

Subject:	Brighton Marina to River Adur Flood and Coastal Risk Management Scheme		
Date of Meeting:	25th June 2019		
Report of:	Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Alistair Booton	Tel: 01273 291733
	Email:	Alistair.booton@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report, is to provide an update, seek delegated authority and agreement to proceed with further development of the Brighton Marina to River Adur Coast Protection Scheme.
- 1.2 Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), in partnership with Shoreham Port Authority (SPA), Adur District Council (Adur DC) and the Environment Agency (EA), have developed a 100 year strategy to improve and maintain the coastal defences for the section of coast line between Brighton Marina and the River Adur.
- 1.3 Technical and financial approval, through the preparation of an Outline Business Case (OBC) for a flood and coastal erosion risk management (FCERM) project, is being sought from the EA.
- 1.4 A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to outline and confirm the intention of BHCC, Adur DC and SPA to progress with the submission of the OBC, has been prepared.
- 1.5 The MoU is a non-legally binding document but promotes the continued partnership to deliver the scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee:

- 2.1 Grants delegated authority to the Assistant Director for City Transport to:
 - (i) Enter into a memorandum of understanding with Adur District Council and Shoreham Port Authority to develop and agree an outline business case on the Brighton Marina to River Adur Coast Protection Scheme for submission to the Environment Agency; and

- (ii) Submit the outline business case on the Brighton Marina to River Adur Coast Protection Scheme referred to in 2.1(i) to the Environment Agency's Large Project Review Group for technical approval.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 BHCC exercises its flood risk and coastal erosion risk management functions as a risk management authority (RMA) in accordance with the Coast Protection Act (1949) and the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) (FWMA2010).
- 3.2 BHCC's strategy for the management of its coastline has been led by The Beachy Head to Selsey Bill Shoreline Management Plan (2006) and the subsequent Brighton Marina to River Adur Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2014).
- 3.3 The strategy recommended a capital improvement scheme is undertaken for Shoreham Locked Section and the Open Coast (Shoreham Port to Brighton Marina) to improve the coastal defences to reduce the long term (100 year) flood and erosion risk, taking account of long term climate change predictions to sea level rise.
- 3.4 The recommended improvement scheme would protect **13** residential and **105** commercial properties (including Shoreham Sewage Pumping Station and Shoreham Power Station) which are predicted to be lost to erosion within the first 20 years under a No Active Intervention scenario. The scheme would also reduce the present day flood risk to a further **6** residential and **8** commercial properties.
- 3.5 The scheme would be carried out under a partnership agreement between BHCC, Adur DC and SPA.
- 3.6 BHCC acting as the project lead, have prepared an OBC for submission to the EA. The OBC supports the application for Flood and Coastal Risk Management - Grant in Aid (FCRM-GiA) funding from the EA.
- 3.7 A signed, non-legally binding MoU between all of the scheme partners is required to support the submission of the OBC. The MoU will outline and confirm the intention of all parties to progress with the submission of the OBC. The draft MoU is included as Appendix A.

Economic Case

- 3.8 The proposed scheme is to improve and maintain the coastal defence infrastructure to reduce the long term (100 year) flood and erosion risk, taking account of long term climate change predictions to sea level rise.
- 3.9 The scheme currently has an average benefit to cost ratio of **5.3**, over the 100 year appraisal period.
- 3.10 The application for FDGiA funding contribution is calculated utilising HM treasury guidance in the form of a partnership funding calculator. The funding calculator takes into consideration the potential benefits of the scheme and the contribution made by all the scheme partners over the length of the scheme programme.

Financial Case

- 3.11 A summary of the scheme costs, utilised for FDGiA approval, are shown in Table 1. The full financial calculation is included in the current draft of the OBC, which is included as Appendix B.
- 3.12 At present the proposed BHCC contribution, utilised within the partnership funding calculator, identifies a Capital works cost of **c.£2.5M** and a continued annual maintenance contribution, matching the proposed annual budget of **c.£260k**, over the 15 years of the proposed project lifecycle.
- 3.13 Utilising these BHCC contributions, upon successful submission of the OBC, **c.£4.1M** of EA's grant would be secured to fund the capital works.
- 3.14 As per HM Treasury guidance, the scheme costs, utilised for FDGiA approval, includes a calculated risk budget (approx. **42%** of scheme costs) and inflation at **2.5%**.

Table 1. Breakdown of scheme costs including partner contribution and FDGiA contribution

Partner	Contribution values - Used for OBC calculations (includes capital and maintenance costs, risk and inflation)	FCRM-GiA
BHCC - Scheme Costs	£2,476,064	£4,165,065
BHCC - Structures and beach maintenance (Contributions represents forecast maintenance costs)	£3,880,661	£0
Adur and Worthing District Council - Scheme Costs	£5,987,179	£7,742,654
Shoreham Port Authority (Contributions represents forecast maintenance costs)	£10,936,696	£0
Total*	£23,370,536	£11,907,719
*Excludes nominal maintenance amount as per paragraph 3.15		Note: An additional £794,000 is to be provided for the detailed design stage

- 3.15 The summary of the scheme cost shown in table 1, are for the purposes of submission of the OBC and support the application for FDGiA. A nominal figure (<0.2% of the overall scheme costs) from Western Esplanade Management is included within the partnership funding calculate but only represents a forecast maintenance cost over the 15 year project programme.
- 3.16 Upon the approval of the OBC, a tranche of funding would be released to fully fund detailed design of the scheme.

- 3.17 The detailed design of the scheme will include physical modelling, site surveys and early contractor involvement (ECI). Through a combination of the outcomes of the detailed design stage and proactive project management, a reduction in the risk to the delivery of the project and subsequently a reduction in the risk budget would be realised.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 4.1 BHCC's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) sets out policy and standards for engaging residents, local groups, stakeholders and statutory consultees. This policy would guide the level of engagement and consultation undertaken by BHCC following the approval of the OBC and progression of the detail design of the scheme.
- 4.2 It is recommended that Adur DC and SPA would undertake their own level of engagement and consultation as per their specific policies

5. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 5.1 A 'Do Nothing' scenario has been considered as part of the development of the OBC. Erosion and flood mapping shows that under a 'Do Nothing' scenario it is predicted that 13 residential and 105 commercial properties would be lost to erosion within the first 20 years including Shoreham Sewage Pumping Station (serving 60,000 population equivalent from Shoreham and Portslade) and Shoreham Power Station (420 mW, sufficient to power 250,000 homes).
- 5.2 This increases to 260 residential and 248 commercial properties by Year 100, including the loss of the majority of businesses and land forming Shoreham Port and sections of the A259.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The main purpose of this report is to update the committee on the current progress on the delivery of the Coast Protection scheme and to seek approval to continue with the submission of the OBC to the EA.
- 6.2 A subsequent report will be submitted to the committee pending the outcome of LPRG feedback. This report would contain any recommendations made following the submission of the OBC.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the drafting and signature of the MoU. The OBC was prepared from existing grant funding. Upon the approval of the OBC, grant funding would be released to fully fund detailed design of the scheme and the preparation of a Full Business Case. BHCC will likely be the recipient of this funding in its capacity as Lead Authority. Indicative high level costings have been detailed in Table 1 above and further work will be undertaken when preparing the Full Business Case to establish the cost and contributions for all partners toward the scheme. A detailed business case will be reported back to this Committee in due course.

Finance Officer Consulted: Rob Allen

Date: 23/05/19

Legal Implications:

- 7.2 In accordance with Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee is the appropriate decision-making body in respect of the recommendations set out in paragraph 2 above. BHCC's legal officers will advise in relation to the MoU. The MoU is not legally binding and would usually be covered by the Scheme of Delegation to Officers but given the significance of this project the Committee is being asked to make the decision with respect to the MoU.

Lawyer Consulted: Wendy McRae- Smith

Date: 31/05/19

Equalities Implications:

- 7.3 There are no equality implications in this report relating to people who share the same legally protected characteristic(s). Community engagement, as outlined in section 6, will ensure a range of perspectives from groups and individuals are considered.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.4 A Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) has been undertaken as part of the OBC and assesses the environmental implications of the preferred option (the proposed scheme). It has been included as Appendix C to this report.
- 7.5 This report identifies and describes all key environmental issues, constraints and opportunities relating to the proposed scheme and recommends the actions required to further assess or manage these during subsequent phases of the scheme implementation.

Risk management and opportunity

- 7.6 The key risks associated with delivery of the scheme and the mitigation strategy which forms part of the schemes risk register is included in as Appendix D. The risk register has also been used to inform the Risk contingency applied to the project.

Any Other Significant Implications:

- 7.7 There are no other significant implications of this report in relation to crime and disorder or corporate/citywide issues.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Memorandum of Understand (MoU) – Brighton Marina to River Adur Coastal Protection Scheme

2. Brighton Marina to River Adur Flood and Coastal Risk Management Scheme – Outline Business Case – DRAFT COPY
3. Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) – Preferred option for Brighton Marina to River Adur Coast Protection Scheme
4. Detailed Risk Assessment – DRAFT COPY

Background Documents

1. The Beachy Head to Selsey Bill Shoreline Management Plan 2006
2. Brighton Marina to River Adur Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy Review