small and can be misleading; therefore, a commentary for the most recent reported annual change (Spring ’19 – Spring ’20) is given below:

- Eastern Beaches (Ferring to Rustington) : Inconsistent patches of accretion and erosion across the majority of the unit, with larger patches of accretion between Broadmark Lane. and Sea Avenue. A wider expanse of erosion is also present along East Preston Beach between Sea Ln. and S. Strand. An overall small net loss for the unit.
- Littlehampton : Small amounts of accretion and erosion across the unit. Main erosion is concentrated at the Western end of the unit, with a significant amount of erosion occurring just South of Norfolk Gardens. A very small net loss for the unit overall
- Climping : Not managed by Arun District Council – Unit is dominated mainly by erosion, with notable rates at the end of Climping St. from 4dSU19.023 to 4dSU19.031. Accretion occurring towards the Eastern end of the unit, with a small amount of erosion occurring by Littlehampton harbour arm. A net loss overall for the unit.
- Elmer : Accretion across the unit, with the most significant rates occurring behind the rock revetments at the upper foreshore. Some notable erosion patches located at 4dSU20.025 and 4dSU20.027. A small net gain overall for the unit.
- Bognor Regis (Aldwick to Middleton on Sea) : A rather even spread of accretion and erosion across the unit. Larger rates of erosion can be seen at the far west and east ends of the unit, with some significant pockets of accretion around Davenport Road Felpham. There is a small net loss overall for this unit.

- Pagham Beach (inc western part of Aldwick) : (see further discussion on the situation at Pagham Beach below) : Accretion is widely spread through much of the unit, with most significant amounts occurring at the far West of the unit. Erosion is concentrated east of East Front Road. A net gain overall for the unit.

### 1.5.3. Pagham Beach

- 1..5.3.1 The dynamic situation has been outlined in several previous reports and the situation continues to evolve. The spit naturally breached in 2016 but whilst the initial breach was about 200m wide, it widened to the extent that the root of the spit was almost back to the 2004 state (i.e. the channel flowing almost straight out to sea. However, the spit has since started to re-grow and is now in excess of 300m long (it was around 1,000m long when it breached). The focus of attention continues to be East Front Road, where the crest has not been naturally supplemented with shingle, moving under littoral drift, as quickly as might have been expected, following the spit breach and the separated portion of the spit 'welding' back to the main beach.
- 1..5.3.2 With the re-growth there has been a landward migration of the outlet channel to the point where there is now flow into the Little Lagoon. This does not present an immediate threat to property but as we have seen, things can develop quickly. There is, therefore, close liaison with the community and other stakeholders, and a Beach Action Plan is nearing completion. This should aid undertaking works considered necessary in a timely fashion but there is certainly no guarantee that circumstances will hold true to predictions – which, it must be said, have low confidence level.
- 1..5.3.3 With the weather forecasts over the winter of 2019/20 predicting stormy conditions, modest but urgent interventions took place to proactively strengthen the crest in the central section of East Front Road. This shingle recycling work proved a worthwhile precaution with the landfall of three named storms. No properties were lost or flooded.
- 1..5.3.4 A specific sum of £250,000 was set aside in 2015 (see Council 5 November 2014 - minute 340); this was expended in 2019/20 and had to be supplemented to allow the interventions to take place. The Coast Protection Revenue Budget (F30) has been supplemented from the Contingency Fund to provide £50,000 in 2020/21, to enable further interventions to take place, depending on the severity of weather/wave conditions and on how the beach at East Front Road erodes or accretes.
- 1..5.3.5 As has been noted in previous reports, the nature of Pagham Beach is dynamic and unpredictable. However, past experience leads an assumption of probable need for these interventions– these would be used to reduce risk but not guarantee safeguarding property – whilst technically feasible, these sums would only allow for beach material recycling if that material were to exist on the beach and not put other property at unacceptable risk if it were to be recycled. Obtaining material from other sources (e.g. offshore) would be an order of magnitude or more and not within the scope of this this (Contingency Fund) funding.

1..5.3.6 This situation is clearly not sustainable financially, environmentally or technically; it is recommended that investigations be undertaken into how a Coastal Change Management Area might be designated and introduced.

1..5.3.7 A Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA) can be defined as:

*An area identified in Local Plans as likely to be affected by coastal change (physical change to the shoreline through erosion, coastal landslip, permanent inundation or coastal accretion).*

1..5.3.8 Paras 166 – 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) deal with coastal change and DEFRA guidance states:

*Local planning authorities should demonstrate that they have considered shoreline management plans, which provide a large-scale assessment of the risks associated with coastal processes, and should provide the primary source of evidence in defining the coastal change management area and inform land allocation within it*

1..5.3.9 The establishment of a CCMA is not straightforward. It is anticipated that the CCMA process may take up to 5 years to initiate and involve the examination of a number of options and extensive consultation. To better understand this and to provide Members with a better picture, it is proposed to undertake a scoping type study. It should be stressed that no decision has been made to introduce a CCMA but it would be prudent to better understand what would be involved in the process at an early date

1..5.3.10 It is proposed that Cabinet approve a supplementary estimate of £30,000 (which equates to a band D equivalent of £0.48) in 20/21 with underspends carried forward to future financial years, to investigate the introduction of a Coastal Change Management Area. In the meantime, as referred to in 1.5.3.5, beach material recycling is probably needed to provide a level of protection for existing properties, for which it is proposed £50,000 be made available in each of 2021/22 and 2022/23 budgets.

1..5.3.11 Further, Cabinet supports the Council making a bid to recently announced Defra/EA Innovative Flood and Coastal Resilience Programme which aims to support the households, communities and businesses in 25 areas affected by flooding or coastal change now, and in the future, to adapt to a changing climate by improving their resilience to flooding and/or response to coastal change and to work with local partners to trial and evaluate the costs and benefits of different actions and explore how they can work individually and together in a place to improve resilience and adaptation of households, communities and businesses to flooding and/or coastal change.

1..5.3.12 Following the decision of the Community Investment Company's decision to put their 'cut the spit' scheme on hold, the Pagham Harbour Coastal Issues Advisory Group has begun regular meetings again. For its part Arun is providing resource and expertise to help develop the Beach Action Plan mentioned above. This is intended to set out a basis of understanding and a

route map to possible interventions and/or adaptation measures – when and where appropriate. It does not commit Arun to funding any action(s) but is consistent with the adopted 'Adaptive Management' policy within the Coastal Defence Strategy (Pagham to East Head) in at least the short term.

1.6 Climping

1.6.1. The frontage breached under the pressures of the named storms of 2019/20, with extensive flooding of the farmland to the north. The Environment Agency, which has historically maintained this frontage, undertook works taking advantage of shingle available from the shingle shoal in the mouth of the River Arun, to rebuild a defensive bund some tens of metres inland of the breach.

1.6.2. The coastal defence strategy for the area set out a policy of doing minimum whilst it was economically viable. The initial indications are that the bund is performing well but it is not seen as a long-term solution.

1.6.3. The hinterland is subject to flood risk, both from the open sea and from the River Arun frontage. Allied to this, is the threat currently existing to Rope Walk (low standard of defence). It had been hoped to combine an improved flood defence to the river frontage as part of the Littlehampton Economic Growth Area (LEGA) development on the west bank (Local Plan housing allocation). With flood defence costs alone being in the order of £30million, this is becoming increasingly less viable. The Council is working with the EA to explore all possible ways of providing defences.

1.7 Revenue Works

1.7.1. The in-house Tree & Maintenance Team's (TMT - formerly the Multi Skilled Team) overall costs include an allowance for day to day revenue works to be undertaken – approx. 30% of their time. Any materials required and external Contractors' costs are financed from the limited Coast Protection revenue budget.

1.7.2. The TMT has again endeavoured to provide the first line response for reactive repairs and planned maintenance, carrying out mainly repairs and refurbishment of the timber groyne field. The use of local contractors, where specific skills and/or equipment are required, would be utilised as necessary but the workload of such contractors has remained high leading to high costs and long lead-in times.

1.7.3. Whilst responsibly sourced hardwoods are used for the initial construction or major refurbishment of defence assets, softwood timbers are used for coastal defences repairs in Arun. These timbers are responsibly sourced from the pacific coast of America and whilst this provided for ease of use and are relatively cheap, the cost is subject to currency fluctuations. This has meant that over recent years we have got less timber for our money. (approx. 20% less).

1.7.4. Every effort has been made to preserve the standard of coastal protection and the service provided to the public. However, priorities have had to be set and



at times difficult choices have had to be made on how to use the limited resources.

- 1.7.5. The Revenue budget has remained largely unchanged for around 10 years; this has led to a gradual degradation of the assets. The combination of asset degradation, with the named storms of last winter and the inability to undertake proactive or timely reactive repairs (due to the COVID-19 lockdown), has led to a situation where the current revenue budget is insufficient to see a halt in the decline of the defences.
- 1.7.6. The Environment Agency was able to access approximately £200m of extra funding to address the damage caused by the named storms of last winter. District and Boroughs did not have access to this fund and so have had to fund repairs from their own budgets. Arun was fortunate in not sustaining much direct damage (other than the accelerated decline mentioned above); representations have been made through the LGA regarding this inconsistency
- 1.7.7. To combat this decline of the District's defences it is proposed that the proposed supplementation of the Community Flood Fund (as above at 1.4) is used in a hybrid fashion to increase coastal defence revenue spend, including but not restricted to, the award of a number of modest enhanced maintenance contracts, either externally let or by the increase use of the TMT where practicable.
- 1.7.8. The scope of these modest works would be to extend the lifetime of the assets (groynes etc.) where there has previously been other priorities and allocations of resource. Unfortunately, this lack of priority has led to a gradual lessening of the standard of defence – which would otherwise, with maintenance, see the asset perform well over time.
- 1.7.9. The sums involved would be within the scope of current officer delegation.

## 1.8 Capital Works

- 1.8.1. Three phases of a largely EA funded Beach Erosion Management Plan (as recommended in the Arun/Pagham Coastal Defence Strategy) have been undertaken – a final phase is planned later this year for Middleton on Sea.
- 1.8.2. Preparatory works for a Groyne Replacement Scheme are programmed for the current year, with works at Aldwick starting next financial year subject to EA approval; two smaller schemes have been combined into one, to realise efficiency savings.
- 1.8.3. Three schemes have been put forward for inclusion in the EA's capital programme. These are shown in the Appendix and are:
- A further 4 phases of Beach Erosion Management Plan works
  - A flood defence wall at Sea Road Littlehampton (extending the existing timber and steel wall westwards) and

- A further scheme of groyne replacements.

1.8.4. All of these will almost certainly require partnership funding; when designs are further progressed, a report will be presented to request scheme approval and draw down of funds, including for the former two, the principle of using Partnership Funding contributions (from the Community Flood Fund) to enable applications for Grant in Aid to be formulated.

## 1.9 Land Drainage

1.9.1. The Council has a responsibility, under the Land Drainage Act 1991, to maintain watercourses on its land and where it is the riparian owner. It also works with West Sussex County Council (as the Local Lead Flood Authority – under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010) on consenting and enforcement activities in relation to land drainage.

1.9.2. Officers also provide advice to residents and landowners – this involvement is almost certain to increase due to the changes brought about in the Internal Drainage Boards arrangements – see below.

1.9.3. Strategic input to the process of land drainage management is also made possible through the operational and strategic officer groups chaired by WSCC (the West Sussex Flood Risk Management Group and Board respectively).

### Drainage Plans and Strategies:

1.9.4. A number of Drainage Area Plans are being prepared by Southern Water Services, looking predominantly at the foul sewerage system for localised areas.

1.9.5. Studies and work schemes are dealing with:

- Angmering (Black Ditch) – previously led by EA but now being progressed by WSCC – the cost of the study and subsequent likely works being met by WSCC, Arun (from Community Flood Fund and developer contributions).
- Aldingbourne - Being led by EA – Majority of the investigatory work is complete; options are being explored
- Elmer Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) - Being led by WSCC (previously by Southern Water Services) – Study complete; delivery of the options is being investigated.
- Lidsey SWMP - Being led by WSCC (previously by EA) - Study complete; delivery of the options is being investigated (with input from Arun)

- 1.9.6. The West Sussex Flood Risk Management Group/Board has initiated a prioritised list of works across the County; Arun's entries on the list are being addressed on an individual basis. This is not an ideal situation and it makes the allocation of the Council's Community Flood Fund (above) difficult.
- 1.9.7. Minor Works : Engineering staff continue to support Town and Parish Councils as well as Flood Action Groups in respect of schemes funded as part of the WSCC Operation Watershed. They also work with other flood risk authorities to promote flood relief schemes.
- 1.10 Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs):
- 1.10.1. There were two IDBs in Arun District, with the EA acting as the Board in both cases. The National Audit Office considered it inappropriate for the EA to do so; accordingly, following consultation, the EA put papers before the Secretary of State to dissolve both of the IDBs.
- 1.10.2. The South West Sussex IDB abolition was straightforward, with the signing-off by the relevant Minister coming into effect on 31 March 2017. The precept formerly paid by Arun to this IDB has been part used to fund a new drainage post, with the remainder consolidated into the Land Drainage Revenue Budget. Advantages of this effective increase in budget have been difficult to realise due to staffing issues but Arun should be seen as exemplar in land drainage management and provide advice to other landowners who have now become directly responsible for their riparian responsibilities
- 1.10.3. Following a Public Inquiry into the issues surrounding the River Arun IDB dissolution, and the output of that Inquiry, the Minister has been minded not to agree to the abolition of the River Arun IDB. It is suggested that the IDB should remain with management of it staying with the EA until such time as a viable alternative arrangement can be found. Funding of this IDB has always been unfairly weighted against Arun DC, with the majority of funding coming from Arun (in excess of £65,000) but the majority of the works being undertaken north of the District.
- 1.10.4. Arun had more riparian responsibilities (more ditches) in the South West Sussex area and so it was seen as convenient that that was dissolved ahead of the Minister's consideration of the River Arun IDB; this gave the opportunity to fund the extra post and to provide direct input to the watercourses that Arun is responsible for.
- 1.10.5. Of the watercourses that lie within River Arun Internal Drainage District, few are ultimately the responsibility of Arun DC. It is considered that a more equitable funding arrangement should be sought if the IDB is to continue under a revised constitution. The amounts previously precepted by the IDB could be much better spent within Arun, maintaining and managing the watercourse network as a whole.

- 1.10.6. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). These should feature heavily in the surface water disposal design of new developments coming forward – from just a single house to many thousands of units (proportionally applied). The drainage team offer advice and consultation responses to the Development Control Team – this is a vital part of the team’s work if flooding is to be avoided in the future.
- 1.10.7. In line with Council’s Land Allocation figures, there has been, and will be, a relatively large number of larger developments coming forward. These are often subject to difficult groundwater and surface water disposal conditions and so there is a demand on the Drainage Team to ensure that any Approvals are properly conditioned.
- 1.10.8. This can be challenging, as winter groundwater monitoring is crucial; when the winter monitoring results are arrived at by the developers, the discharge of condition applications tend to arrive together shortly after, creating a backlog in demand of consultation responses
- 1.11 Structural & General
- 1.11.1 The Section continues to undertake a range of tasks for other Internal and External Services:
- 1.11.2 Structural Calculation checking for Building Control – a cost effective and flexible arrangement that ensures a suitable level of checking is applied to structural calculations submitted as part of Building Control submissions. A checking service is now provided to Horsham District Council, Worthing & Adur Councils on a rechargeable basis.
- 1.11.3 Structural advice is also provided to other internal services e.g. Housing; provision of timely advice to Housing Repairs and Planned Maintenance on a range of issues that arise.
- 1.11.4 Street lighting management (no budget holding) – covering car parks, housing sites and others; oversight of Arun’s lighting assets – these are maintained by the WSCC framework contractor.
- 1.11.5 Play Area inspections – in Public Open Spaces, Housing sites and some Town and Parish areas (approx. 400 in total). Currently. The routine/visual are be included in the Parks Maintenance Contract but the ‘operational’ inspections, which are more detailed and comprehensive, are undertaken by Engineering staff trained in this type of work, to ensure that safety and insurance cover are maintained.
- 1.11.6 Bus Shelters (no budget holding) – there are three main shelter provisions Arun, Parish Council and Clear Channel (approx. 100 in total). Engineering Services provides a point of contact for enquiries and liaises with Property and Estates for the maintenance of the Arun operated shelters. The Clear Channel shelters are operated independently by the company and funded by advertising within the shelter.

## 1.12 Other

- 1.12.1 River wall collapse River Road, Arundel: Since the collapse of the wall in January 2016, parties sought to find a viable solution. The EA has been able to incorporate the repairs into a brought forward scheme to address flood risk to the wider town area. Works are substantially now complete. The EA had requested that Arun contribute £96,000 in Partnership Funding to the original scheme; this has not increased with the addition of the River Rd. repairs to the scheme.
- 1.12.2 Members of the Engineering Services team also utilise their design, management and supervisory skills to input to other ad hoc Council projects e.g. from smaller projects and feasibility study (e.g. beach access) to the new Littlehampton Wave, as well as representing Arun DC on various working and focus groups e.g. the A27 Improvements for Arundel (Highways England). Assistance is also being provided to Residential Service's Warm Home Project.

## 2. PROPOSALS:

Cabinet is requested to:

- (1) Note the report;
- (2) Approve the contributions from the Community Flood Fund noted at Paragraph 1.4.3;
- (3) Endorse a £50,000 'top-up' to the Community Flood Fund in the 2021/22 Budget;
- (4) Support the Council making a bid to the Defra/EA Innovative Flood and Coastal Resilience Programme
- (5) Endorse the inclusion of £50,000 in each of 2021/22 & 2022/23 to be available for the purpose of beach material recycling at Pagham beach;
- (6) Approve the use of the Community Flood Fund to supplement the Coast Protection revenue budget, subject to approval in accordance with the scheme of delegation, not to exceed a total of £50,000 per annum.
- (7) authorise the Engineering Services Manager to undertake the necessary preparatory work relating to the three new schemes shown within Appendix 1 to the report, and to make funding applications to the Environment Agency; and
- (8) authorise Officers to enter discussions regarding new arrangements relating to the River Arun Internal Drainage Board in accordance with paragraph 1.10.5 of the report.

Cabinet is also requested to ask Full Council to:

- (9) approve a supplementary estimate of £30,000 (which equates to a band D equivalent of £0.48) with underspends carried forward to future financial years, to investigate the introduction of a Coastal Change Management Area.

## 3. OPTIONS:

Not to accept the Report

### **Community Flood Fund**

Not to approve the proposed scheme contributions (para 1.4.3) – the effect being that the schemes would be unlikely to proceed.

Not to make any further contributions and use up the fund over time (this removing the ability to make PF contributions and probably not see schemes progress);

Replenish and keep to previous target level (i.e. £750,000) by two further annual contributions of £250,000;

Replenish at an alternative level (higher or lower) with annual contributions greater or less than £250,00 – perhaps set annually as part of the budget setting process.

Not to approve the concept of using Community Flood Fund to augment the coast protection Revenue budget – the effect would be to allow the continued decline in the condition of the Council's coastal defence assets

Augment the coast protection Revenue budget by some other means

Not approve the investigation into the formation of a Coastal Change Management Area – this would lead to uncertainty regarding the unsustainable situation and a greater risk to life and property

Not to approve the new schemes within the proposed Coast Protection Capital Programme – the effect would be that there would be an increased risk of erosion and /or flooding to the areas concerned.

### **River Arun Internal Drainage Board**

Instruct officers to negotiate the terms of any future Board funding based around the current funding arrangement, whereby there is a unbalanced geographic contribution/spend arrangement.

Instruct officers to negotiate the terms of any future Board that excluded Arun District involvement.

## **4. CONSULTATION:**

Has consultation been undertaken with:	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Relevant Town/Parish Council		✓
Relevant District Ward Councillors		✓
Other groups/persons (please specify)		✓
<b>5. ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING COUNCIL POLICIES: (Explain in more detail at 6 below)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>

Financial	✓	
Legal		✓
Human Rights/Equality Impact Assessment		✓
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act		✓
Sustainability	✓	
Asset Management/Property/Land	✓	
Technology		✓
Other (please explain)		✓

#### **6. IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial provision is sought to ensure that flood and erosion risk management assets be provided and maintained in a sustainable manner.

The additional budgets will worsen the Council's budget deficit for 2021/22

#### **7. REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

To ensure resources are used sustainably to manage flood and erosion risk in the district.

#### **8. EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE DECISION: 28 October 2020**

#### **9. BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

Links provided in body of the report:

Climate Change - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/climate-change-explained>.

The Met Office projections;

<https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/approach/collaboration/ukcp/about>.

Appendix 1: Capital Coastal Programme

Appendix 2: Community Flood Fund