

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

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Executive Member for Environment and Transport
<b>Date:</b>	15 September 2016
<b>Title:</b>	Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme - Priorities
<b>Reference:</b>	7526
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Simon Cramp

**Tel:** 01962 832348

**Email:** Simon.cramp@hants.gov.uk

## **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1. The purpose of this paper is to set out the priorities for the County Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Defence (FRCD) Programme.
- 1.2. Since 2011, the County Council has committed over £7.0m of capital resources to fund works for flood defence and coastal sites. Prior to the flood events in winter 2013/2014, the key priorities were sites emerging from the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) and Surface Water Management Plans (SWMP), and sea defences to protect the County Council's own assets at Calshot Quay and Royal Victoria Country Park.
- 1.3. 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 (refer Appendix 1).
- 1.4. 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 (refer Appendices 2 and 3). So far, the County Council has been able to supplement local capital resources by drawing down £2.096 million of funding from these, and other partnership funding sources.
- 1.5. 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, it has become increasingly apparent that there is an urgent need to review the priorities for flood defence sites to ensure that the use of the FRCD programme budget takes account of the potentially high demand for resources and funding from bids submitted to Defra, and other locations that have been identified.

- 1.6 Critically, this need to revisit the prioritisation of locations is also driven by the County Council's experience of the FCERM process since 2014. In particular, the indication that on average at least 60 - 70% of the overall scheme cost may need to be met from stakeholder / partner contributions in order to 'unlock' national FDGiA funding. In the context of increasing public sector financial constraints, and limited access to private sector funding, it will be a challenge to close this sort of gap on major schemes, and impossible for the FRCD programme to sustain this level of investment across all locations.
- 1.7 All the bids submitted to Defra for funding in March 2014, and those additional locations that have been identified subsequently, have therefore been reassessed against a robust set of criteria. Those locations where work has already been undertaken or where further action is no longer considered to be required (refer Appendix 4) were excluded from this process.
- 1.8 The outcome of the prioritisation process is a 'Main Programme' and a 'Pipeline Programme' as set out at Appendix 5 and Appendix 6. Locations in the 'Pipeline Programme' would 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.
- 1.9 It is proposed that a flexible approach is taken to the utilisation of FRCD programme resources required for the delivery of schemes in the 'Main Programme', and needs are assessed on a case by case basis. For major schemes, such as Romsey and Buckskin, this will be set out within a Project Appraisal which will be presented to the Executive Member for decision. It is anticipated that the level of FRCD programme investment for most schemes will be relatively low.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1. In 2011, the Economy, Transport and Environment Department secured £1.5m capital funding for its '*Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Management programme and capital match funding for Environment Agency (EA) grant-in-aid schemes and minor flood defence works*' for the '*provision for works and strategies for flood defence and coastal sites including match funding for joint schemes with external bodies*'.

- 2.2. In the following year, the Executive Member for Environment and Transport approved a two year programme for 2012/14 with funding allocated from the corporate capital budget for flood risk and coastal defence management. The programme was made up of three elements:
- Priority sites emerging from the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and Surface Water Management Plans;
  - Hampshire County Council's own assets (Calshot Quay and Royal Victoria Country Park sea defences); and
  - Feasibility studies into future high cost repairs and preventative maintenance.
- 2.3 The allocation of funding to these elements, and individual locations, was prioritised according to the following criteria:
- Number of households and businesses protected;
  - Critical services and infrastructure protected;
  - Health and safety issues addressed;
  - Potential to maximise partnership funding opportunities;
  - Secures added benefits by aligning schemes with other Environment Agency and Local Authority projects; and
  - Flood risk reduction measures would be cost beneficial.
- 2.4 The outcome of this initial prioritisation work was the identification of low cost scheme development work to inform future project selection and, more significantly, the allocation of £325,000 to support the delivery of coastal defence improvements of the County Council's assets at Calshot and Royal Victoria Country Park.
- 2.5 It was recognised that the FRCD programme would need to be reviewed as new information emerged. This became an imperative following the 2013/14 flood events when a significant number of 'new' locations came to prominence.
- 2.6 In March 2014, the County Council submitted 33 bids, representing in excess of 50 locations, to Defra for inclusion in the prospective 6 year Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) programme (refer Appendix 1). The scale of the submission not only reflected the extent of the flooding occurring at that time, but the work undertaken by the County Council in developing the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and Surface Water Management Plans, and the identification of priority locations. Due to the short timescale provided by the Environment Agency for submissions, the concentration of resources during this period on the flooding emergency and the limited intelligence available for many sites, the quality of the bids was variable. However, in the absence of firm information about the opportunity to submit schemes to the 6 year programme at a later date, it was considered that the entry of bids at this stage was important for establishing the level of 'need' in Hampshire.

- 2.7 In response to the 2013/14 flood events, the Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment approved on 11 July 2014 an allocation of capital funding from the FRCD programme to support the delivery of a programme of 'Early Action' where works would not be eligible for funding through the FCERM programme or local levy mechanism operated by the Regional Flood and Coastal Committees (RFCC).
- 2.8 In further response to the 2013/14 flood events, and the County Council's submission to the 6 year FCERM programme, Cabinet set out in July 2014 provision for an additional £4.46m for flood related activities being led by the County Council as follows: *'£2.460m flood and sea defences required as additional match funding towards bids that have been made to the Environment Agency for Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA)'* and *'£2m ...to provide funding to meet other schemes that will not qualify for grant funding'*.
- 2.9 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 of the projects submitted by the County Council were allocated indicative FDGiA funding, with an additional 5 projects having indicative local levy (LL) funding via the Southern RFCC (refer Appendices 2 and 3). In both instances, the release of funding is subject to the development of schemes and approval of business cases. The total Grant in Aid (GiA) allocation announced is just under £10m. In addition, indicative local levy funding amounting to some £1.8m has been allocated over the six years to support scheme development and, dependent on an approved business case in some cases, scheme implementation.
- 2.10 Further to these announcements, and securing partnership funding from Winchester City Council for the Hambledon Flood Alleviation Scheme, the County Council has so far been able to supplement local capital resources by drawing down £2.096 million of funding. There is an expectation of further funding being secured from both GiA and local levy as schemes are developed.
- 2.11 In addition, the Coastal Conservation budget was vired from the Policy and Resources budget to that of Economy, Transport and Environment, and incorporated into the FRCD programme in January 2016. The Coastal Conservation budget currently stands at £950,000 with a projected allocation of an additional £106,000 pa. The overall FRCD programme budget is as shown in the table below as of the date of the decision.

<b>Funding source</b>	<b>Amount £'000</b>
Capital Resource local resource – see 2.1 and 2.8 above)	6,100
FDGiA (incl. Underspend and Recovery)	1,751
Local Levy and partnership funding	345
Coastal Conservation	950
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,146</b>

### **3. Expenditure, commitments and funding requirements**

- 3.1. Although some work had been undertaken prior to 2014, there has been a significant acceleration in activity directed at developing measures to improve flood risk management since the events of winter 2013/14. Appendix 4 sets out those locations where the potential for schemes is being investigated, work is underway or no further action is anticipated at this stage. This includes both schemes submitted to Defra for funding in March 2014 and additional locations identified subsequently. The list does not include the many locations where work has been 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. Many similar initiatives have been undertaken by our district partners and local communities.
- 3.2 As at end of Q1 2016/2017, the total expenditure on the FRCD programme, including implementation of Phase 1 and 2 of the Hambledon Flood Alleviation Scheme and work on the County Council's coastal assets at Calshot and Royal Victoria Country Park, was approximately £4.3M. Commitments as at Q1 2016 / 2017, total in the region of £1.2M of which approximately £1.1M is forecast for the completion of the Hambledon scheme. Wherever possible, further FDGiA, local levy and partnership funding will be secured to cover costs.
- 3.3 The expenditure and current commitments noted above have had a significant impact on the FRCD programme budget. At this stage, without further replenishment, the available budget totals £4.12M. In view of the potentially high demand for resources and funding from schemes shown at Appendix 4, and those other locations that formed part of the submission to Defra in 2014, there is an urgent need to review the prioritisation process

carried out earlier so that the use of the FRCD programme budget is optimised.

- 3.4 Critically, this need to revisit the prioritisation of locations is also driven by the County Council’s experience of the FCERM process since 2014. As noted above, only a limited amount of time was available for the original submission of bids to Defra. Through the more detailed investigation and development of schemes it has become apparent that very often the number of properties at risk and the cost of measures in the bid, and therefore the amount of national funding that can be secured, need to be further refined.
- 3.5 The funding allocated in Defra’s six year FCERM GiA programme is indicative only. The actual amount that can be secured by any one scheme is dependent upon the outcomes of detailed feasibility appraisals, the value of the benefits derived from implementation and therefore the cost benefit ratio, and the availability of external contributions.
- 3.6 Having brought a number of schemes to the point where the likely level of funding available from Defra can be more accurately calculated, the County Council’s experience so far indicates that it would be realistic to anticipate that on average at least 60 - 70% of the overall scheme cost may need to be met from stakeholder/partner contributions. Assuming that the County Council might in some circumstances need to share this on a 50/50 basis, on a scheme like Romsey Flood Alleviation Scheme for example this could mean a contribution of approximately £0.85M. Other major schemes would require a similar or greater level of contribution. In the context of increasing public sector financial constraints, and limited access to private sector funding, it will be a challenge to close this sort of gap, and impossible for the FRCD programme to sustain this level of investment across all locations.

**4. Prioritisation Process**

- 4.1 Following confirmation of the FCERM programme for 2015/16 – 2020/21, all 33 bids submitted to Defra for funding in March 2014, and those additional locations that have been identified subsequently, have been reassessed with the aim of ranking them in order of priority and therefore how, and where, resources should be directed. Those locations where work has already been undertaken or where further action is no longer considered to be required (refer Appendix 4) were excluded from this process.
- 4.2 In order to provide a robust and objective assessment of the locations, the priorities and criteria established previously (refer paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 above) have been refined as follows:

Locations	Indicates	Information source
Number of households at risk	Level of sensitivity and benefits to be achieved	Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Map

Levels of deprivation and vulnerable groups	Areas where people may benefit from intervention	Indices of deprivation and GIS mapping
Critical services and infrastructure at risk	Level of sensitivity and benefits to be achieved	GIS mapping
Alignment with Water Company Programmes	Potential to secure added benefits and cost sharing	5 year (2015 – 2020) investment plans
Alignment with Environment Agency and Local Authority schemes in the FCERM GiA six year programme	Potential to secure added benefits	6 year FCERM programme
Presence of Flood Action Group/Flood Plan	Level of local commitment and 'ownership'	Hampshire County Council - Emergency Planning database

- 4.3 Where the criteria represented a range of possible impacts, a simple weighting factor was applied. For example, a location in a 60% least deprived, 21 - 40% most deprived or 20% most deprived, area scored 0, 10 or 20 respectively. The impact on critical infrastructure was similarly measured with 'B' class roads and schools scoring 5, and 'A' class roads, sub-stations and hospitals, 10 points. The maximum available overall score for any location was 70.
- 4.4 The methodology for scoring, and the results of the assessment process, are set out at Appendix 5 and Appendix 6 with locations scoring 20 points or more placed in a proposed 'Main Programme' (Appendix 5) and those scoring less included in a 'Pipeline Programme' (Appendix 6). Where work to establish the potential for schemes is already being investigated, is actively being planned (refer Appendix 4), or where an opportunity to potentially secure either FDGiA or Local Levy within the 6 year FCERM programme (refer Appendix 3) has so far been unexplored, it is recommended that these commitments are continued within the 'Main Programme'.
- 4.5 Locations in the 'Pipeline Programme' would 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.

- 4.6 Following the prioritisation process, a second exercise was undertaken to establish what level of contribution could be made available for the delivery of those schemes within the 'Main Programme'.

**5. Utilisation of Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme budget**

- 5.1 Given the potential financial demands on the FRCD programme, it is important that the County Council's investment in any one scheme recognises the overall budget constraints. Ideally, the requirements for each scheme in the 'Main Programme' would be known at the same time and a decision could be made on the utilisation of the programme funding ensuring a fair distribution. In reality, while substantial progress has been made on many of the schemes, each has achieved a different stage of development, and the amount and quality of detail available can vary significantly. This makes it very difficult to assess the viability of schemes, their cost and their funding requirements, both on an individual and like for like basis. At this stage, few schemes are at a position where either the benefit cost ratio or the amount of partnership contributions needed to 'unlock' FCERM funding has been calculated to a reasonable level of accuracy.
- 5.2 In addition to those locations that are not currently included in the 6 year FCERM programme, because the cost of developing a business case to secure national funding can often outweigh the anticipated benefits on a comparatively low cost scheme, there are a number of schemes where it is considered likely that delivery will be pursued outside this process. In those instances, the County Council will seek to work with local partners to bring those schemes forward. Although it is anticipated that this will tend to be of a lower order of investment, this will have an impact on the overall FRCD programme budget.
- 5.3 Although there is only partial visibility at this stage of the full financial implications of the locations within the FRCD programme, the experience so far on developing major schemes demonstrates that it would be both inappropriate and unsustainable for the County Council to commit to fund either all or a significant proportion of the partnership contribution required to secure FCERM funding. Similarly, meeting the full cost of schemes would be unaffordable.
- 5.4 A number of options have been considered for establishing what level of contribution could be made available from the FRCD programme for the delivery of those schemes within the 'Main Programme'. For example, a fixed percentage or capped financial contribution to the scheme, a 'sliding scale' related to the overall scheme costs and/or benefit cost ratio, or a figure tied to the level of external contributions secured. Unfortunately, none of these appeared to adequately address the need for the County Council's investment to respond to the needs of individual schemes flexibly, and on a case by case basis, as represented by:

- Scheme cost;
- Availability of partnership funding;
- Opportunity for self help; and
- Economic, social and environmental benefits achieved.

5.5 It is considered that the amount of the County Council's contribution should be dependent upon these criteria, and the ability of the FRCD programme to sustain that investment at that time with a view to outstanding commitments.

## **6. Next Steps**

6.1 It is proposed that schemes from the 'Main Programme' are now developed further. It is anticipated that major schemes, such as Romsey and Buckskin, will be brought forward in due course as Project Appraisals for decision by the Executive Member. The report will set out the justification for the scheme, the stakeholder / partner contributions, and the level of FRCD programme investment required, in line with the criteria established above.

6.2 The County Council's experience of the FCERM process since 2014 has demonstrated that the existing method of calculating and prioritising central government funding does not fit well with Hampshire's circumstances. The County Council has previously suggested to Defra that the opportunity to devolve national flood risk management budgets, to support the implementation of reduction measures at the local level, be explored through its own Hampshire Groundwater Pathfinder. The County Council considers that there would still be merit in this approach and it is therefore proposed that the County Council undertake further discussions with Defra about the current flood risk management funding mechanism.

## **7. Recommendations**

7.1 That the progress on schemes within Hampshire County Council's Flood Risk and Coastal Defence Programme be noted.

7.2 That approval be given for further work to be undertaken to develop those schemes as shown included in the 'Main Programme' at Appendix 5 of this report.

7.3 That approval be given for further engagement with Defra to seek a change in the way that the Flood Coastal Erosion Risk Management process and funding is operated and applied.

**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):	

**Other Significant Links**

<b>Links to previous Member decisions:</b>		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date</u>
Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment - Response to the Flood investigation in Romsey and Sub-catchment Flood Risk Management	5957	11 July 2014
Cabinet Report - Capital programme 2014/15 to 2016/17	5893	21 July 2014
Executive Member for Economy, Transport and Environment - ETE Capital Programme 2015/16 Quarter 3 Monitoring and 2016/17 - 2018/19 Proposed Capital Programme	7228	19 January 2016
<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.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
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:**

This paper sets out a prioritised list of flood risk related activities undertaken by Hampshire County Council.

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 scheme has no impact on Crime and Disorder.

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

3.1. 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.

- 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 outcomes of this work support communities to become more resilient to flooding events, and considers the effects of extreme events.

**Appendix 1 - Hampshire County Council's Applications to Flood Defence Grant in Aid submitted March 2014**

<b>West Thames Area</b>	
<b>6 year programme</b>	<b>District</b>
Buckskin Lane Flood Alleviation Scheme, Basingstoke	Basingstoke and Deane
Middleton Gardens Flood Alleviation, Farnborough	Rushmoor
Sycamore Road Flood Alleviation Scheme, Farnborough	Rushmoor
Rectory Road Flood Alleviation Scheme, Farnborough	Rushmoor
<b>7 year + "pipeline" programme</b>	
Mapledurwell Flood Alleviation	Basingstoke and Deane
Local Groundwater Flood Alleviation (A32 Corridor)	East Hants
Chandlers Lane, Yateley	Hart
Church Lane East, Aldershot	Rushmoor
B3014 Fleet Road, Cove	Rushmoor
<b>Wessex Area</b>	
<b>7 year programme</b>	
Ringwood	New Forest
Fordingbridge	New Forest
North Gorley	New Forest
<b>Southern Area</b>	
<b>6 year programme</b>	
Candover Brook (Preston + Brown)	Basingstoke and Deane
Upper Test (Deane, Cole Henley).	Basingstoke and Deane
River Lavant (Finchdean + Rowlands Castle)	East Hants
Monks Brook, Chandler's Ford	Eastleigh
Romsey	Test Valley
Appleshaw (within Penton Bellinger Ward)	Test Valley
Winchester ( <i>including central areas, Andover Road North</i> )	Winchester
Hambleton	Winchester
<b>7 year + "pipeline" programme</b>	
Local Groundwater Management Programme ( <i>Kings Worthy, Headbourne Worthy, Littleton, Micheldever/Northbrook, Sutton Scotney, Bishops Sutton, Bramdean, Cheriton, Kings Somborne, Chilbolton, The Pentons and Monxton, Stockbridge, West Tytherley and Longparish</i> )	East Hants / Test Valley / Winchester
School Lane, Chandlers Ford	Eastleigh

New Forest small scale flood alleviation works ( <i>including Woodlands and Tiptoe</i> )	New Forest
Copythorne Flood Alleviation Works	New Forest
Spencer Road, New Milton	New Forest
Butts Ash Lane, Hythe	New Forest
Calmore Road, Totton	New Forest
The Bourne Rivulet ( <i>including St Mary Bourne, Stoke, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Vernham Dean and Upton</i> )	Test Valley
Watery Lane, Upper Clatford	Test Valley
Pitt Village, Winchester	Winchester
Hursley Village	Winchester
Bishops Waltham, Beeches Hill	Winchester
Twyford Village / Morestead Road	Winchester

### Appendix 2 – Summary of Recovery, FDGiA underspend and local levy funding pre 2015

Scheme Name	Recovery	FDGiA underspend	Local levy allocation
<b>West Thames Area</b>			
Buckskin, Basingstoke			50,000
Middleton Gardens, Rushmoor			30,000
Sycamore Road, Rushmoor			48,000
Rectory Road, Rushmoor			49,000
<b>Southern Area</b>			
Bramdean, Winchester		50,000	
River Lavant, East Hants			30,000
Candover Brook, Basingstoke and Deane		8,000	30,000
Monks Brook, Eastleigh			20,000
Romsey, Test Valley		49,000	50,000
Winchester		45,000	50,000
Hambledon, Winchester	200,000		
<b>Total</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>152,000</b>	<b>357,000</b>

### Appendix 3 - Summary of indicative FDGiA and local levy 6 year funding programme (2015/16 – 2020/21) announced for Hampshire on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2015

Scheme Name	Indicative FDGiA Allocation in announcement (£)	Local levy allocation (£)
<b>West Thames Area</b>		
Buckskin, Basingstoke	2,090,000	0
Middleton Gardens, Rushmoor	194,000	66,000
Sycamore Road, Rushmoor	185,000	50,000
Rectory Road, Rushmoor	140,000	0
<b>Southern Area</b>		
Appleshaw, Test Valley		128,000
River Lavant, East Hants		63,000
Candover Brook, Basingstoke and Deane		220,000
Upper Test, Basingstoke and Deane		150,000
Monks Brook, Eastleigh		601,000
Romsey, Test Valley	2,870,000	310,000
Winchester	2,985,000	235,000
Hambledon, Winchester (Ph 2)	1,399,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,863,000</b>	<b>1,823,000</b>

**Appendix 4 – Locations where the potential for schemes is being investigated, work is underway or no further action is anticipated at this stage.**

<b>Location</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
Buckskin, Basingstoke.	Basingstoke and Deane	Scheme feasibility and modelling report completed.	To be agreed by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Candover Brook ( <i>Preston and Brown Candover</i> ).	Basingstoke and Deane	Initial highway drainage works completed. Scheme feasibility report completed.	To be agreed with Environment Agency (EA) and local partners by Q3 2016 / 2017.
River Lavant ( <i>Finchdean, Rowlands Castle</i> ).	East Hants	Initial highway drainage works completed.	To be agreed by Q4 2016 / 2017.
A32 Corridor ( <i>incl. Lower Farringdon and Chawton</i> )	East Hants	Scheme feasibility report started.	Report due for completion Q3 2016 / 2017.
Wallington	Fareham	Initial highway drainage works completed. Scheme feasibility report completed by EA.	To be agreed by Q4 2016 / 2017.
Monks Brook, Chandler's Ford.	Eastleigh	Scheme feasibility and modelling report completed.	To be agreed with EA by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Calmore Road, Totton	New Forest	Scheme feasibility report completed.	To be agreed with EA by Q3 2016 / 2017.
North Gorley	New Forest	Drainage improvement works completed.	No further action.
Ringwood	New Forest	Initial appraisal completed.	To be agreed with EA by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Fordingbridge and Breamore	New Forest	Initial appraisal completed.	To be agreed with EA by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Woodlands and Tiptoe, New Forest	New Forest	Drainage improvement works completed.	No further action.
Middleton Gardens, Farnborough	Rushmoor	Scheme feasibility report completed. Emergency Flood Action Plan to be prepared locally.	No further action.
Rectory Road, Farnborough	Rushmoor	Scheme feasibility report completed. Outcomes under discussion with EA, Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC) and Thames Water.	To be agreed by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Sycamore Road, Farnborough	Rushmoor	Initial appraisal completed. Outcomes under discussion with EA, RBC and TW.	To be agreed by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Romsey	Test Valley	Detailed scheme feasibility report started.	Report due for completion Q4 2016 / 2017. Anticipated start of construction Q2 2017 / 2018.
Kings Somborne	Test Valley	Drainage improvement works completed by Environment Agency.	No further action.

Stockbridge and Chilbolton.	Test Valley	Community lead initiatives supported by the County Council's Small Grants Scheme.	No further action.
Bourne Rivulet <i>(incl. St. Mary Bourne, Stoke, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Vernham Dean, Upton and Ibthorpe)</i>	Test Valley	Defra Pathfinder feasibility report completed. Outcomes under discussion with EA, TVBC, Basingstoke and Dean BC and local partners.	To be agreed Q3 – Q4 2016 / 2017.
Dean Lane, Bishops Waltham.	Winchester	Highway drainage works completed.	No further action.
Cheriton and Bramdean	Winchester	Highway drainage works completed.	No further action.
Hambledon (Phase 1 and 2)	Winchester	Works due for completion by November 2016.	No further action.
Sutton Scotney	Winchester	Initial appraisal completed. Potential highway drainage works under investigation.	To be agreed Q3 2016 / 2017.
Wickham	Winchester	Flood Investigation report completed.	To be agreed with EA, Winchester CC, Southern Water and local partners by Q3 2016 / 2017.
Winchester <i>(incl. Andover Road, Littleton, Pitt, Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy)</i>	Winchester	Works undertaken in Water Lane, and Park Avenue scheme started. Operation Resilience works at Andover Road completed. Scheme feasibility work underway for Pitt, Littleton, Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy.	Report due for completion Q3 2016 / 2017.
Calshot and Royal Victoria Country Park.	New Forest / Eastleigh	Coastal protection works completed to Hampshire County Council Assets.	No further action.

## Appendix 5 – Main Programme: Locations ranked in priority order following prioritisation process

	Criteria	Number of households at risk	Levels of deprivation	Vulnerable groups at risk (i.e. care /nursing homes)	Critical services and infrastructure at risk	Alignment with water company programmes	Alignment with Environment Agency and Local Authority schemes in the FCERM GiA six year programme	Presence of Flood Action Group / Flood Plan.		
	Scoring	1 = 0 – 9; 5 = 10 – 24; 10 = 25 – 49; 15 = 50 – 99; 20 = 100+	0 = 60% least deprived; 10 = 40% most deprived; 20 = 20% most deprived	0 = No; 5 = Yes	0 = None; 5 = Local ('B' roads, schools); 10 = Strategic ('A' roads, substation, hospital)	0 = No; 5 = Yes	0 = No; 5 = Yes	0 = No; 5 = Yes	Total Score	Notes (see below)
Location	District									
Buckskin, Basingstoke.	Basingstoke and Deane	20	10	0	10	5	5	5	55	2.
Romsey	Test Valley	20	0	5	10	5	5	5	50	2.
Winchester (incl. Littleton, Kings Worthy and Headbourne Worthy)	Winchester	20	0	5	10	0	5	5	45	2
Bourne Rivulet (incl. St. Mary Bourne, Stoke, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Vernham Dean, Upton and Ibthorpe)	Test Valley	15	0	0	5	5	5	5	35	
Hursley	Winchester	10	0	0	10	0	0	5	25	
Calmore Road, Totton	New Forest	15	0	5	0	0	5	0	25	
Copythorne	New Forest	15	0	0	10	0	0	0	25	
Candover Brook (Preston and Brown Candover).	Basingstoke and Deane	10	0	0	10	0	0	5	25	1.
Wickham	Winchester	5	0	0	10	5	0	5	25	
Lower Farringdon and Chawton	East Hants	1	0	0	10	0	5	5	21	
Ringwood	New Forest	5	0	0	10	0	0	5	20	
Sutton Scotney	Winchester	5	0	0	10	0	5	0	20	
Beeches Lane, Bishops Waltham	Winchester	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	20	
River Lavant (Finchdean, Rowlands Castle).	East Hants	10	0	5	0	0	0	5	20	1.
Twyford	Winchester	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	20	
Rectory Road, Farnborough	Rushmoor	5	0	5	10	0	0	0	20	2.
School Lane, Chandlers Ford	Eastleigh	15	0	0	5	0	0	0	20	

## Notes

1. Potential to secure indicative Local Levy within the 6 year FCERM programme
2. Potential to secure indicative FDGiA or Local Levy within the 6 year FCERM programme

**Appendix 6 – Pipeline Programme: Locations ranked in priority order following prioritisation process**

	<b>Criteria</b>	Number of households at risk	Levels of deprivation and vulnerable groups	Vulnerable groups at risk (i.e. care /nursing homes)	Critical services and infrastructure at risk	Alignment with water company programmes	Alignment with Environment Agency and Local Authority schemes in the FCERM GiA six year programme	Presence of Flood Action Group / Flood Plan.		
	<b>Scoring</b>								<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Notes (see below)</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>District</b>									
Wallington	Fareham	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	15	
Fleet Road, Cove, Farnborough	Rushmoor	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	15	
Fordingbridge and Breamore	New Forest	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	11	
The Pentons and Monxton	Test Valley	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	11	
Pitt, Winchester	Winchester	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	11	
Watery Lane, Upper Clatford	Test Valley	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	11	
Spencer Road, New Milton	New Forest	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	11	
Sycamore Road, Farnborough	Rushmoor	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	10	2.
Monks Brook, Chandler's Ford.	Eastleigh	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1.
Goodworth and Clatford	Test Valley	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	
Upper Test (Deane, Cole Henley).	Basingstoke	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	1.
West Tytherley	Test Valley	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	
Chandlers Lane, Yateley	Rushmoor	1	0	0		0	5	0	6	
Longparish	Test Valley	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	
Bishops Sutton	Winchester	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	
Church Lane East, Aldershot	Rushmoor	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	6	
Appleshaw	Test Valley	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1.
Micheldever	Winchester	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Mapledurwell	Basingstoke	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Owslebury	Winchester	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Butts Ash Lane, Hythe	New Forest	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

**Notes**

1. Potential to secure indicative Local Levy within the 6 year FCERM programme
2. Potential to secure indicative FDGiA or Local Levy within the 6 year FCERM programme