Bradford Initial assessment report
Masons Mill - Shipley
November 2016

Using this template

The standard headings and tables in this template should be modified to meet the requirements of each Initial Assessment. The sites may have diverse issues and constraints and problems and the standard template is therefore just a guide on typical requirements but flexibility is allowed to amend/ add headings as required

Hidden guidance

The template contains various pieces of guidance covering content, use of tables etc. The guidance is shown in blue text and can be turned 'on' to assist in the writing stages or 'hidden' for viewing or when printing the document. You can switch between 'hidden' and 'on' and back to 'hidden' at any time.

To show/hide the guidance click on the ¶ icon on the MS Word toolbar.

If the hidden text does not disappear off the screen when the ¶ icon is clicked, go to: Tools>Options>View Tab and uncheck the 'Hidden text' box.

It is advisable to work with the hidden text turned on, as this helps to format new text and to avoid deleting the hidden text itself.

Auto-updating of contents page

The contents page will update to reflect changed information in the main text and tables. To update right click on the relevant area of the contents page, to highlight it, and select 'Update Field" to access the update option.

To enable these updating features to be created, the document contains specific text types and "fields". These are Headings 1, 2, 3 & 4; fields in the table labels and in the appendix labels. When editing the document, take care to maintain these aspects.

Inserting new headings

To insert new headings in the main text go to: Format>Styles and Formatting to open the styles box. Insert the new headings, highlight it and click on the appropriate Heading level in the 'Pick formatting to apply' box. Paragraph text can be inserted and formatted in a similar way.

Inserting new tables

Table labels should be added by Insert>Reference>Caption and selecting 'Table' from the drop down 'Label' box. This will insert the Table title with the correct number and the caption can be typed in after the label. Tables can then be cross referenced from the text by Insert>Reference>Cross Reference and selecting the appropriate reference type and caption from the drop down box and list.

Numbering paragraphs

All paragraphs should be numbered sequentially as sub-sets of the section number. Prompts for paragraph numbering are provided as 'Start writing here' after which pressing <return> will automatically provide the next paragraph number.

1 Initial Assessment Report

Scheme or project location name	Yorkshire Area Initial Assessment: Masons Mill - Shipley

Masons Mill, Shipley

Date	November 2016
Version	1

Version control

Version	Status	Signed off by:	Date signed	Date issued
0	Draft	G Fardell	06.10.16	06.10.16
1	Final	G Fardell	08.11.16	08.11.16

Contact Details

Role	Name	Post Title
Project Sponsor		
Senior User		
Senior Supplier		
Project Executive		
Project Manager		

Sign Off

Form completed by:	Name:	Title: Project Manager	Signature:	Date:
Project Executive Approval:	Name:	Title: Project Team Leader	Signature:	Date:
Senior User Approval:	Name:	Title:	Signature:	Date:
Project Sponsor Approval:				

CONTENTS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

APPENDICES

1.1 Introduction and background

1.1.1 Background

In May 2016 CH2M were commissioned by the Environment Agency to undertake Yorkshire Area Initial Assessments report for Masons Mill, Shipley providing guidance on measures to reduce flood risk and potential funding availability. A site visit for this Initial Assessment was undertaken on 18th of July 2016. This report is based on information from the site visit and previous studies and reports that are relevant to this Initial Assessment.

1.1.2 Description of Location

Shipley is a town located 5km to the north-east of Bradford. It is part of the Metropolitan District of the City of Bradford. The Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the River Aire run through the town. The area belongs to the River Aire Middle Catchment Flood Warning Area.

The Baildon/Shipley area is comprised of five individual benefit areas; Aire Close, Baildon Bridge, Glenaire Court, Lower Holme and Masons Mill.

Masons Mill area is located on the right bank of the River Aire, upstream of Baildon Bridge. The cell reaches from the HM Revenues building at the upstream end to Ives Street at the downstream end. A location plan of the site is shown in Appendix H.

The study area is classified within the 20% most deprived area in the country. There are no properties within the 10% most deprived classification.

1.1.3 Description of Watercourses and Geology

The River Aire is a major watercourse in Yorkshire flowing from Malhamin the Yorkshire Dales, through the urban areas of Bradford and Leeds, before joining the Rover Ouse at Airmyn. The Aire is approximately 114km in length from its source to its confluence.

The underlying bedrock of the Area of Shipley is Millstone Grit, overlain by lover coal measures. Ground condition could be described as slowly permeable seasonally wet acid loamy and clayey soils.

1.1.4 History of Flooding

The properties in Shipley have been flooded several times in the past. During the December 2015 event flooding occurred which is likely due to high river levels in the River Aire overtopping the river banks and flood defences.

Six historic flood events in Shipley have been identified from previous reports and studies – in 1909, 1967, 1980, 2000 and 2008.

1.1.5 Summary of modelling analysis

In 2008 hydraulic and hydrological modelling of the Upper River Aire was completed by JBA to support the development of the Flood Risk Management Strategy. For this study the River Aire was modelled from High Hill Weir upstream of Gargrave to Fleet Weir downstream of Leeds. The Upper River Aire model is a 1D hydrodynamic ISIS model containing 1922 nodes.

This 2008 study aimed to define flood risk within this area and identify potential flood risk management options. This informed the Flood Risk Management Strategy for the Upper Aire which proposed flood risk management options for the short, medium and long-term. These recommendations included progressing a flood management scheme for defences at Baildon.

Following the December 2015 flood event the detailed modelling is being undertaken by the EA National Flood Modelling Team and it is still subject to confirmation. For the purpose of the Initial Assessment report, initial review of modelled options shown below, have been provided:

- Three Weir Study – Re-run the Aire Model using the estimate December 2015 flows to investigate the removal of three weirs around Shipley and Baildon.

- Baildon Bridge Blockage Analysis – Re-run the Aire Model using the estimated December 2015 flow to complete blockage analysis on Baildon Bridge.

- Wall Scenario Downstream of Baildon Weir – Following the December 2015 event a riparian owner has raised the height of a flood wall on the right bank. Various modelling runs have been carried out to determine the impact of the raise wall on flood risk to the left bank.

1.1.6 Drivers, Constraints and Opportunities

The Aire River falls under the Aire Catchment Flood Management Plan and is covered by sub-area 3 – Worth and Aire. The CFMP can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289346/River_Aire_Catchment_Flood_Management_Plan.pdf. The designated policy for the area at risk is 'Policy Option 5: Areas of moderate to high flood risk where we can generally take further action to reduce flood risk.

The following drivers, constraints and opportunities have been identified within the study area.

Political Drivers	**Summary Description**
Catchment Flood Management Plan	River Aire Catchment Flood Management Plan
Catchment Flood Management Policy	5 - areas of moderate to high flood risk where we can generally take further action to reduce flood risk
Economic Drivers	**Summary Description**
Funding Time Constraints	Must be obtained within 6 year programme of capital investment
Social Constraints	**Summary Description**
Existing Public Space	Residential and commercial space in the town
Environmental Constraints	**Summary Description**
World Heritage Site	A desk study of MAGIC reveals the eastern boundary of the Saltaire World Heritage Site lies within 200m of the benefits area (approx.. 130m away). Works to the site have the potential to impact the World Heritage Site. A full impact assessment should be conducted once an option has been selected.
Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	The benefits area lies approximately 1.2km east of the Trench Meadows SSSI. This is a biologically important site. The benefits area thus lies within a SSSI impact risk zone.
Ancient Woodland	Fairbank Wood 0.2 kilometres to the north west; Midgleley Wood 0.5 kilometres to the north west; Old Spring Wood 0.9 kilometres to the south west
Contaminated Land	There are no records of historical landfill within the benefits area.
Tree Preservation	There are no TPOs within the benefits area.

Orders	
Ground Conditions	Slowly permeable seasonally wet acid loamy and clayey soils
Scheduled Monument	Scheduled monument 0.4 kilometres to the south; another one 0.6 kilometres to the north
Listed Buildings/Structures	Three Grade II buildings exist within the benefits area at Victoria Works/Masons Mills. A further Grade II listed building exists within 200m of the benefits area, located west of the Salts Mill Road bridge over the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. Impacts upon these buildings are largely expected to be minimal, though this is dependent upon option selection.
Historical Park & Gardens	Roberts Park 0.5 kilometres to the north west.
WFD Body	River Aire (River Worth to Gill Beck)
WFD Status	Moderate

Refer to Appendix B for the full list of constraints that were considered.

1.2 Problem and objectives

1.2.1 Problem

Based on the evidence provide and local anecdotal knowledge, it is likely that the flooding during the December 2015 event was predominantly from fluvial sources. 69 properties have been identified as being a fluvial flood risk.

However, the site may be at risk from other sources of flooding including surface water and groundwater flooding. It is recommended that further investigation is carried out to identify and understand the flood risk from other sources.

During the December 2015 flood event, the River Aire overtopped due to high water levels caused by prolonged, heavy rainfall. In additional to the high flows two containers were swept into the river and became stuck under Baildon Bridge constricting the flow in that section.

Based on all the available information, EA had estimated that the December flood event has 1.3% – 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP). It means, that an event has between 1 in 80 and 1 in 100 chance of occurring in any single year.

The current standard of protection for the study area is unknown at the time this report is written, however investigations are ongoing and should be used in any future studies.

This report will identify potential solutions to the flooding based on the evidence available and identify if there is scope to determine the best cost/benefit solution to manage this flood risk.

1.2.2 Objectives

The primary objective of this initial assessment is to identify the flood risk issues and viable solutions for the affected properties and to identify any other potential flood risk management measures which are consistent with the current CFMP policy.

The purpose of this report is to lay the groundwork and, where applicable, provide a business case for future more detailed appraisal. The report aims to achieve the following:

- Confirm the need for a project;
- Identify the issues and Political, Environmental, Societal, Technological, Legislative and Economic (PESTLE) drivers and opportunities related to the need;

- Identify the options to address the need and problem;
- Demonstrate that viable options exist based upon the available information;
- Provide sufficient information to allow the packaging and optimisation of packages of future appraisal, design and construction packages;
- Provide sufficient information for the appraisal scope to be prepared;
- Make an assessment on the deliverability of the project;
- Provide a basis/starting point for discussion with communities and partner organisations for use in the development of potential schemes and negotiations regarding funding contributions.

1.3 Benefits

In this area the primary benefit associated with a reduction in flood risk would be the reduction in economic damages to properties. This would result in the reduction of disruption to local transport, businesses, private residences and other infrastructure.

Social benefits relate primarily to a reduction in stress, health effects (including risk to life) and loss of memorabilia for those at risk.

An appraisal period of 100 years is assumed, over which the current Standard of Protection of existing assets is expected to decrease as a result of climate change.

Table 1.1 shows the properties at risk within the study area.

Table 1.1 Number of Properties at Risk (based on current outlines)

Property Type	Flood Risk	Number of Properties
Residential	≥1 in 25 year (4% AEP) (Very Significant Risk)	11
	<1 in 25 year (4% AEP) ≥1 in 75 year (1.33% AEP) (Significant Risk)	28
	<1 in 75 year (1.33% AEP) ≥1 in 200 year (0.5% AEP) (Moderate Risk)	30
Non-Residential	≥1 in 25 year (4% AEP) (Very Significant Risk)	1
	<1 in 25 year (4% AEP) ≥1 in 75 year (1.33% AEP) (Significant Risk)	3
	<1 in 75 year (1.33% AEP) ≥1 in 200 year (0.5% AEP) (Moderate Risk)	4

Detail of the methodology used for assessing the benefits of each option is detailed in Appendix C.

1.4 Options

A long list of options has been compiled. The table on the following page shows the large range of long list options considered and the reasoning for or against them being taken forward to the short list of options to be assessed.

Category	Long List Option	Water Course / Areas Affected	Description	Take Forward for assessment?	Reasoning / Notes / Past Study Reference
Do nothing	Do nothing		All operational and maintenance activities cease	Yes	Required to support development of business case and benefit cost ratios.
Do minimum	Do Minimum		Continue with current operational and maintenance activities.	Yes	Required to support development of business case and incremental b/c ratio.
Non-structural (by EA)	Improved flood warning		Enhanced flood warning to allow residents to prepare plus appropriate implementation of flood action plans	No	Not appropriate. A Flood warning system is already in place for Shipley/Baildon. Not funded via the capital programme
Non-structural (by EA)	Flood action plans		Improved direction of reactionary flood defence measure (fire crews, temporary pumps, etc.)	No	Recommended as best practice, and a plan must be in place to respond to a breach in defences. Not taken forward for assessment as not part of capital programme of works.
Property level protection	Property level protection		Protection to individual properties (e.g. via air brick covers, door guards etc.).	Yes	Passive solutions to be considered as an option (flood doors, automatic airbricks)
Operational (by Others)	Improve operation/design		Remove or lower Baildon weir.	Yes	Baildon weir is located downstream of the site. Lowering or removing the weir will lower the water levels adjacent to the site.
Planning	Land re-designation		Re-designation / reuse of land in affected areas - long-term (100yr).	No	Not a solution for the main problem.
Land management	Attenuate flows in urban areas (SUDS)		Use of SUDS drainage on new developments, make changes to urban areas to reduce speed of runoff.	No	Flooding only due to overtopping of defences. This would not have an impact on risk.

Category	Long List Option	Water Course / Areas Affected	Description	Take Forward for assessment?	Reasoning / Notes / Past Study Reference
Urban drainage	Improve urban drainage.		Improved surface water drainage system.	No	Flooding only due to overtopping of defences. This would not have an impact on risk.
Structural	Linear Defences		Repair and strengthen existing flood defences along the river front.	Yes	Repair and raise existing defence level to increase standard of protection.
Structural	Linear Defences		Replace the existing defences flood along the river front.	Yes	The existing defence may not be able to be increased in height, in this situation the entire defence will need to be replaced.
Structural	Conveyance		Channel deepening or widening	Yes	Shoal clearance should be made but it should be considered as an additional option rather that a main option.
Structural	Conveyance		Supplementary bypass channel(s, tunnels or floodway	No	The site in an urban location, there is insufficient space for a bypass due to consistent development within that area
Structural	Conveyance		Raise deck level of Baildon Bridge.	Yes	Baildon Bridge is downstream of the site, the bridge is a potential pinch point. Raising the bridge deck will increase the conveyance and reduce water levels adjacent to the site. Increasing the deck level will also reduce the risk of blockages.
Structural	Conveyance		Maintain bridge openings and clear them before high order events.	Yes	Baildon Bridge is a potential pinch point. Clearing the bridge prior to high order events will reduce the risk of blockages.

Category	Long List Option	Water Course / Areas Affected	Description	Take Forward for assessment?	Reasoning / Notes / Past Study Reference
Flood storage area	Online		Use of active structures and re-profiling to store water online. (River Worth).	Yes	Online flood storage area North of Haworth. The Upper Aire SFRA identified two potential storage areas on the River Worth upstream of Keighley. Use of these sites would reduce peak flows in Keighley increasing the standard of protection provided by the Worth scheme.
Flood storage area	Online		Use of active structures and re-profiling to store water online. (River Aire).	Yes	As part of the Leeds FAS Phase 2 study upstream storage is being considered. The storage being proposed can potentially deliver further benefits to Bradford
Flood storage area	Offline		Gravity or pumping to offline storage area	No	Not considered as an option. No suitable areas identified.
Floodplain storage	Washlands-type scheme		Enhance/increase natural floodplain attenuation with cascade of passive storage areas in existing floodplain	Yes	Cricket ground and floodplain areas upstream of the site could be considered as a floodplain storage areas.

1.4.1 Shortlisted options description

Do Nothing

The Do Nothing option is defined as taking no action whatsoever; under this option all management activities would cease, including maintenance and repair work to existing assets.

Under this assumption, the natural deterioration of the river channel will occur, leading to an increase in flood risk.

There could be some advantages of this option in the form of habitat creation due to wetting of dry areas and naturalisation of channel, however, this is also likely increase the risk to people and wildlife.

The Do Nothing option is not to be taken forward as a viable option as it results in an unacceptable increase in flood risk to people and property due to failure and deterioration of assets and blockages to the channel, however it is required to be assessed in order to develop the business case.

Do Minimum

The Do Minimum option is defined as the minimum level of action or intervention necessary to maintain defence at their current level presently offered throughout the study area. Under the Do Minimum scenario the existing defences are maintain until the end of their design life but are not replaced.

The advantage of Do Minimum is that it sustains current standard of service within the study area and minimises initial capital outlay.

Option 1 – Property Level Protection

This option considers providing property level protection measures for the properties that were affected by the December 2015 flood event. PLP can take the form of barriers in doorways, non-return valves fitted to drains, and airbrick/vent covers. Properties can also be made more flood resilient, using waterproof plaster, solid concrete floors or tiled floor coverings in order to reduce the amount of time and money needed to recover from a flood event. PLP is generally used as an option for properties that experience less than 500mm of flooding.

The EA have requested the use of passive measures to maximise the effectiveness of the measures, ensuring the measure are installed at times of flooding.

Property level protection prevents water entering the property but water will still retained by the building structure. Furthermore, PLP does not provide any wider environmental benefits and does not prevent the flooding of areas surrounding the property.

There are currently no properties in the very significant flood risk category, therefore this option will not be eligible for FDGiA funding.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, however the costings are based on the number of properties at risk in each individual benefit area. Therefore the costs will be different for each benefit area.

Option 2 – Removal of Baildon Weir

Baildon Weir is located downstream of Baildon Bridge and is owned by a 3rd party. This option involves removing the weir to lower the upstream water level. It is recommended that further detailed hydraulic modelling of this option is undertaken to confirm the changes in water levels as the bridge upstream and confluence with the Bradford Beck downstream makes the hydraulics complex.

The EA have already completed modelling for the 3 Weirs Project. The modelling involved running the estimated December 2015 flows with the removal of three weirs in the River Aire; Hirst Weir, Saltmill Weir and Baildon Weir. The results show that the removal of Baildon Weir has a small impact of water levels around Shipley/Baildon. However the modelling completed to date only considers one flood event and the removal of the weir could be more beneficial at lower order events.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, the costing for the option will be the same for all the benefit areas.

Option 3 – Repair Linear Defence

There is an existing flood wall along the Masons Mill area. The current alignment is along the river frontage, and the standard of protection offered is approximately 4% (1 in 25 year) AEP event.

This option looks at repairing and maintaining the existing defences to the existing standard throughout the 100 year appraisal period.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, however the costings are based on the length of river frontage along individual benefit areas. Therefore the costs will be different for each benefit area.

Option 4 – Improve Linear Defence

This option is to raise the existing flood defence to a uniform standard of protection, 1% (1 in 100 year) AEP and maintain that standard over the 100 year appraisal period.

The option will include extending the existing flood wall to tie into Leeds Canal embankments at the upstream end and high ground along Ives Street at the downstream end to prevent the defences being outflanked.

Raised defences at Shipley/Baildon proposed as part of the long-term plan for the Upper Aire Flood Risk Management Strategy (2009).

Limited water level data was available for this assessment, therefore a nominal defence height of 1m was assumed for this option, further analysis will be required to refine the defence height if the option is carried forward.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, however the costings are based on the length of river frontage along individual benefit areas. Therefore the costs will be different for each benefit area.

Option 5 – Shoal removal

The EA have proposed a one-off programme of shoal removal for many locations along the River Aire, including Baildon. The impacts of the regular shoal removal are not expected to have a significant impact on water levels and have not been taken forward in this appraisal.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, the costing for the option will be the same for all the benefit areas.

Option 6 – Raise Baildon Bridge

During the December 2015 flood event Baildon Bridge became blocked by debris, reducing flows under the bridge and increasing upstream water levels. The bridge was also blocked by two shipping containers,further constricting the flow in that section.

This option proposes to raise the height of the bridge decks by 1m to increase the conveyance under the bridge and reduce the chance of blockages.

This option requires hydraulic modelling to confirm its viability and effectiveness, passing more water beneath the bridge is likely to reduce upstream flood risk but could also increase flood risk downstream. The standard of protection provided by this scheme is uncertain until further modelling is carried out.

Blockage scenario modelling has been completed by the EA following the December 2015 flooding. The modelling estimated the flows experienced during the December 2015 event, and tested it against various blockage scenarios. The model results suggested an increase in upstream water levels of circa 200mm for a 75% blockage, however this is only for a single return period.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, the costing for the option will be the same for all the benefit areas.

Option 7 – Clear debris from Baildon Bridge

The blockage analysis report at Baildon Bridge recommended that monitoring of the bridge and channel be undertaken in case of the high flows in the River Aire. This option is proposed to meet that recommendation. The proposal is to carry out localised channel clearance directly upstream on the bridge to maximise the existing conveyance at the location.

This option requires hydraulic modelling to confirm its viability and effectiveness. The standard of protection provided by this scheme is uncertain until further modelling is carried out.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, the costing for the option will be the same for all the benefit areas.

Option 8– Flood storage areas (River Worth)

The 2014 Upper Aire SFRA identified a site near Lord Lane north of Haworth that could potentially be used as a flood storage area. This option provides a reduction in flood risk from the River Aire further downstream. The SFRA estimated the use of this area could potentially result in a 7% reduction in peak Aire flow and a 50mm reduction in flood depths in Leeds.

The impact of the storage area on Shipley/Baildon will be to reduce flood risk however the magnitude of the impact is uncertain. This option can be used in conjunction with other options, for example reducing the flood defences.

The scheme will also provide a reduction in flood risk beyond the study area. As a result the benefit-cost ratio for the option will be artificially low, being limited to the Shipley/Baildon benefits. Therefore the economic analysis for the option is not presented in this report, but the option should be considered in any future studies.

Option 9 – Flood storage areas (River Aire)

The Leeds FAS Phase 2 scheme has identified three locations that could be potentially used as flood storage areas; Keighley Holden Park, Marley Bridge and Rodley. The Rodley site is downstream of our study area but the other two sites could potentially provide benefits for Baildon. The Upper Aire FRMS has estimated a reduction of 300mm to 400mm for a 1% (1 in 100 year) AEP event at Leeds Station. The impact at Baildon, however, is uncertain but is expected to be significant on peak water levels.

The scheme will also provide a reduction in flood risk beyond the study. As a result the benefit-cost ratio for the option will be artificially low, being limited to the Baildon benefits. Therefore the

economic analysis for the option is not presented in this report but the option should be considered in any future studies.

Option 10 – Floodplain storage

This option considers maximising the potential floodplain storage. There is currently one designated washland sites identified by the EA; the sports ground and adjacent area on the left bank of the River Aire, opposite Masons Mill, upstream of the Baildon Bridge

The proposal is to lower the existing ground level of these washland areas to allow the areas to fill earlier and store a larger quantity of floodwater, reducing the river levels. The option is to reduce the existing levels of the site by 1m and create circa 38,200m3 of additional storage.

This option requires testing in the hydraulic model to confirm its viability and effectiveness. The option is technically feasible however there are risks associated with gaining land owner consent. The standard of protection provided by this scheme is highly uncertain until further modelling is carried out.

This option is repeated for the other sites in Baildon, the costing for the option will be the same for all the benefit areas.

1.4.2 Costs of options

The costs for the options were calculated using the Environment Agency's Project Cost Tool and Long Term Costing Workbook. The maintenance and operation costs relate to mechanical maintenance of the assets to Target Condition 3.

It is assumed that a major replacement of assets will be required at some point during the appraisal period after the initial construction phase. The timing of these replacements is based on the EA's Asset Deterioration Guidance (2013), and the assumptions are outlined in Appendix B.

An appraisal period of 100 years has been used. A detailed breakdown of costs across this period is included in Appendix B.

Table 1.2 shows the build-up of costs for all options.

Table 1.2 Project costs (£k)

Item	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 6	Option 7	Option 10
Construction Costs		309	2,456	339	2,111	958	113	1,551
Environment Agency staff		49	182	54	156	151	18	115
Consultant fees (appraisal)		20	128	22	110	61	7	81
Consultant fees (design)		67	349	74	300	208	24	220
Consultant fees (construction)		17	145	19	125	54	6	92
Site investigation & survey		4	98	5	85	14	2	63

Item	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 6	Option 7	Option 10
Land purchase		0.3	12	0.3	11	1.0	0.1	8
Optimism Bias (44%)		206	1,482	226	1,274	634	75	937
TOTAL		**672**	**4,851**	**738**	**4,171**	**2,084**	**245**	**3,065**
Annual Operation and Maintenance Costs (including optimism bias)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5

1.5 Initial environmental assessment

The main impacts of each option are summarised in Table 1.3:

Table 1.3 Key environmental impacts, mitigation and opportunities

Key positive impacts	Key negative impacts	Mitigation/ enhancement opportunity
Option 1		
Reduced risk of flooding. Reduces future maintenance costs for properties at risk	Option only protects properties and not surrounding land.	
Option 2		
Reduced risk of flooding. Reduces future maintenance costs for properties at risk	Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction. Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of health hazards - possibility of contaminated water and water borne diseases.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance. The designer should give consideration to any options which may reduce the effect of the identified hazards.
Option 3		
Reduced risk of flooding. Reduces future maintenance costs for properties at risk	Construction work takes place alongside watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance.
Option 4		
Reduced risk of flooding. Reduces future maintenance costs for properties at risk	Construction work takes place alongside watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction. Visual impact of raising wall	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance.
Option 5		
Reduced risk of flooding.	Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction. Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of health hazards - possibility of contaminated water and water borne diseases.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance. The designer should give consideration to any options which may reduce the effect of the identified hazards.
Option 6		
Reduced risk of flooding. Reduces future maintenance costs for properties at risk	Construction work takes place alongside watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance.

Key positive impacts	Key negative impacts	Mitigation/ enhancement opportunity
Option 7		
Reduced risk of flooding.	Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction. Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of health hazards - possibility of contaminated water and water borne diseases.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance. The designer should give consideration to any options which may reduce the effect of the identified hazards.
Option 8		
Reduced risk of flooding.	Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance.
Option 9		
Reduced risk of flooding.	Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance.
Option 10		
Reduced risk of flooding.	Construction work takes place in a watercourse. Risk of pollution incidents and disruption to area during construction.	Best practice should be followed including referring to EA Pollution Prevention Guidance.

1.6 Consultation

The options in this appraisal were developed in consultation with the Environment Agency and Bradford MDC. No public consultations were held at this stage as the work is a high-level assessment of potential options. Stakeholder engagement will take place at subsequent stages of the project.

If this project is taken forward for further appraisal it is recommended that consultation is focused on, but not limited to, the following:

- Residents in the area at risk
- Landowners and developers for the upstream storage option.
- Riparian landowners, especially owners of riverside walls acting as informal defences

1.7 Economic summary and preliminary preferred option

Table 1.4 summarises the economic assessment carried out for all options. The calculations for PV benefits area shown in Appendix D. The options are ordered by benefit (lowest benefit first).

The benefit values are estimates based on the methodology detailed in Appendix C. There is significant uncertainty in these estimates, which are based on Weighted Annual Average Data (WAAD) from the Multi-Coloured Manual (MCM, 2015/16). If this project progresses to further

appraisal the benefits of these options should be more accurately assessed though hydraulic modelling and use of the more detailed flood depth / damage data from MCM.

Table 1.4 Benefit-cost assessment

	PV costs (£k)	PV benefits (£k)	Av. BCR	Incr' BCR	Option for iBCR calc	Comments
Do Nothing						
Do Minimum	20	Low 131 Mid 174 High 218	6.5 8.7 10.9	-		Highest ABCR
Option 3	758	Low 1,212 Mid 1,616 High 2,020	1.6 2.1 2.7	1.5 2.0 2.6	Do Minimum	Positive ABCR
Option 2	4,871	Low 1,742 Mid 2,322 High 2,903	0.4 0.5 0.6	0.1 0.2 0.2	Option 3	
Option 10	3,085	Low 2,136 Mid 2,849 High 3,561	0.7 0.9 1.2	0.4 0.5 0.6	Option 3	
Option 1	1,385	Low 1,742 Mid 2,322 High 2,903	1.3 1.7 2.1	0.8 1.1 1.4	Option 3	Positive ABCR
Option 7	517	Low 1,680 Mid 2,240 High 2,800	3.3 4.3 5.4	3.1 4.2 5.4	Do Minimum	Positive ABCR
Option 6	2,104	Low 1,680 Mid 2,240 High 2,800	0.8 1.1 1.3	0.0 0.0 0.0	Option 7	Positive ABCR
Option 4	4,156	Low 2,166 Mid 2,888 High 3,610	0.5 0.7 0.9	0.2 0.3 0.4	Option 6	

The Do Minimum scenario has the highest ABCR justifying the continuation of the current maintenance regime.

Option 7, Clearance of Debris at Baildon Bridge, is the next highest ABCR. The option is based on improved conveyance in the channel. This will have a greater impact on lower order events but will not be as effective on the higher order events. It is assumed that the works will be consider as separate discreet schemes and been classed as Capital Maintenance.

Option 4, improve existing defences, offers the highest standard or protection (1% (1 in 100 year) AEP) and has an ABCR lower than option 1 and 7.

1.7.1 Funding and contributions

Preliminary estimates for Partnership Funding scores for Options 4 and 7 has been calculated as shown in Table 1.5. Due to the FDGiA funding rules option 1 is not eligible for GiA funding so no funding calculation has been undertaken.

Table 1.5 FDGiA Funding Calculator

Contributions to outcome measures	Option 4
OM1 – Economic Benefit:	
Benefit period used for Partnership Funding calcs	*100*
PV Benefits (£k)	*2,887,908*
PV Costs (£k)	*4,155,840*
Benefit/Cost ratio	*11.4*
OM2 – No. of households moved out of any flood probability category to a lower category	69
OM2b – No. of households for which the probability of flooding or coastal erosion is reduced from the very significant or significant category to the moderate or low category	0
OM2c – No. of households in the 20% most deprived areas moved from the very significant or significant flood probability category to the moderate or low category	69
Partnership Funding (PF) Score	21%
Contributions required for a PF score of 100%	£3,285,100
Contributions required for a PF score of 120%	£3,430,342

The Partner Funding score for option 7 looks unusually high. This is due to the Do Nothing scenario assuming a breach within 10 years; so a significant amount of the benefits will be achieved for a relatively low cost.

Other potential funding sources identified include:

- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Benefitting local businesses
- Council Tax
- Local Enterprise Partnerships

1.7.2 Key delivery risks (economic, social and environmental)

Key delivery risk and recommendations for mitigating these risks are shown in the table below.

Table 1.6 Risks and mitigation

Risk	Key Mitigation

Risk	Key Mitigation
Bypass channel does not reduce flood levels to a sufficient extent to protect properties	Modelling of this option should be carried out to assess its impact on flood flows
Insufficient 3rd party Funding available to allow scheme to progress	Assess potential funding options before progressing scheme appraisal further.
Inaccurate benefits assessment due to limited understanding of flood risk hence unreliable approach to economic damage calculations used for IA's.	A more accurate damages assessment based on hydraulic modelling and flood depth damage data should be considered before progressing to further appraisal.
Option 7 may not be classified as Capital Maintenance	Alternative funding sources identified.

1.8 Project Scoring

The data used in this assessment has been subjected to a RAG assessment. RAG status reporting is used to indicate the level of confidence in the data used in each aspect of the assessment, using the traffic light system. This gives a three figure score with the first number being the number of reds (showed as a letter R)), where there is significant uncertainty or challenges. The second and third numbers are the numbers of amber (A) and greens (G). The results are shown below:

- A – Problem Definition: The fluvial flooding mechanism are well understood but the other sources of flooding are currently unknown – **AMBER**
- B – Economic Case: The benefits assessment has been based on moving properties from flood risk bands and weighted average annual damages – **RED**
- C – Funding: The options are likely to require external funding. Alternative funding sources have been identified – **AMBER**
- D – Engineering case: Solutions taken to outline design and are tried and tested defence options, however may need significant change due to other flooding sources – **RED**
- E – Permissions & Consents: Solution are unlikely to require unusual permissions or consents – **GREEN**
- F – Environmental sensitivities: Initial environmental assessments has been completed based on outline options – **AMBER**
- G – Opportunities: Some potential opportunities for partnership working but minimal environment opportunities – **AMBER**

Model. A	Econ. B	Funding C	Eng. D	Permission E	Env. F	RAG	Opps. G
2	3	2	3	1	2	231	2

1.9 Further work requirements

If the project is taken forward for further appraisal it is recommended that the following work is carried out:

- Investigate the impacts of upstream storage options proposed by the Leeds Phase 2 PAR and Upper Aire SFRA. The findings should be used to review and update the economic assessment.

- Option 2 – Further investigation and hydraulic modelling of the removal of Baildon weir, including lower order return periods. The impacts of the scheme should also be investigated outside of the Masons Mill benefit area to identify additional benefits.

- Option 6 and 7 – Further investigation and hydraulic modelling on blockage analysis at Baildon Bridge, including lower order return periods. The impacts of the scheme should also be investigated outside of the Masons Mill benefit area to identify additional benefits.

- Option 10 – upstream storage will have benefits outside of the study area. Hydraulic modelling of this option should be carried out as it is recognised that such a measure will benefit areas further downstream within Bradford.

1.10 Conclusions and Recommendation

The conclusions and recommendations made in this section are based on the limited data available at the time. It is strongly recommended that further investigation into all sources of flooding is undertaken.

Based on the evidence provided it is understood the main risk of flooding within Shipley/Baildon is fluvial from the overtopping of river banks. The existing fluvial flood risk is moderate to high. There was significant flooding in the area during Boxing Day 2015 from the River Aire.

The economic analysis shows that the Do Minimum scenario is the most beneficial and that the current maintenance regime should be continued.

Option 7, clearance of debris from Baildon Bridge is the next highest scoring option, and offers community wide protection, unlike Option1. However this option is unable to gain any FDGiA funding, as it is maintenance of an existing asset. It is recommended that the inspection and maintenance programme for Baildon Bridge are reviewed to reflect the importance of the structure.

Option 4, improve existing defences provides the highest standard of protection. The option is eligible for 21% of the costs being funded by FDGiA funding.

It is recommended that the flood storage options are considered further in a wider strategic assessment as they could benefit a large area on the Upper Aire.

The Baildon/Shipley area is comprised of five individual benefit areas; Aire Close, Baildon Bridge, Glenaire Court, Lower Holme and Masons Mill. It is recognised that there is potential to manage flows upstream and provide further benefits to all areas. Potential storage sites have been identified between Hirst Mill and Baildon Bridge, see figure 2 in Appendix H. It is recommended that further hydraulic modelling be undertaken to investigate the impact of these storage areas on water levels within the Baildon/Shipley area and further downstream.

Based on the limited information we have available, we recommend the Do Minimum scenario, to be the most appropriate. However, we recommend further investigation to be undertaken to determine all flood risk sources and how they can be managed.

Appendices