



Report of the Strategic Director of Place to the meeting of Regeneration and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be held on 28th November 2023.

Q

Subject:

Bradford Beck Pilot Study

Summary statement:

The Bradford Beck Pilot Study was first discussed by members in April 2013 and has been before the Environment & Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis since then. It was resolved on 18th October 2022 that the ongoing collaboration between officers and Friends of Bradford Beck be supported; also that the Friends of Bradford Beck be congratulated for the work they have undertaken throughout the years. This report outlines the work undertaken within the catchment since the previous report in October 2022.

Strategic Director:

David Shepherd
Strategic Director of Place

Portfolio:

Regeneration, Planning & Transport

Report Contact:

Edward Norfolk
Principal Drainage Engineer
Phone: (01274) 433905
E-mail: edward.norfolk@bradford.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Area:

Regeneration and Environment.

EQUALITY & DIVERSITY:

The public sector equality duty in s149 of the Equalities Act applies to the Council in the exercise of its functions. Those functions will include most, if not all, of the proposals and other measures referred to in this report. The duty is to “have due regard to the need to (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under [the 2010 Act], (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it.”. In summary, this includes the need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons that are connected to that relevant protected characteristic and taking steps to meet the needs of persons who do not share it and encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to take account of disabled person’s disabilities and makes it clear that compliance with the duties ‘may involve treating some persons more favourably than others’. It is evidence that all of the schemes and proposals referred to in this report have the potential to impact on persons who share one of more of the relevant protected characteristics.

1. SUMMARY

The Bradford Beck Pilot Study was first discussed by members in April 2013 and has been before the Environment & Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis since then. It was resolved on 18th October 2022 that the ongoing collaboration between officers and Friends of Bradford Beck be supported; also, that the Friends of Bradford Beck be congratulated for the work they have undertaken throughout the years. This report outlines the work undertaken within the catchment since the previous report in October 2022.

The Committee also resolved that a report considering the issue of main river status for Bradford Beck be presented to the Committee within 12 months. The details of this matter are included within section 3 of this report.

2. BACKGROUND

Since the Committee meeting of October 2022 there has been cooperation on a range of projects between Council officers of various services and Friends of Bradford’s Becks (FOBB). This report outlines the work carried out over the last year in collaboration to the catchment plan produced by FOBB that was supported by the Environment and Waste O&S Committee in 2013.

The Friends of Bradford Becks have provided an update to their work streams over the last year and their report is included as Appendix 1.

The Environment Agency has been approached on pollution incidents that have been reported within the Bradford Beck catchment over the last year. This data is included as Appendix 2.

3. REPORT ISSUES

Throughout the course of the year there have been work streams and developments involving FOBB and Council department in relation to Bradford Beck. An update on existing and emerging projects and initiatives are discussed throughout this section.

Sustainable Drainage Systems

Retrofitting sustainable drainage systems into our urban landscapes is now seen as a priority and is the strategy used on redevelopment projects in the Bradford Beck catchment. One scheme currently being constructed is the Top of Town public realm improvements that includes high quality upgrades to the conservation area in the form of highway improvements and sustainable landscaping works at North Parade, Rawson Square, and Northgate. A network of rain gardens is being implemented and these are areas of planting designed to temporarily soak up rainwater to reduce pressure on storm water drains, help tackle climate change and reduce flood risk. The scheme will create a safe, healthy, attractive and community friendly environment with high quality public spaces which supports new and existing businesses. The Council will promote these sustainable drainage solutions in all future city centre regeneration schemes as they provide multiple benefits.

By reducing surface water runoff into local sewerage networks, schemes will help reduce the discharge from Yorkshire Waters Combined Sewer Overflows that connect to the Beck improving the water quality of the natural environment. Preliminary discussions have begun between the Council and Yorkshire Water at identifying areas where the implementation of nature-based drainage solutions will reduce flood risk, improve urban water body quality and reduce combined sewer overflow discharges.

Bradford Beck River Restoration Project

CBMDC, The Environment Agency, The Friends of Bradford Beck and the Wild Trout Trust worked in partnership to deliver a 3 year £90,000 EA funded scheme to re-naturalise the northern length of Bradford Beck. The project included measures to improve fish passage, facilitate public access and deliver habitat creation measures on a length of beck between Briggate B6149 and the River Aire. The project is now complete, and all outputs have been delivered. The scheme has delivered valuable improvements to support the Naturalising Bradford Beck scheme.

Further work is now being planned to remove or bypass the small weir that sits between Briggate and the culvert as this is the last major barrier to fish passage between Poplar Road and the River Aire. The recently approved district heating plant in the city centre (planning reference 23/01541/MAF) committed to a commuted sum of £20,000 for works on Bradford Beck to be paid via the Section 106 legal agreement for works including surveys and the creation of a fish pass at Shipley Field Weir.

Naturalising Bradford Beck

Following many years of work from the Friends of Bradford Becks, the Aire Rivers Trust (ART) and the council funding was secured in 2021 to design and deliver a de-culverting scheme. The funding allowed a number of surveys, appraisals and options to be drawn up for the works to be carried out. It was hoped the scheme would be delivered between autumn 2022 and summer 2023. The key deliverables were to:

- Remove or bury the concrete culvert.
- Create a naturalistic channel and bank profile with minimal artificial structures.
- Enhance wildlife value and fish passage through habitat creation and removal of structures.
- Reduce flood risk from a 1:5 to a 1:50 risk of flooding in any one year with no increase downstream flood risk.
- Create a linear park with improved public access and amenity value

Whilst not a technical output for the funding a key element of the scheme for stakeholders was to create a more natural looking watercourse that could be easily viewed and enjoyed by the general public. The beck would form the centre piece of a new linear park, vastly increasing public interest in the beck and its health. The scheme would align with the aims of the Water Framework Directive.

The total budget of £3.6m was split evenly between the Local Transport Fund and the European Regional Development Funds. The ERDF funding was confirmed in spring 2021 with an end date of June 2023 leaving a tight window for design and delivery. The transport funding programme was more flexible and did not influence the project programme.

A number of options were drawn up in liaison with the FoBB, the EA and ART. These varied from a semi-natural design comprising gently sloping riverbanks and loose stone bed, to more engineered options comprising high retaining walls and a concrete bed. Layout plans are included in the attachments.

This transition from a more naturalistic scheme to a more engineered scheme was driven by a combination of accumulated constraints and Covid related inflation in the construction industry. These combined to increase costs.

The council did try to deliver the scheme however a further increase in costs at the tender stage pushed the budget beyond the available funding. With half of the funding needing to be spent by the end of June 2023 we had no option but to postpone delivery of the scheme until the design could be refined and more funding secured.

Whilst this was very disappointing for all involved the work did allow the council to gather further information of the beck and various constraints. Existing feasibility work was more akin to a visioning document rather than a systematic exploration of technical constraints. In effect the project delivered this feasibility work as part of the survey and design development phase of the works.

The main constraints complicating delivery of the scheme are as follows:

- Depth of the bed- The depth of the bed in relation to the ground surface is around 7-8m. This depth would require a significant volume of materials to be removed to both expose the channel and to create a semi-natural bank profile. Our aim was initially to have a bank slope no steeper than 1:3 to allow for maintenance of the site. The initial design would have required around 17-18,000m³ of material to be removed. The most modest scheme with significant retaining structures would have required around 7,000m³ to be removed. Options for removal of this material included the creation of landform on an adjacent area of the beck valley and removal directly to a tip.
- Land contamination- Much of the beck valley is contaminated to some degree. Whilst there were no land uses on the site that would have caused serious contamination bore hole data looks to show that contaminated material has been brought in from elsewhere and used to fill the site. The degree of contamination is highly variable within the project area. The exact positioning of the channel will have a huge impact on how much of the ground is contaminated and to what degree. The most recent survey suggested that a channel location immediately to the east of the culvert would have required a significant amount of hazardous material to be removed. There may have been more than 50% of the material in this location classed as hazardous.
- Culvert Location Adjacent to Valley Road- one major constraint that came out of the project was the proximity of the concrete culvert to Valley Road at the northern end of the site. This complicated its removal and or modification of the culvert as there was a risk of the road collapsing if the culvert was removed without additional support being provided. Whilst a sheet piling option was considered this would have been expensive and there were issues with it being very close to services.

- As a result, it was considered pragmatic to retain some or all of the culvert and stabilise at least one half with foam concrete to prevent collapse. Initial quotes for this were around £800,000 (£1.6m for both sides).
- Stability of the culvert- The culvert is considered to be in poor condition and in need of replacement or strengthening. As a result the option to demolish and remove the culvert was looking problematic as it might need support to avoid an uncontrolled collapse during demolition. Again this points towards the need to fill some or all of the culvert with some kind of structural concrete.
- Flashy nature of the beck and significant drop in height across the site area- The modelling carried out during the early design phases of the scheme indicated that in high flows a 'riprap' bed would have been washed away. This problem was exacerbated by the significant fall through the culvert. This led the consultants insisting that the bed would need to be constructed with reinforced concrete to withstand flows and avoid the risk of the retaining wall supporting Valley Road being undermined. All stakeholders including council officers were unhappy with this as it failed to deliver on the naturalising aims of the scheme and would have looked unsightly.
- In addition, this became extremely expensive when requirement for fish passage were incorporated into the design. This included the creation of pool and riffle sequences with complex formed concrete structures and embedded boulders.
- Bat protection issues- We were advised that the culvert could be a roost for bats and as such the works would either need to be carried out in the summer or bats were excluded during the autumn roosting if the work needed to be carried out in the winter. Due to funding constraints the latter option was pursued but a flash flood washed away the structures to prevent bat access. As such that option was abandoned and the work programme modified to allow for summer only working on and around the culvert.
- Yorkshire Water Sewer and existing cycleway- To the east of the culvert location a sewer and a well-used cycleway are likely to limit to extent to which the channel can be moved to the east. Relocating both would have logistical and cost implication but these will need to be balanced with the higher contamination levels further west.

Many of these constraints interact with each other to further complicate delivery. Delivery was further hampered by COVID related inflation which vastly increased costs in the construction industry pushing even the most basic scheme over budget.

The Council are still committed to delivering the scheme with the three core outputs of reduced flood risk, ecological enhancement (including fish passage) and improved amenity

value. At present we feel a budget of around £5m is required to deliver a scheme that can deliver on these outputs and funding streams are being investigated.

Pitty Beck Environmental Improvements

CBMDC is working in partnership with JUMP to deliver a range of environmental improvements across the district to promote physical activity in the 5-11 age group. The lottery funded project is one of 12 local delivery pilots currently being implemented across the country. The Pitty Beck scheme has a value of £100k and involved developing a network of paths and supporting infrastructure aimed at encouraging young people to take part in active outdoor recreation. In addition to crushed stone paths and a footbridge a number of seats, a picnic area, signage and habitat creation was implemented. The phase 1 scheme was completed last year with the installation of a new footbridge. We are currently in the early stages of a second phase to install informal play facilities on the site.

The phase two scheme is being currently being agreed. This is likely to include habitat creation works and the installation of street furniture and informal play features. The value is around £30k. We hope to be starting on site in the next 6 months.

Postmans Walk

CBMDC secured £90k from the Towns Fund to deliver a range of environmental improvements at an open space overlooking North Beck in Keighley. The works involved refurbishing a dilapidated seating area to discourage anti-social behaviour and encourage more people to visit the space. Works included improving visibility through woodland management, repaving paths, replacing dilapidated furniture, installing new safety railings and removing fly-tipped debris. The Aire Rivers Trust delivered a complimentary project to develop native habitat on recently cleared areas. It is hoped the works will lead to the space being used for active recreation by the local community.

This is complete and currently in a 12-month defects period. The scheme has been well received.

Land Drainage Investigations

Bradford Councils Land Drainage Team regularly investigate reports of blocked or collapsed watercourses within the Bradford Beck Catchment. Blockages can lead to an increased risk of flooding, risk of environmental pollution incidents and impacts on the amenity quality of an area.

Land drainage law is complex and is covered within the Land Drainage Act 1991. The Council is able to offer advice about problems associated with land drainage, including ditches, streams, rivers and other watercourses. Essentially, a landowner is responsible for the drainage of their land. If a watercourse passes through land, under the Land Drainage Act 1991, the landowner is classified as a 'Riparian Owner' and is responsible for maintaining the flow within the watercourse and to ensure an impediment to that flow does

not exist.

The Council only has a responsibility for watercourse when the Council is the landowner. Other than that, the Council do have powers to act in certain circumstances, to mitigate against the effects of flooding generated from land drainage matters.

If a landowner fails to carry out necessary maintenance on a watercourse, the Council can serve notice and carry out works if ditches have become blocked resulting in a flood risk or health hazard. These powers are contained in the Land Drainage Acts 1991 and Sections of the Public Health Act 1936 but are not instantaneous - the process between first notification of a problem and serving a notice can take years, and further stages are required if the landowner defaults on the notice.

Occasionally investigations reveal blockages on land that is unregistered. In these instances, the Council conduct a review to understand the risk posed by any defects and if quick interventions will reduce the risk and avoid on-going issues that can take up large amounts of resource. Land Drainage investigations have led to the removal of abandoned vehicles in Bull Greave Beck, a tributary to Bradford Beck, helping to reduce flood risk, improve amenity and prevent pollution to the watercourse.

LIFE Critical

The Council continues to work on the LIFE Critical European project at Horton Park. LIFE Critical is an EU project that adapts older city neighbourhoods, so they are equipped for the effects of climate change. Westbrook Beck, which flows through the ponds and water features of Horton Park, stopped flowing a few years ago. With support from the University of Bradford, the project objectives are to mitigate the effects of climate change by carrying out work to neighbourhood parks. The thing that makes this different to some other programmes is that the emphasis is on citizen science and recruiting the community to help deliver change with a strong emphasis on improving local drainage, air pollution, loss of ecological diversity and the heat island effect. The innovative approach addresses the problems that these neighbourhoods face with regard to adaptation by exploiting the potential of nearby parks for climate adaptation. Crucial for this approach is the proactive involvement of citizens and co-ownership, because without their support the changes to the parks are difficult to realize. The Council will work with FOBB to find solutions to this issue during the development of the project. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will also be installed in the park. These are a more natural way to reduce the likelihood of flooding by transporting surface water elsewhere, slowing the flow of water or using materials to encourage the water to soak into the ground or evaporate.

Sediment Control

Following a series of sediment pollution incidents involving new developments, the Council met with FOBB to discuss if there were any opportunities through the development control and planning process to help prevent future pollution incidents. Although the policy and responsibility for sediment control is complicated, it was agreed that guidance and warnings

could be included in pre planning application advice and as footnotes on planning application decision notices with the intention of raising awareness to developers of these types of pollution incidents. It was also agreed that planning condition requiring the details of temporary site drainage runoff would be used where there is a risk of sediment pollution being generated during the construction period of a development.

Bradford Beck Hydraulic Modelling

Bradford Beck is a heavily culverted, non-main river, watercourse and given the urban nature of the watercourse, it is important to know the current and future flood risk that the Beck poses. Managing flood risk in the catchment is a key tool in reducing pollution incidents but also to manage biodiversity and ecology within a watercourse that is heavily modified from its natural course.

The Council have recently commissioned a specialist consultant to create a new build computer model of Bradford Beck and its tributaries. The completed model will be ready early next year and will provide computer generated flood outlines and depths in the Bradford Beck Catchment. The model will be used as the evidence base for the emerging Level 1 and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment updates for this catchment and the Council will also use the new model for evaluating flood risk management options in future capital works schemes. As part of the project the Council will be undertaking a full structural and geometric survey of the culverted sections of Bradford Beck. This will be achieved by using remote laser scanning technology that will provide a full three dimensional computer model of the culvert structure allowing this data to be used for a multitude of projects. This 3D model can be incorporated into the Virtual Bradford 3D city model helping visualise flood risk scenarios and engage with elected members and the public.

Bradford Beck designation

This section of the paper reports on the following issues:

- a) the distinction between main rivers and ordinary watercourses, including the procedure for designation; and
- b) riparian owner responsibilities to maintain watercourses; and
- c) Considerations for designating Bradford Beck as a Main river;

The distinction between main rivers and ordinary watercourses, including the procedure for designation;

At the present time, the Council is the operating authority for ordinary watercourses and the Environment Agency (EA) is the operating authority for main rivers in the district. ordinary watercourses can be designated as main river through a process of "enmainment". Once designated, the EA will become the operating authority for these new main rivers. Enmainment also places a requirement on adjacent land for up to 8 metres from the centre line of the main river to be kept clear for access. In built up areas, this requirement is introduced on redevelopment.

The Environment Agency has permissive powers to undertake flood defence works (such as capital schemes and maintenance) on main rivers. On ordinary watercourses these powers reside with local authorities or, where they exist, with internal drainage boards.

For either designation the Environment Agency are the statutory authority that has relevant powers to deal with water pollution incidents and Water Framework Directive objectives.

The major rivers in England (and Wales) are designated as main river as well as many more minor watercourses. Some rivers may have a mixture of main river and ordinary watercourse sections. In recent years most amendments to main river maps have been to change the designation of small stretches of rivers, rather than the whole river.

The Environment Agency is responsible for maintaining a map of the main river (the Main River Map) and making any changes to it, and determining whether or not a watercourse, or part of a watercourse, is to be treated as a main river or part of a main river.

Section 193 of the Water Resources Act 1991 requires the Environment Agency to keep maps showing those watercourses which have been designated as "main rivers". Watercourses which do not appear on the map are regarded as "ordinary watercourses".

Section 193 of the Water Resources Act 1991 sets out the procedures for amending the Main River map.

The main river map also shows where the Environment Agency intends to make changes. These are highlighted as 'additions' and 'deletions'.

In England, the Environment Agency decides which watercourses are main rivers. It consults with other risk management authorities and the public before making these decisions. The main river map is then updated to reflect these changes.

Statutory guidance sets out the basis on which the Environment Agency should decide whether or not a river or watercourse is treated as a 'main river'. The guidance has been issued under section 193E of the Water Resources Act 1991. The guidance is recited below for the information of the committee.

Criteria for determining whether or not a watercourse or part of a watercourse is suitable to become or to remain a main river or a part of a main river

References to a watercourse include both a whole watercourse and parts of a watercourse.

The criteria below are primarily directed at the management of flood risk. Any determination will need to be made in the context of the Environment Agency's other relevant functions (and this may include environmental considerations, where relevant).

1. Principal criteria

Flood consequence

1.1. A watercourse should be a main river if significant numbers of people and/or properties are liable to flood. This also includes areas where there are vulnerable groups and areas where flooding can occur with limited time for warnings.

Managing flooding across the catchment

1.2. A watercourse should be a main river where it could contribute to extensive flooding across a catchment.

1.3. A watercourse should be a main river if it is required to reduce flood risk elsewhere or provide capacity for water flowing from, for example, a reservoir, sewage treatment works or another river.

2. Secondary considerations if changing the status of a watercourse

An efficient network

2.1. When considering changing the status of a watercourse, the Environment Agency should avoid short stretches of watercourses of alternating main river and ordinary watercourse status to provide clarity and to minimise inefficiency through multiple authorities acting on the same watercourse.

Competence, capability and resources

2.2. When considering changing the status of a watercourse, the Environment Agency should consider if those taking on responsibility have sufficient competence, capability and/or resources for flood risk management, including whether their governance enables sufficient competence, capability and/or resources, and local

accountability. In carrying out this assessment, the Environment Agency should seek Defra's views.

Other relevant criteria

2.3. The Environment Agency may have regard to other relevant factors that it considers appropriate when exercising its discretion to determine whether to change the status of a watercourse or part of a watercourse. The Environment Agency should consider relevant benefits or costs for the local community and representations from the local community and others in response to consultation.

While the designation of "main river" and "ordinary watercourses" may lead to differences of approach, there are numerous reasons why such differences may exist; these reasons are set out below for the information of the Committee.

- i. All flood and coastal defence legislation is *permissive*, ie there are no obligations to provide defences, either to a given standard or at all. Within this overarching principle, there are *powers* for the Environment Agency to undertake flood defence measures on main rivers while on ordinary watercourses such powers reside with local authorities and internal drainage boards (IDBs). In the light of this, the operating authorities will establish their policy. In the absence of the operating authority assuming responsibility, it is retained by the riparian owner. The requirement under high level targets for operating authorities to produce policy statements will place their approaches to these responsibilities on the public record.
- ii. A local authority or IDB may not have actively managed flood risk on an ordinary watercourse. However, there is no guarantee that changing its designation to main river, and bringing it under the Environment Agency, would automatically mean that the Agency afforded it any higher priority. The Agency would need to consider and prioritise its work programme within available resources according to their assessment of flood risk.
- iii. There will also be differences in approach between, and possibly within, Environment Agency regions. The involvement of executive flood defence committees in setting priorities and budgets means that work which one committee is willing to undertake, another may not.

Riparian owner responsibilities to maintain the condition of watercourses

Flood and coastal defence legislation is generally *permissive*- there are *powers* for the operating authorities to maintain rivers and flood defences but *no obligations* on them to do so.

Should the operating authority not undertake maintenance then this responsibility falls to the riparian owner, though that party is not normally obliged to do so. Legal requirements to carry out maintenance or repair work may exist by prescription, custom, tenure, covenant or by statute but these are rare.

The Water Resources Act 1991 and Land Drainage Act 1991 do not impose maintenance obligations on riparian owners but they do empower the operating authorities to serve notices on landowners requiring them to ensure a free flow of water through their land, for example by removing obstructions. If a watercourse passes through land, under the Land Drainage Act 1991, the landowner is classified as a 'Riparian Owner' and is responsible for maintaining the flow within the watercourse and to ensure an impediment to that flow does not exist.

If a landowner fails to carry out necessary maintenance on a watercourse, then the Council can use powers under the Land Drainage Act 1991 to serve notice requiring them to undertake the remedial works. Failure to comply with such a notice may result in the Council undertaking the work and recharging the owner the costs of doing so.

There are also provisions under the Land Drainage Act 1991 for landowners to bring a case before the Agricultural Land Tribunal if they consider that their land has been injured by, for example, a neighbour's failure to maintain or cleanse ditches etc.

Considerations for designating Bradford Beck as a Main river;

Bradford Beck is designated an ordinary watercourse and under its function as Lead Local Flood Authority, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council are the operating authority.

Bradford Beck is an ordinary watercourse that flows through Bradford City Centre and on to the River Aire at Shipley. A catchment plan is included within Appendix C for information of the committee. The upper catchment within Thornton, Allerton and Clayton is mainly pasture land and the smaller streams that lead to Bradford Beck are mainly open, natural watercourses. As the watercourse reaches Bradford city centre it runs underground after being built over in the 19th century. It is culverted as it runs from Bradford city centre to Queen's Road after which it runs mostly in an open, heavily modified unnatural channel to Shipley. The watershed for Bradford Beck catchment is approximately 22 square miles (58 km²) and has divided the beck into two sections; the upper part is named Clayton Beck then it is named Middlebrook Beck before it passes underneath Cemetery Road in Lidget Green to the west of the City Centre, the name changes to Bradford Beck. From here to the outfall point into the River Aire at Shipley Bradford Beck is approximately 9.11km in length.

The approximate total length of ordinary watercourse in the Bradford District is 760.96 Km, based on the national Detailed River Network mapping. As a percentage of the total Ordinary Watercourses in the district Bradford Beck represents approximately 1.2%.

Should Bradford Beck be designated as Main River this would lead to the transfer of certain powers and responsibilities to the Environment Agency leading to potential differences in Bradford Becks management. There are numerous reasons why such differences may exist; these reasons are set out below for the information of the Committee.

- Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of a main river.
- Permissive powers of enforcement would transfer to the Environment Agency. Should the beck become defective, and require enforcement action, the Environment Agency would need to consider and prioritise its work programme within available resources according to their assessment of flood risk.
- Permissive powers of flood defence powers would transfer to the Environment Agency. The Agency would subsequently have the strategic oversight for the delivery of flood risk management projects on Bradford Beck and would need to consider and prioritise its work programme within available resources according to their assessment of flood risk.
- Emergency works as a result of enforcement action or flood recovery, would be progressed by the Environment Agency. The Agency would need to consider and prioritise its work programme within available resources according to their assessment of flood risk.
- Any flood risk management assets promoted by the Environment Agency on Bradford Beck would benefit from being eligible to claim Flood Defence Grant in Aid funding from DEFRA for the future maintenance of new assets.

4. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL

The Council do not receive ringfenced funding to deliver statutory land drainage duties on ordinary watercourses. Any enforcement, flood defence or emergency works on ordinary watercourses are considered and prioritised within available resources according to the assessment of flood risk.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

None

6. LEGAL APPRAISAL

There are no legal implications directly arising from this report.

7. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

7.1 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

None

7.2 TACKLING THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY IMPLICATIONS

None

7.3 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

None

7.4 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

None

7.5 TRADE UNION

None

7.6 WARD IMPLICATIONS

None

**7.7 AREA COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN IMPLICATIONS
(for reports to Area Committees only)**

Not applicable

7.8 IMPLICATIONS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

None

7.9 ISSUES ARISING FROM PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

None

8. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS

None

9. OPTIONS

Members are asked to consider the report and provide views and comments.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Friends of Bradford's Becks and the Strategic Director, Place be requested to work jointly on studies and proposals.
2. That the Friends of Bradford's Becks be invited to report back in a year's time.
3. That this report be noted and that the ongoing collaboration between officers and the Friends of Bradford's Becks be supported.
4. That Members express Bradford Council's support and appreciation to Friends of Bradford's Becks for the work to tackle pollution, promote community engagement and restore and improve the beck and its catchment.

11. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Friends of Bradford Becks summary of activities 2023.

Appendix 2 – Environment Agency's reported pollution incidents 2022/ 2023.

Appendix 3 – Bradford Beck Catchment Plan

12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Bradford's Becks – a New Lease of Life

Available online from:

[Catchment Management Plan – bradford-beck.org](http://bradford-beck.org)