

North Yorkshire County Council

Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

15 November 2019

Flood Risk Management Programme Delivery Update

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To inform the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services (BES) and BES Executive Members of:
- i. The progress of scheme development within the flood risk management programme.
- 1.2 To seek the approval of the Corporate Director, BES, in consultation with BES Executive Members for:
- i. The bringing into the programme of Stokesley, Saxton and the Dales Villages projects
 - ii. That NYCC allocate up to a value of £55k and £30k as contribution to the Stokesley and Saxton feasibility work respectively.
 - iii. That following the publication of the section 19 report for the Dales Villages, officers will continue to progress any recommendations of the report.
 - iv. The submission of planning applications and permits to Ryedale District Council (RDC) and the Environment Agency (EA) respectively for infrastructure elements of the Malton, Norton and Old Malton Scheme.
 - v. The roll out of property level resilience surveys to wider high risk properties identified through modelling work so eventual scheme value is understood.
 - vi. Officers to continue work with RDC on the Malton rain garden as a wider aspiration and a separate project.
 - vii. The allocation of £200k of funding from the NYCC Flood Risk Management (FRM) Budget to fund the continued development and delivery of property level resilience schemes in the Rye village project areas and for the delivery of other identified and appropriate drainage recommendations as required.
 - viii. The scoping and commissioning of feasibility work in Low Bradley and Connonley, into 20/21 to a value not exceeding £40k.
 - ix. Officers to continue to support EA project development and delivery in Tadcaster
- 1.3 To seek the support of the Corporate Director, BES and BES Executive Members for:
- i. The submission of NYCC bids to the Northumbria Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) and EA for proportionate contributions to the Stokesley feasibility study.
 - ii. The submission of a Business Case Application to the EA and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (YNER LEP) with rationalised costs for Malton, Norton and Old Malton scheme contributions.

- | |
|---|
| <p>iii. The submission of an NYCC bid to the EA for £100k to support study work required during 20/21 in the Dales villages following the recommendations of the section 19 report on the July 2019 flooding.</p> |
|---|

2.0 Background information

- 2.1 In January 2018 The Corporate Director, BES in consultation with BES Executive Members approved a method of prioritising locations where flood investigation had been necessary, to inform the programme for scheme development and delivery, with the intention of NYCC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) delivering surface and ground water flood mitigation in line with its powers to act under the Flood and Water Management Act (2010).
- 2.2 In May 2018 members approved the first tranche of delivery, based on the criteria approved on 26 January 2018.
- 2.3 Based on the criteria and with the agreement of the Corporate Director, BES, in consultation with BES Executive Members at their meeting on 7 December 2018, the present schemes in development are:
- Tadcaster
 - Great Ayton
 - Rye Villages including Kirbymoorside
 - Malton, Norton and Old Malton Flood Management Scheme
 - Scarborough Town Surface Water mitigation
 - South Craven Villages

3.0 Update on NYCC scheme development

- 3.1 Appendix 1 provides an update on the status of projects in agreed NYCC priority locations.
- 3.2 The remainder of Section 3 of this report contains details of projects that are recommended to be brought forward into the programme.

3.3 Stokesley

- 3.4. The NYCC Programme is based upon the prioritisation of locations known to be at risk of flooding, due to investigations having been undertaken by NYCC in its capacity as LLFA.
- 3.5 The Northumbrian Independent Drainage Partnership (NIDP) covers a small area of North Yorkshire, including Great Ayton and Stokesley area. NYCC is consequently a member of this partnership.
- 3.6 In the wider partnership area, schemes are prioritised by the NIDP based not on historic incident but on hypothetical risk based on modelling and mapping, this is essentially because of the denser populations that exist in other north east authority areas.
- 3.7 The work of the partnership is tied to the Northumbria Regional Flood and Coastal Committee, to which NYCC contributes approximately £35k per annum.

- 3.8 The on-going work in Great Ayton led by NYCC is being delivered as part of this partnership and has successfully received a contribution from the RFCC during the last financial year accordingly. This is because Great Ayton has both a long flood incident history and a high hypothetical risk, making it suitable for both programming mechanisms.
- 3.9 No reports of internal property flooding have been received by NYCC during the period in which it has been LLFA. Consequently, flood investigation has never been undertaken by NYCC in Stokesley.
- 3.10 Notwithstanding this, Stokesley does have a significantly high hypothetical modelled risk to properties.
- 3.11 The NIDP have therefore offered to bring this location into its programme for Phase 1 and 2 surface water study. This would mean the EA, Northumbria Water and NYCC contributing to feasibility work, similar to that being undertaken in Great Ayton. The value of the NYCC contribution would be approximately £55k.
- 3.12 Whilst this location does not fall within NYCC programme criteria, it would however permit NYCC to realise a return from the RFCC contribution made annually. Because of the very small area of North Yorkshire covered by the Northumbria RFCC, there would be no additional schemes in this area to which NYCC could seek to draw funding.
- 3.13 In addition, this surface water study would complement the delivery of the main river scheme for which the EA has recently received full funding.
- 3.14 Given that programmes differ only on the risk calculation and the work in Stokesley would be valuable to understanding the risk and mechanisms of flooding, it is therefore recommended that NYCC makes an exception to its criteria in order to deliver this partnership work over the next two years.
- 3.15 Saxton**
- 3.16 Saxton is a location which has a long history of surface water flooding. There is an active flood group affiliated to the Parish Council, which NYCC officers work alongside.
- 3.17 According to the NYCC criteria, Saxton is the next highest priority location following those already in the programme. It is proposed to bring the project into the programme, given the potential to work alongside the flood group.
- 3.18 It is proposed to allocated £30k to scheme development and feasibility to support this work.
- 3.19 Dales villages**
- 3.20 In July 2019 a very large storm event centring on Leyburn caused significant flooding and damage to infrastructure in Wensleydale and Swaledale.
- 3.21 NYCC is presently undertaking its statutory duty under section 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) to investigate the incidents so as to try and ascertain where responsibility for managing the flood risk lies and what is being done about it

and to publish the results of the investigation and to notify the relevant risk management authorities. It is expected that the report will be presented to the BES Corporate Director and BES Executive Members in January 2020.

- 3.22 As part of the investigation, drainage studies have been commissioned in Grinton, Reeth, Leyburn and Bellerby, to demonstrate the condition and identify any capacity issues within the drainage system. This would then lead to recommendations for future work to improve their function.
- 3.23 In the future years programme, based on the NYCC programme criteria, work was already intended to be undertaken in Wensleydale villages, to look at locations with common surface water flood and drainage issues in 2021.
- 3.24 In order to maintain the momentum from the Section 19 process it is recommended that the intended Wensleydale villages work is brought forward on the programme into 2020, to follow on from the publication of the report and that the remit is extended to include the affected Swaledale villages.
- 3.25 Because of the dispersed nature of the locations and the relatively small number of properties in some of the villages, it is recommended that EA funding is sourced for the feasibility study work, as was undertaken in the Rye villages, meaning that the business case process was more proportionate to the level of property protection NYCC would be offering. This is estimated to be approximately £75 - £100k. The delivery of any outcomes would therefore be funded through NYCC and potentially RFCC contributions and, depending on the value of works identified, this would not preclude a future EA contribution.

4.0 Progress on existing priorities

- 4.1 Malton, Norton and Old Malton Flood Management Scheme.
- 4.2 The Malton, Norton and Old Malton scheme has continued over the past year. Work to secure funding and develop detailed solutions in the locations has resulted in a scheme which sees the flood risk from surface water systems managed through the operation of a pump plan, with property level protection offered to those at the most high risk in the vicinity of the issues.
- 4.2 Funding has been conditionally agreed with both the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership and the Environment Agency. The final business case submissions are required to be submitted in December and quarter 4 of the financial year respectively, in order to achieve delivery targets.
- 4.3 Some of the pumping operations require permanent infrastructure in order to ensure operations are swift and to reduce the risk to site operatives as water levels can rise quickly, for example, fixed brackets and frames for pipework and hard standings. Some of these measures will require planning permission to be submitted. The Local Planning Authority has been approached and has offered positive advice on the suitability of the proposals.
- 4.4 Rye Villages
- 4.5 Drainage studies and options have been undertaken as part of the Rye Villages project in Hovingham, Kirbymoorside, Gilling East, Thornton Dale and Sinnington.

These NYCC studies were funded by the EA and have identified appropriate options for managing the flood risk in these locations.

- 4.6 Solutions identified involve minor upgrades to surface water systems and individual property level resilience measures.
- 4.7 Given the locations are rural and therefore contain relatively low numbers of affected properties, the opportunity to achieve flood defence grant in aid from the EA was reduced. Therefore the study phase in this instance was funded by the EA as a pilot, with the expectation that measures would be then funded through local authority contribution.
- 4.8 This pilot has demonstrated that this is an effective way of delivering work in dispersed communities and this approach may work well in other high priority locations, for example the Dales Villages recently hit by flash flooding.
- 4.9 South Craven Villages
- 4.10 Work to deliver a model for the Glusburn Beck funded by the EA is progressing but outputs are delayed.
- 4.11 It is proposed to commence the remaining work NYCC has identified from the December 2015 Section 19 process, in Low Bradley and Cononley, to undertake feasibility work into the delivery of surface water solutions in these two conurbations.
- 4.12 Tadcaster
- 4.13 The EA has now received full funding to deliver the main river defence in Tadcaster. The EA is presently preparing its business case for this purpose.
- 4.14 Issues in Tadcaster are interlinked and surface water issues interplay with main river mechanisms to cause repeat flooding on Bridge Street.
- 4.15 The EA will be setting up a working group to support its business case preparations. Through NYCC involvement in this it is hoped that surface water benefits can be identified and addressed alongside preparation of the EA scheme.

5.0 Equalities

- 5.1 A Full Equalities Impact Assessment is included in Appendix 2.
- 5.2 The Assessment finds that the proposals will have no heightened effect upon any protected characteristic or combination of protected characteristics.

6.0 Finance

- 6.1 There is £308k presently underspent in the FRM annual project revenue budget which this report seeks to commit to reserve to permit development of the proposed commitments in future years that are set out in section 3 above.
- 6.2 There is presently £ 893,274.75 in reserve, which is required to fund the delivery of schemes presently in preparation, in future years.

- 6.3 Whilst there have been some significant successes in the recruitment of a project manager for the Malton Scheme, which has significantly accelerated specific scheme progress, across the programme development of schemes this year has however been slower than anticipated. This is in part due to changes in team structures and staff roles associated with the realignment of the flood risk and transport and development teams, but also is due to delays in the programmes of other partner agencies with which NYCC is working.
- 6.4 Work nevertheless is intended to continue into the next financial year as planned. A revised programme including the recommended additional projects is included in this report as appendix 3.

7.0 Legal

- 7.1 North Yorkshire County Council has permissive powers under both Section 14 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 to undertake work to mitigate surface water flooding or groundwater flooding, and to undertake works to ordinary watercourses and under Section 25 of the 1991 Act (in areas without an Internal Drainage Board (IDB)) to require works to maintain the free passage of flow on ordinary watercourses.
- 7.2 Under the County Council's Constitution, the Corporate Director BES has delegated powers to exercise all functions of NYCC as Lead Local Flood Authority under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and the Land Drainage Act 1991, including (but not limited to) the granting (or otherwise) of land drainage consents for ordinary watercourses.
- 7.3 This report seeks to update on the progress of scheme development in the locations which are of the highest priority to NYCC in which to exercise these powers. The affordance of a priority to "high risk locations" is detailed in the NY Flood Risk Management Strategy.
- 7.4 Because work is required to be undertaken on third party assets, a decision over the ownership and maintenance of any future assets resulting from the work would be required following the establishing of a preferred scheme and prior to its delivery.
- 7.5 Specific contracts detailing the future maintenance commitments of third party owners following a scheme may be required to be entered into as a consequence of any future decisions taken over the delivery of a future project, but this is not a matter for this report.

8.0 Recommendations

- 8.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director, BES in consultation with BES Executive Members note:
- i. The progress of scheme development in the priority locations agreed to be progressed by NYCC in December 2018, as detailed in Appendix 1.
- 8.2 The Corporate Director, BES, in consultation with BES Executive Members approve the following associated recommendations:
- i. The bringing into the programme of Stokesley, Saxton and the Dales Villages
 - ii. That NYCC allocate up to a value of £55k from the FRM reserve as a contribution to the Stokesley feasibility work

- iii. That NYCC allocate £30k from the FRM reserve to permit feasibility work in Saxton.
 - iv. That following the publication of the section 19 report for the Dales Villages, in Jan 2020, officers will continue to progress any recommendations of the report.
 - v. The submission of planning applications and permits to RDC and the EA respectively for infrastructure elements of the Malton, Norton and Old Malton Scheme.
 - vi. The roll out of property level resilience surveys to wider high risk properties identified through modelling work so eventual scheme value is understood.
 - vii. That £200k of funding is allocated from NYCC Budget to fund the development and delivery of property level resilience schemes in the Rye village project areas and for the delivery of other identified and appropriate drainage recommendations as required.
 - viii. The scoping and commissioning of feasibility work in Low Bradley and Connonley, into 20/21 to a value not exceeding £40k.
 - ix. Officers continue to support EA project development and delivery in Tadcaster
- 8.3 The Corporate Director, BES, in consultation with BES Executive Members supports:
- i. The submission of NYCC bids to the RFCC and EA for proportionate contribution to the Stokesley feasibility study.
 - ii. The submission of Business Case Application to the EA and the LEP with rationalised costs for Malton, Norton and Old Malton scheme contributions.
 - iii. The submission of an NYCC bid to the EA for £100k to support study work required during 20/21 in the Dales villages following the recommendations of the section 19 report on July 2019 flooding.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director - Highways and Transportation

Author of Report: Emily Mellalieu

Background Documents:
Flood Incident Review Protocol

Table 1 Progress update on NYCC agreed priority locations.

Location	Officer comment	Recommendation for future work
Malton, Norton and Old Malton	<p>Project Manager part funded by RDC in post since April, and work to progress the Malton, Norton and Old Malton business case for partner contributions has continued. Detailed designs have been developed and drainage studies delivered which have significantly revised scheme costs. Whilst those costs are yet to be finalised it is expected that the scheme will be approx. £1m in value, due to most critically, one aspect of the project growing in scope, and therefore due to timescale constraints, requiring the removal of the SuDS/rain garden project to permit it to be delivered as a larger growth project, potentially led in the future by Ryedale District Council.</p> <p>The EA £314k contribution has been rationalised and is fixed, however this means that contribution from growth fund, RDC and NYCC can be amended proportionately. RDC now has member agreement in principle to a 20% contribution, to a maximum value of £321k.</p> <p>Wayleave agreements are being developed alongside legal agreements with RDC and Willoughby's for the joint funding and operation of the pumping plan respectively. Pilot Property Level Resilience Scheme undertaken as part of scheme development. Groundwater study has been undertaken in Malton which has confirmed a relationship between the Broughton and Taylor Brown boreholes which can be extrapolated to improve telemetry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost rationalisation to continue. • Wayleave agreements with Fitzwilliam Estate and Taylor Brown sites to be signed. • Planning Permission is required for some of the infrastructure elements. Work is in progress with RDC but applications need to be submitted and any other permits require to be sought. • Business Case application to EA to be submitted with rationalised costs. • Business case application to LEP to be submitted with rationalised costs • Offer of property level resilience surveys to be rolled out to wider high risk properties identified through modelling work so eventual scheme value is understood. • To continue to work with RDC on rain garden as a wider aspiration and a separate project. • Condition improvements to be undertaken to existing drainage systems in Old Malton • Improved telemetry/flood warning through borehole • Purchase of additional CCTV to improve monitoring
Scarborough Town	<p>Feasibility study completed by WSP to offer recommendations for future direction of work. This has resulted in the commissioning of drainage consequence modelling, targeting NYCC LHA culverts and interactions with wider drainage system, in the vicinity of Scalby Road. This is a known problem area and may result in funding becoming available for upgrade to existing NYCC assets.</p>	<p>It is expected that the first outputs from the modelling will be available by year end. This will inform future decision making.</p>
Great Ayton	<p>£45k was contributed from the 17/18 FRM budget towards a multi-source study being developed in partnership with NYCC and Northumbria Water.</p> <p>NYCC successfully bid for RFCC and EA funding towards this work.</p> <p>Outputs expected in Q4. This will inform future decision making on direction of work,</p>	<p>Awaiting outcomes of phase 2 study</p>

Appendix 1

Rye Villages	<p>Drainage studies and feasibility work undertaken during this financial year, focussing on Kirkbymoorside, Hovingham, Sinnington, Gilling East.</p> <p>Various distinct recommendations for villages, with a focus on property level protection.</p> <p>In Kirkbymoorside additional drainage condition survey has been identified as required. It is intended that this will be commissioned during this financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage condition studies in Kirkbymoorside continues, using funding given by the EA for study phase and therefore already allocated. • £200k of funding is allocated from NYCC Budget to fund the development and delivery of property level resilience schemes and any other identified actions as required. If schemes exceed this value, RFCC contribution will be sought.
South Craven	<p>NYCC contributed £25k to a project led by the EA closely supported by NYCC officers delivering studies to support the understanding of future feasibility of mitigation. The results of this are still awaited from the EA.</p> <p>Because of the 3 delays which are affecting the wider NYCC programme and as part of this work, NYCC intends to bring forward its own work in Low Bradley and Cononley, leading on from the 2017 section 19 report, to look at feasibility in these other affected villages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To scope and commission feasibility work in Low Bradley and Cononley, into 20/21. It is expected that this will cost approximately £30k • To await the results of the EA flooding models for Eastburn.
Tadcaster	<p>Following the receipt of central government funding, the EA now is proceeding with full funding of this scheme.</p> <p>NYCC has contributed £25k towards business case preparation.</p> <p>The EA is forming a working group for the delivery of the project. Due to the surface water interaction this will need to be delivered in partnership.</p> <p>NYCC to continue to support the project in general but in particular the delivery of any surface water elements.</p>	<p>NYCC Officers to continue to work with EA on the scheme and update as appropriate.</p>

Name of Directorate and Service Area	BES H & T Network Strategy
Lead Officer and contact details	Emily Mellalieu – 01609 534876
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Tony Law
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	Any issues identified will be considered by the report author.
When did the due regard process start?	When the NY Flood Risk Management Strategy was introduced a full EIA was prepared, which considered how the work to manage flood risk would be prioritised. Subsequently, a prioritisation method was given approval which directed the investigatory works of the flood risk management team. In January 2018 it was agreed to use this method to prioritise scheme development. In May 2018 locations for scheme development were agreed by the Corporate Director, BES in consultation with BES Executive Members, this report seeks to update on project work, allocating funding towards the remaining 19/20 budget towards these projects and to seek approval for flood risk expenditure on other partnership projects.
Sign off by Assistant Director (or equivalent) and date	Barrie Mason 06/11/19
<p>Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, stopping doing something?)</p> <p>In January 2018 it was agreed that the existing method of prioritising investigation was extended and used to prioritise locations for scheme development. In May 2018 the highest priority locations for scheme development were agreed by the Corporate Director, BES in consultation with BES Executive Members. The report to which this EIA relates seeks to update on the work, demonstrate the status of the programme, and to seek approval for flood risk expenditure on other partnership projects.</p>	
<p>Section 2. Why is this being proposed? (e.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)</p> <p>To allocate the flood risk management budget to the development of flood alleviation solutions in our most at risk priority communities, to offer property and business protection, but also influences the growth potential in those locations. This also has public health benefits for those living at risk of flooding.</p>	
<p>Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?</p> <p>The method of prioritisation of locations is already agreed. The locations at risk are already agreed. This report seeks to allocate the remaining budget to these projects and bring forward other locations on the programme.</p>	
<p>Section 4. What impact will this proposal have on council resources (budgets)?</p> <p>Cost neutral? N however the report seeks to demonstrate and gain approval for specific expenditure of resource already allocated towards Flood Risk Management rather than seeking additional funding. Increased cost? N Reduced cost? Y</p>	

Please explain briefly why this will be the result.				
<p>Funds are ear-marked for the delivery of flood risk management annually.</p> <p>Since the approval of a method of prioritisation of locations, the flood risk management team is now able to allocate its annual funding from its budget towards projects, drawing from the existing reserve where required.</p> <p>This report does not therefore alter council resources significantly but simply offers a robust statement of how funding allocated to flood risk management will be spent this year, with opportunities for additional external funding identified where appropriate which will reduce the value potentially required to be found from NYCC resources.</p>				
Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No Impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
Age	X			<p>The proposed programme and allocated funding will not have any impact upon age, as it uses a methodology and a criteria for quantifying risk. As part of the calculation for prioritisation of locations, “critical infrastructure” – which would include residential care homes and hospitals is given a higher weighting than other indicative factors, in the criteria given that the risk of flooding affecting critical infrastructure has a higher and more far reaching impact than in other location. This means that locations which have residential facilities, doctor’s surgeries and hospitals have a higher priority than locations which do not and the proposed allocation of funding is therefore towards locations where critical infrastructure is more likely to be affected.</p> <p>This neither benefits nor dis-benefit any protected characteristic but it does mean that flood risk works are targeted at locations where the risk is heightened by its effects on critical infrastructure, which may include facilities used more by those with some protected characteristics.</p> <p>The weightings were agreed in January 2018.</p>
Disability	X			As above
Sex (Gender)	X			<p>The proposal is to allocate funding and funding bids in accordance with the approved methodology for the delivery of flood mitigation works. Fundamentally the whole programme is based upon a locations risk of flooding, rather than based upon measures which benefit a particular set of individuals, the proposals will therefore have the same impact on all individuals.</p>

Race	X			As above
Gender reassignment	X			As above
Sexual orientation	X			As above
Religion or belief	X			As above
Pregnancy or maternity	X			As above
Marriage or civil partnership	X			As above
Section 6. Would this proposal affect people for the following reasons?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Give any evidence you have.
Live in a rural area	X			Locations which are extremely rural are likely to have a lower score as the impact on the wider community is lower than in a larger conurbation with critical services and larger more densely spaced property numbers. Notwithstanding this, the impacts of flooding in a larger conurbation have a secondary effect on the wider community that the town services, for example, critical infrastructure such as hospitals, wider growth issues, disruption to transport, loss of business etc. are facilities for use by those living in a wide geographical area, and therefore the prioritisation used aims to prioritise those locations which have the largest effect on the wider community and not just the individual immediate properties affected.
Have a low income	x			The proposal would not affect this as the criteria would not distinguish between any factor that could identify a person's income.
Section 7. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men?) State where this is likely to happen and explain what you think the effect will be and why, giving any evidence you have. This is not likely to affect any one more because of a combination of protected characteristics.				
Section 8. Only complete this section if the proposal will make things worse for some people. Remember that we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us.				

Can we change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts? N/a			
Can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people? N/a			
If we need to achieve our aim and can't remove or reduce the adverse impacts get advice from legal services. Summarise the advice here. Make sure the advice is passed on to decision makers if the proposal proceeds.			
Section 9. If the proposal is implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?) As the schemes in the locations progress, risk registers and community engagement will be an integral part of planning, these will be picked up and mitigated as part of the scheme development. Any impacts will be reported through EIA in annual progress reports to the Corporate Director, BES in consultation with BES Executive Members.			
Section 10. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA			
Action	Lead	By when	Progress

2019 excerpt from FRM Programme

Project	Total scheme costs (K)	EA match (K)	NYCC capital commitment(K)	RFCC match	Other Risk Management Authority(K)	NYCC scheme dev costs (K)	2017/18	2018/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	TOTAL
Malton, Norton, Old Malton	1,384	314	450		0	520	100	30	50	20	764	520		1,384
Scarborough Town	750	250	200	200			100			25	75	250	200	750
Great Ayton	145			45	45	55	55	40	105					145
Stokesley	110				55	55	55			15	95			110
Tadcaster	25					25	25			25				25
Rye Villages	275	75	100	100		0	0	20	55	100	100			275
Kirkbymoorside	250	157	43			50	50			50	100	100		250
Dales Villages	90	70				20	20			90				90
Leyburn	35					35	35			35				35
Bellerby	35					35	35			35				35
South Craven villages	25					25	25	25						25
Low Bradley	150	20	45	35		50	50			50	100			150
Cononley	200	31	90	29		50	50			100	100			200
Saxton	170	35	65	20		50	50			30	70	70		170
TOTAL	3,644	952	993	429	620	650	70	200	140	1424	1240	370	200	3,644
EA Match Funding	952								20	55	415	405	57	952
NYCC Reserves + NYCC Feasibility	1,643						30	130	85	735	370	293		1,643
RFCC	429						0	45	0	19	145	0	220	429
Other	620						40	5		255	320			620
TOTAL	3644			TOTAL			70	200	140	1424	1240			3644

The figures in the above table demonstrate anticipated costs, which may require refinement as feasibility and scheme development continues. The above figures demonstrate total year expenditure against projects, and do not necessarily represent the value of work which this report seeks approval for at the time of writing this report.