

**HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL****Decision Report**

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Cabinet
<b>Date:</b>	14 April 2014
<b>Title:</b>	Response to Flooding in Hampshire
<b>Reference:</b>	5778
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Corporate Resources – Corporate Services Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Rob Carr  
Stuart Jarvis

**Tel:** 01962 847508      **Email:** Rob.carr@hants.gov.uk  
01962 845260      Stuart.jarvis@hants.gov.uk

**1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1. The flooding in Hampshire and across other parts of the country has been the largest and most severe emergency that has been responded to since the Civil Contingencies Act was introduced in 2004.
- 1.2. The multi-agency response within Hampshire, overseen by the Local Resilience Forum chaired by the Chief Constable, has been praised by Government both for the way in which agencies have worked together and the outcomes that were achieved, often in very difficult circumstances.
- 1.3. Now that the worst of the flooding has subsided and the recovery phase of the operation is well under way, it was considered timely to update Cabinet on the impact of the flooding across Hampshire, the measures that were taken to protect life and property and to look at the financial impact of the flooding and what support is available to offset the impact on the agencies involved.
- 1.4. The report also provides some background information on the various Government financial support schemes in the form of a presentation that was delivered to the Hampshire Partnership on 20<sup>th</sup> March.
- 1.5. The report has been prepared by the officers with a County Council perspective on events. Fire, Police, the Armed Services and Districts will all have equally valid perspectives. The quality of the joint working in Hampshire was of a very high order.

**2. The Impact of Flooding**

2.1. There were a large number of areas within Hampshire that suffered the worst of the flooding and other severe weather which hit mainly throughout February and into early March. These were mainly concentrated within certain geographical locations and the nature of the problems in each were actually very different, requiring different types of emergency responses:

- **Winchester City Centre** – Significant problems caused by river overflow into the City and impact on main highway routes in and out of the City. A number of homes were threatened as well as St Bede C of E Primary School and the surrounding area.
- **Kings Worthy** – again significant problems caused by high ground water levels along Springvale Road and at the junction with Lovedon Lane.
- **Hambledon** – Significant flooding as a result of ground water levels throughout the village, exacerbated by surface water flooding and the subsequent surcharging of the foul sewerage system requiring much of the surrounding road network to be closed for many weeks.
- **Basingstoke** – Specific problems with high groundwater levels leading to property flooding and flowing water outside of premises, often contaminated by sewage.
- **Romsey** – Although Romsey was particularly affected by river flooding, this was also prevalent throughout the whole of the Test Valley with many communities such as Kings Somborne suffering from flooding for many weeks.
- **Milford on Sea** – Specific incidents of coastal flooding, coastal erosion and severe weather together with the ‘Valentine’s Day Incident’ which saw restaurant clients evacuated by the military during an extraordinarily violent coastal storm.

### 3. Multi-Agency Response

- 3.1. The flooding events over the winter of 2013/14 represent the most comprehensive and sustained challenge to multi-agency emergency response arrangements in Hampshire since the introduction of the Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) 2004, with the most significant winter rainfall in 250 years.
- 3.2. Appropriate plans and arrangements were invoked by responding agencies, including the Hampshire Multi-Agency Flood Plan together with the appropriate command and control arrangements; in particular, the Response Working Group was established through the Local Resilience Forum and a Strategic Co-ordinating Group which was eventually superseded by the Recovery Working Group. The County Council was represented on these groups by both Emergency Planning and ETE.
- 3.3. The key agencies are shown below; all concerned demonstrated significant commitment to these arrangements, with appropriate contacts being made available at all levels so that decisions could be taken promptly, and to ensure that lines of communication were strong and always open:

- i. Hampshire County Council (as a category 1 responder and as the highways authority and the lead local flood authority)
  - ii. Hampshire Constabulary
  - iii. Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service
  - iv. The Environment Agency;
  - v. The Military;
  - vi. District Councils.
- 3.4. In addition, the Department for Communities and Local Government took an interest in the operations and was generally responsive and supportive.
- 3.5. District Councils led at the Tactical Command Group (TCG) level as envisaged in the overall Emergency Planning arrangements. A TCG is the tier of command and control which operates close to the affected area and within a multi-agency framework manages the local response using local knowledge and deploying emergency services in a co-ordinated fashion, working to the policy and strategy set by the overarching or Strategic command level.
- 3.6. In addition, a major contribution was made by Highways to these tactical operations including:
- Provision, distribution, and strategic location of sandbags;
  - Engineering advice and input – temporary schemes and water diversions;
  - Removal of trees from the highway and emergency repairs;
  - Gully emptying and flood alleviation of the highways;
  - General provision of resources in terms of staff, equipment, and expertise; and
  - Co-ordination of major works, including utilising the armed forces to assist in the emergency response.

#### **4. Flood Risk Management Response**

- 4.1. Throughout the period of emergency, the County Council's flood risk management experts worked long hours responding to enquiries from the public concerning flood risk management responsibilities, and offering advice on how to manage flood risk on private property. The same staff also led on the vital work of investigating flood events as appropriate in order to ensure lessons were learned and appropriate long term solutions put in place. This is in line with the County Council's statutory responsibilities as Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 4.2. During the period of late December 2013 and early March 2014, a total of 80 investigations were initiated from an estimated 200 enquiries. In addition, using its powers under Section 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act, the County Council has initiated four more formal and detailed investigations into major incidents throughout the period, and is considering commissioning a fifth. These should begin to report back over the spring, and the findings will be published.

- 4.3. Towards the end of the flooding emergency, officers were also notified piecemeal (and at extremely short notice) of Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) bidding windows opening for each of the three Regional Flood and Coastal Committees (RFCC) of which Hampshire forms part. In some cases only a few weeks were available to prepare bids, and the criteria had been amended at short notice from the approach used the previous year. Several officers had to be redeployed from focusing on the recovery to preparing a total of 33 bids to the RFCCs.
- 4.4. At the same time, a “Pathfinder” proposal for funding groundwater flood risk management schemes has been put together and presented to Defra for consideration.
- 4.5. The work carried out detailed above – both in relation to answering and advising members of the public and submitting bids for funding for future flood risk management – involved staff in extensive consultation with individuals, groups, and parish councils to ensure that the community was able to make an input to both the emergency response and prioritising proposed schemes for funding bids.
- 4.6. One further point for consideration is that an increase in waste disposed at the County Council’s Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) is expected to be reported as a result of flood wreckage. A high volume of wood has already been reported for January and February compared to previous years, possibly reflecting disposed wood panels and fencing. The impact of this is likely to have some financial implications, as is the additional work staff have put into assisting the public with recycling and in some cases disposal of sand bags and other related storm-damaged materials. Communications were put out to the public to the effect that the HWRCs were ready to receive waste associated with the storms.

## **5. Emergency Responses**

- 5.1. As mentioned in Section 2, the response that was required was very different depending on the locality of the emergency. The following sections outline some of the key actions that were put in place as general responses to protect life and property and in specific locations where flooding was most severe.

### **Keeping People Safe**

- 5.2. Significant support was provided by District Councils and the Emergency Planning Team to residents who were evacuated from flooded properties (or properties at risk from flooding) by providing temporary shelter until alternative accommodation could be found, or it was safe to return. Some of the most extreme cases included:
  - The evacuation of the Marine Restaurant on Friday 14th February in Milford on Sea. The military were key in responding in particularly challenging circumstances as, in addition to the violent storm, power cuts in the area meant that staff were operating in a very challenging and dangerous environment.

- The evacuation, shelter and rehousing of the Buckskin Estate, Basingstoke;
  - The impact of flooding at Hambledon.
- 5.3. A continuous check of vulnerable people within the affected communities was carried out and support from colleagues within Adult Services (Community Response Teams) was deployed where necessary, often responding to incidents raised by other agencies working on the ground.
- 5.4. Public Health were key in providing help and advice to residents on health related matters linked to the flooding and in particular contaminated water and have continued to monitor health issues in affected areas during the recovery period.

### **Keeping the Highways Open and Safe**

- 5.5. Hampshire Highways worked tirelessly to respond to events as they occurred over a two month period, and to put in place preventative and mitigation measures where flooding had been anticipated. This involved more than 100 Hampshire County Council staff on continuous deployment, along with all of the 200 frontline staff from Amey, the County Council's term highways contractor.
- 5.6. In addition, some 40-50 staff were taken off non-emergency work to help and support the Area Highways Offices. Between Christmas Eve and the 13th March, a total of 13,127 ETE staff hours were expended on responding to the emergency and dealing with the aftermath. Throughout the course of the emergency, Hampshire Highways responded to 1,000 incidents of fallen trees.
- 5.7. Around 22,000 phone calls were taken on Highways matters over the two month period, compared with an average of around 6,500 phone calls per month. 70% of the calls received related to highways defects and weather emergency issues.
- 5.8. At Litchfield and at Andover Road, Winchester, temporary roads were put in place to keep traffic moving through key strategic routes that came under threat. These required an innovative approach, whereby engineers spent just three days planning the scheme and a further three days implementing it before it was up and running. In the case of Andover Road, the scheme involved the use of 68 concrete barriers to retain 160 tonnes of 40mm stones and a further 160 tonnes of crushed concrete, finished off with over 500 square metres of tarmac road surfacing.

### **Protecting Property**

- 5.9. All agencies were involved in the co-ordinated acquisition, assembly, and deployment of sand bags across the County many of which were sourced by or provided by HCC. Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Military were key in undertaking the deployment of sandbags together with the County Council's term highway contractor, Amey.
- 5.10. The multi-agency teams also worked with a significant number of residents helping them to mitigate the impact of flooding on their homes and possessions and further support is available in the form of the Repair and Renew Grant

provided by Government to implement future flood mitigation measures in flood affected properties.

### **Winchester City Centre**

- 5.11. One of the more impressive feats of engineering and deployment related to the works carried out by the military to stem the flow of the river into the City through the design, creation and deployment of the 'cat flap'. This feat was co-ordinated by HCC in direct collaboration with the army with further involvement of the Environment Agency and Winchester District Council.
- 5.12. Works were also carried out to alleviate pressures on the City Mill and pumping was organised at Park Avenue to move water around the Mill.
- 5.13. A temporary sandbag depot was established in the Durngate Area in readiness to protect the city should the flooding increase, but ultimately the works to divert the Itchen prevailed.
- 5.14. As alluded to above, major works were carried out to keep Andover Road moving, and in all cases the Winchester Tactical Command Group was key in co-ordinating the response throughout affected areas in Winchester.

### **Hambledon**

- 5.15. Significant work had already been done by the Local Resilience Forum partners in assisting the community of Hambledon to prepare for flooding, and by the time the village did start to flood on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2014 all agencies were well placed to assist in the response. The Village Flood Plan was successfully implemented, an important element of which was the provision of sandbags in advance of the flooding event, and close working with the local community in placing the bags. The results of this were successful, ensuring a steady flow of water down the street and out of the village. The village suffered a total of 68 days of this.
- 5.16. Key to the flood plans was the continued pumping out of the electricity generating station by Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service in order to maintain the electricity supply to pumps that were operating in affected households.
- 5.17. Where necessary, road closures were put in place and targeted pumping was deployed where appropriate. The maintenance of strong communication ties with the community and with other agencies involved was vital in ensuring the effective flood response in this area. This included establishment of a Flood Incident Room in the Village Hall, which served as the local focus for the flood response effort. A Hambledon Flood Response Group was also established which met regularly throughout the flood incident.
- 5.18. The village was also well served by the provision of Accredited Community Support Officers (ACSO) and the military who assisted in a variety of roles and greatly contributed to the flood relief effort.

### **Basingstoke**

- 5.19. At Buckskin, a co-ordinated use of sandbags was deployed for the protection of property, which was especially necessary due to the risk of foul water flooding. A temporary ramp was also constructed over the road to sustain the flow of traffic.
- 5.20. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service worked together in the development and implementation of the over-pumping project, which took groundwater down to the river Loddon, some 1.5km away.
- 5.21. Colleagues in public health offered information and advice to residents on how to avoid infection from contaminated water and worked with social services to ensure that vulnerable people in the community were given additional assistance.

### **Romsey**

- 5.22. Within the bounds of the Test Valley Borough Council TCG the Environment Agency led on the design of the response to flooding in Romsey, and the County Council helped to deploy approximately 40,000 sand bags and supervised their location. The Fire Station at Romsey was opened as a key communication and information point for residents and to provide re-assurance to the community during the sustained period of flooding.
- 5.23. It should be added that isolated flooding was rife throughout Test Valley and, as with the county generally, Highways teams were deployed throughout the district to carry out emergency works, clear trees from roads, and put in place urgent flood mitigation measures.

### **Milford on Sea**

- 5.24. Coastal flooding at Milford on Sea devastated a restaurant and washed away six vehicles. The Military intervened with specialist vehicles to rescue clients at the restaurant and the County Council assisted in the emergency response by urgently removing trees from the highway to enable Fire and Rescue Teams to access the site. A Rest Centre was opened to assist those impacted by the severe storms.

## **6. Lessons Learned**

- 6.1. Given the scale of the multi-agency response and the widespread impact of the flooding, one of the key issues that all parties have recognised as we move out of the Recovery Phase of the operation is to ensure that we capture as many lessons learned as possible and use this to inform future flood mitigation measures and potential emergency responses.
- 6.2. This piece of work is initially being led by Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service but will involve all agencies as appropriate. The aim will be to ensure that for the future:

- Environment Agency information and modelling is more accurate following the experiences and data collection over this period.
  - Effective flood mitigation measures are put in place.
  - Flood risk management plans are updated.
  - Emergency responses are even better co-ordinated across agencies
- 6.3. The expectation is that a full report on this will be available to all agencies in due course and will dovetail where appropriate with the Government's announcement to develop long term plans for future flood investment.

## 7. The Financial Impact

- 7.1. Clearly the focus to date has been to respond to the emergencies that have arisen and not the accounting position surrounding it. Given the speed at which things were ordered and responded to, many of the actual payments will not yet have been made.
- 7.2. It will therefore take some time to fully understand the actual financial impact of the emergency response but this will continue to be worked on and will be reported on in due course.
- 7.3. In the meantime, Finance Officers across all the agencies have been asked to provide initial estimates of the costs of the emergency response and other costs incurred. Whilst there are almost certain to be elements of double counting in what has been provided to date, it was felt important to provide Cabinet with an indication of the scale of the response and the potential cost of remedial works that will follow.
- 7.4. The Government has also made several calls for information on the emergency response costs (for the purposes of Bellwin claims) and the impact of the flooding and severe weather on coastal protection, flood risk and highways, for which estimates have had to be prepared.
- 7.5. In order to better understand the costs that have been incurred and what might be eligible for grant or Bellwin claims, HCC Departments and partner agencies were asked to provide information categorised into five distinct areas :-
- **Enhanced Reactive Works** – This covers works which are over and above the level of normal reactive works experienced in past years, but were not part of the specific emergency flood response. Before the floods hit, the County Council was already incurring significant additional costs as a result of the severe weather in December and January. Whilst these events were not originally registered under Bellwin (as we did not know what was to come and our threshold was previously £2.9M) we have contacted DCLG who have said they would still be willing to 'consider' claims for these costs.
  - **Emergency Response** – As the title suggest, costs which are specifically for responding to emergencies that would qualify for Bellwin support. This includes a £400,000 estimated figure for sand bag recovery, which DCLG have confirmed will be eligible for Bellwin.
  - **Recovery Works** – Short term works that are now taking place to clean up sites and remove debris etc. These costs do not qualify for Bellwin, but again

there is a strong argument to make to Government that these should be funded centrally. Costs on this are likely to come through in later stages.

- **Remedial Works** – This covers an assessment of the longer term capital costs required to either repair damage that has been done or to put in place measures that will avoid flooding at locations badly affected this time round.
- **Opportunity Costs** – An attempt has also been made to try to capture the amount of effort put in by staff in responding to the emergencies, to help properly represent the full extent of Hampshire County Council's response to the emergency situation albeit they did not lead to additional costs (and therefore cannot be reclaimed). This category however, is arguably the most difficult to capture.

- 7.6. The table below summarises the estimated costs for Hampshire County Council that have been collected to date. For the most part this relates to cost estimates rather than costs incurred, but again this will be updated as invoices are processed:

Category	Estimated Costs £'000
Emergency response	5,071
Enhanced reactive works	539
Opportunity cost	132
Recovery Works	14
Remedial works	62,747
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>68,503</b>

- 7.7. Based on this data and the fact that there are still invoices outstanding, the County Council may be looking at a Bellwin claim to the Government of between £3.5M and £4.5M given that our revised threshold is around £1.5M (reduced from £2.9M).
- 7.8. This would still mean that costs of at least £1.5M would need to be met by the County Council as a result of the response to the prolonged period of severe weather and this will be reflected in the outturn position that will be reported to Cabinet in due course.
- 7.9. It is anticipated that any costs incurred during 2013/14 that cannot be met from Government grant will be funded from corporate contingencies or reserves, held precisely for these types of situations. Longer term remedial funding will need to be considered in light of any Government support received and future planning of the capital programme.
- 7.10. Information from partner agencies indicates that the emergency response from Hampshire Constabulary and Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service has not in the main led to significant extra costs despite the enormous level of effort involved and therefore neither organisation expects to exceed their Bellwin Threshold.

- 7.11. The military response and the involvement of the Environment Agency were in effect carried out as 'business as usual' and there is no mechanism to allow these costs to be charged out to other agencies.
- 7.12. District Councils who have been affected by the flooding are all above their Bellwin Thresholds and cost estimates range from around £100,000 to £500,000 across the different District Councils.
- 7.13. In terms of the future requirement for remedial works, Officers have tried at very short notice to produce a series of estimates in respect of highway repairs, flood and coastal defence works (for a Flood Defence Grant in Aid bid, which includes the Hambledon works), together with site specific estimates shown in the table below :

Description	Estimated Costs £'000
Repairs to damaged highways (top end of range)	36,000
Flood and Coastal Defence Works – Based on Bid	20,009
Works to Hambledon	3,848
Itchen Navigation / Test Way Works	1,675
Defence Works at St. Bede C of E Primary School	255
Floor Repairs at Vernham Deane School	100
Defence Works at other Schools	209
Repair works at Lepe Facilities and Car Park	146
Other Works	505
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>62,747</b>

- 7.14. There are a significant number of Government Schemes in operation, a summary of which is included in the presentation that was delivered to the Hampshire Partnership on 20<sup>th</sup> March - attached at Appendix 1. This covers funding available to local authorities, together with information on the schemes that have been put in place to assist homeowners and businesses.
- 7.15. To date, the only formal notifications that have been received by the County Council are the receipt of £66,000 for the first tranche of the community element of the Severe Weather Recovery Scheme (SWRS) grant and £11.5M for highways works, which is the County Council's share of £70M set aside for flood affected areas under the highways element of SWRS plus a further £103.5M allocated to all highway authorities in response to the severe weather across the country.
- 7.16. The £11.5M does represent a significant contribution to the repairs required as a result of the severe weather but is obviously less than a third of what we think may be required. The County Council will therefore continue to make representations to Government for additional funding, but in the meantime will also make a bid against the £200M pothole challenge fund announced in the budget.

**8. Recommendations**

Cabinet is recommended to:

- 8.1. Note the scale of the multi-agency response to the severe weather and flooding during the winter of 2013/14.
- 8.2. Note the anticipated costs of the emergency response for Hampshire County Council and how much of this may be met from a Bellwin Claim to the Government.
- 8.3. Note that a further report will be prepared for a future Cabinet meeting to look at the outcome of the 'lessons learned' project and to update Members on the final costs of the emergency response.

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

<b>Hampshire safer and more secure for all:</b>	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>Maximising well-being:</b>	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>Enhancing our quality of place:</b>	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

**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. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

- 1.1. Equality objectives are not considered to be adversely affected by this report since it deals with emergency response arrangements that were put in place in response to severe weather and flooding.

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

- 2.1. The proposals in this report are not considered to have any direct impact on the prevention of crime.

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

- 3.1. How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

Not applicable.

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

The future flood mitigation measures highlighted in this report will need to fully taken in to account the potential impacts of climate change and would by their nature be designed to be resilient to its longer term impacts.

## SUPPORT TO HOMEOWNERS

- Council Tax discount for homeowners that have been flooded or affected by flooding (varies between Districts)
- £4M provided by Government, 'should enable' authorities to provide funding for at least 3 months – most schemes are operating on a 3 month limit at the moment
- EA has suggested that £4M 'might' fund council tax discounts up to 6 months
- Government have said that they will pay for as long as people are out of their homes
- However, total funding envelope has not been changed
- Scheme not entirely clear, needs further clarification from Government

## SUPPORT TO BUSINESSES

- 100% business rate relief for business **flooded** since December 2013
- Property must have been flooded in whole or in part and business activity adversely affected
- Limited to properties with a rateable value of less than £10M
- Relief given for 3 months regardless of how long they were flooded
- Local authorities must use existing powers to grant discretionary relief
- Government will reimburse authorities for lost revenue

## SUPPORT TO BUSINESSES

- £10M business support scheme for small and medium size enterprises **affected by flooding**
- Will provide hardship funding to businesses, but shouldn't duplicate insurance arrangements
- Will pay for clean up costs, materials, exceptional costs, replacement of stock, temporary premises, business continuity planning and marketing - anything to help them keep trading
- Local authorities to decide on process and criteria – NFDC provided template claim form to other authorities
- Grant levels to be decided by LA's but Government guidance says past schemes had average claims of £2,500 per business
 

– Basingstoke and Deane £65,000	Eastleigh £5,000
– East Hants £30,000	Havant £70,000
– New Forest £20,000	Portsmouth £5,000
– Test Valley £350,000	Winchester £130,000

## REPAIR AND RENEW GRANT

- Available to homeowners and businesses
- Designed to pay for works that help a property to withstand future flooding but **over and above** repairs normally covered by insurance
- Grants of up to £5,000 per property available
- Application process administered by local authorities who make decisions on grant levels
- Take into account 'community level schemes' and 'property level protection schemes' to avoid duplication
- Government will reimburse local authorities through section 31 grant
- Any measure recommended by the 'Property-Protection-Advisor' website or the list in Annex to guidance will automatically qualify

## SUPPORT TO FARMING

- £10M Farming Recovery Fund has been put in place
- Designed to restore flooded agricultural land and bring it back into use as quickly as possible
- Farm businesses must have been identified by DEFRA as being within flood impacted areas
- Applications forms are on line and to be submitted direct to DEFRA



## SUPPORT TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES - BELLWIN

- Available to local authorities to meet the costs of emergency response involving the destruction of, or danger to, life or property.
- Bellwin thresholds are set for each authority based on spend levels
- District Council thresholds tend to be in the £20 - £30,000 range
- HCC figure was £2.9M but revised down to £1.5M following flooding (HC around £0.5M, HFRS £135,000)
- Funding provided for eligible expenditure over threshold level (now paid at 100% was only 85%)
- Currently collating likely costs across Hampshire but HCC claim could be in the region of £3.5M to £4.5M above threshold



## **SUPPORT TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES SEVERE WEATHER RECOVERY SCHEME**

- Community support element - £3.5M to be allocated based on number of homes and businesses flooded. Further tranche of £3M recently announced
- Highways element – originally £3.5M to be allocated based on number of classified A and B roads affected and number of bridges damaged
- Funding increased to £33.5M and then to £80M (but includes £10M for Somerset)
- Further £103.5M made available to all authorities to be allocated on existing grant methodology
- HCC Share of this £173.5M is £11.5M



## **SUPPORT TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES BUDGET ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Additional £140M for repair and maintenance of flood defences over 2014/15 and 2015/16
- Additional £200M in 2014/15 to set up a 'potholes challenge fund'
- Development of a long term plan for how to direct future flood investment – to be published in the Autumn

