

BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

MINUTES

of the proceedings of a meeting of the Culverts & Bridges Committee

held at the offices of the Board on
6th April 2016 at 2pm

Members

Chairman - * Mr J G Fowler

* Mr W Ash	* Mr V A Barker
* Mr P Holmes	* Mr R Leggott
* Mr P Robinson	* Cllr P Skinner

* Member Present

In attendance: Mr I Warsap (Chief Executive)
Mr P Nicholson (Operations Manager)
Mr J Mitchell (Technical Engineer)

916 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE - Agenda Item 1

There were no apologies.

917 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - Agenda Item 2

(a) Culvert 2931 - Gosberton High Fen

A declaration of interest was received from Mr V A Barker with regard to Minute no 923.

(b) Culvert 3098 - Spalding Road, Bourne North Fen

A declaration of interest was received from Mr W Ash with regard to Minute no 923.

918 MINUTES OF THE CULVERTS & BRIDGES COMMITTEE MEETING - Agenda Item 3

Minutes of the last meeting held on the 29th April 2015, copies of which had been circulated, were considered and it was agreed that they should be signed as a true record.

919 MATTERS ARISING - Agenda Item 4

(a) Brick Arch Bridges on Hammond Beck and Risegate Eau constructed in the 19th Century - Minute No 737(a)

The Operations Manager stated that he had spoken with the relevant landowners who have no problem with these brick arches being removed.

919 (a) Cont.....

Therefore, they are scheduled for removal and the bricks taken to Gosberton for redistribution.

(b) Review the IDB Land Drainage Act Enforcement & Consent Concordat - Minute No 737(b)

The Chief Executive stated that he had previously outlined the role of Mark Welsh who has been involved in preparing this concordat. The document has references to bridges and other structures; copies are available if any member requires one.

The Chief Executive stated that the Board has taken a soft approach to landowner's maintenance of riparian watercourses, dykes and drains by trying to negotiate rather than it becoming an enforcement issue. With the possible extension of the Boards area into the upper catchment this concordat should be used in conjunction with the legal backing of Lincolnshire County Council.

A recent example; a landowner's poor maintenance of a riparian watercourses in Dunsby which is placing a village at risk of possible flooding. The concordat states once a "nuisance" has been identified within or outside the catchment then if the landowner does not carry out suitable works then the Board can attend to the "nuisance" and recover costs from the landowner.

The Committee AGREED that the IDB Land Drainage Act Enforcement & Consent Concordat be used in partnership with Lincolnshire County Council.

(c) Culvert Inspection Records - Minute No 739(a)

Mr R Leggott questioned the FDGiA funding for the Graft drain culvert replacement works. The Operations Manager responded that it had taken three years to obtain approval for these culvert replacements. It may be difficult to obtain future funding for culvert replacement as the Environment Agency have recently taken on their own consultants to review FDGiA applications.

920 REVIEW OF CULVERT AND BRIDGE REPLACEMENT POLICY - Agenda Item 5

(a) The Committee discussed the policy and the following amendments were made:

1. PURPOSE

Second paragraph: add "bridges or"

"In the first instance, if a culvert has deteriorated to such an extent that it is holding up the flow of water, then the **bridge or** culvert shall be removed by the Board.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

The wording within this paragraph does not tie in with the Terms of Reference for this Committee which will be discussed in Agenda Item 6.

The Chief Executive was requested to draft an appropriate paragraph which will be sent by email to the Committee for review.

6.1 CLEAR SPAN BRIDGES CARRYING HIGHWAYS

The Committee asked if Lincolnshire County Council were to replace/construct a structure should liaison with the IDB be in place to monitor materials, size etc. Mr J Mitchell responded that LCC would be required to complete an application for byelaw consent.

6.6 GUIDELINES

Lines regarding items (b) and (d):

The Members discussed the wording “proven need” who gives the need, who approves the need. What justification and who has to prove it be accepted by the Board, will it be in the consent.

The Committee agreed that the Chief Executive should review wording and email to the Members a draft.

921 REVIEW OF DRAFT: CULVERT & BRIDGES TERMS OF REFERENCE - Agenda Item 6

The Chief Executive outlined these draft terms of reference which once reviewed by the Committee will be approved by the Board.

The Committee reviewed the first title section and recommended the following amendments:

1. GENERAL

First paragraph – remove “SEVEN” and replace with “**EIGHT**”

- “The Committee shall have **EIGHT** members

Remove and delete the second paragraph completely.

The final paragraph should remain the same.

2. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Within the first paragraph, removed “three” and replace with “**four**”
Therefore, it should read: - “and a quorum shall be **four** members.”

3. POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Regarding the delegated powers of this Committee the Members queried section 6.10 in the Culvert & Bridges Replacement Policy which states that if a landowner should be unhappy regarding a particular culvert designation, then it be referred to the Culvert & Bridges Committee for "final determination". Is this a delegation of power?

The Chief Executive has been requested to review the wording within section 5 of the Culvert & Bridges Replacement Policy which will impact on the wording within section 3 of these Terms of Reference.

Upon which if the wording is agreed by the Committee then section 6.10 should then be reviewed to be in line with both.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

The first sentence, remove "be" and replace with "include:"

Therefore, it should read: - "The responsibilities of the Committee shall include:"

922 TO REVIEW A PRESENTATION OF THE CULVERT INSPECTION PROCESS - Agenda Item 7

The Operations Manager presented a slide detailing a spreadsheet with the culvert inspection details for 2012-2014. He explained that 2015 culvert inspections had not taken place due to staffing issues and that this has now been rectified. He added these inspections will resume starting from this month and it is planned that there will be one inspection day per month. In theory each day should see 15 to 20 culverts inspected within the eleven catchments detailed on the spreadsheet, there are a further number of catchments within the Boards area.

The Committee asked how many in total are within the Boards catchment. Mr J Mitchell responded that there are estimated c2,500 culverts spanning Boards maintained watercourses/drains which does not include privately owned ones which could take the total to 4,000.

Mr V Barker requested that a map per area would be of benefit. Mr J Mitchell explained that the Board uses a GIS mapping system which has overlays which can be designated for specific items ie culverts which can then be placed over a catchment area.

The Chief Executive will clarify the licencing arrangements, and ascertain if the software can be disseminated to Board Members with different overlays as specified ie culverts, bridges etc.

Culvert Works 2015-16

The Operations Manager presented slides detailing both Southern and Northern area culvert works completed in 2015-16.

Culvert Replacement 2016-17

The Operations Manager presented the spreadsheet below detailing the proposed culvert works for 2016-17.

Culvert No	Catchment	Drain No	Dimensions	Estimated Cost	Contribution
755	South Kyme	14/9	12m x 0.9m	£7,000	£3,500
3190	South Kyme	14/2	12m x 1.2m	£9,000	
2000	Trinity College	15/1	12m x 0.9m	£7,000	£3,500
2005	Trinity College	15/5	Remove	£2,000	
1253	Horbling	18/1	40m x 0.6m	£8,000	£3,500
1302	Dowsby Fen	21/2	25m x 1.2m	Remove Armco pipe section £2,000	
1303	Dowsby Fen	21/2	12m x 1.2m	£9,000	£3,500
2072	Dowsby Fen	21/9	12m x 0.6m	£5,000	
1283	Dowsby Fen	21/11	12m x 0.6m	£5,000	£3,500
1959	Gosberton	22/10	15m x 1.2m	£10,000	£3,500
2503	Morton, Bourne & Leaves Lake	28/14	12m x 1.2m	£9,000	
2428	Scredington	36/5	12m x 0.9m	£7,000	

The Operations Manager stated that the contributions identified have not been agreed with any of the relevant landowners.

Culvert No 2503: Dyke Drove, Dyke Fen - Morton Bourne & Leaveslake Catchment

The Operations Manager highlighted culvert 2503 at Dyke Drove, Dyke Fen presenting a photographic slide. The landowner enquired about replacement of this bridge with a culvert and had a pipe which he has been informed is too small in diameter. The slide shows damage to the bridge of which no responsibility can be proven but it is unsafe. He concluded that as it is used by the Board as a crossing point, it will be replaced by the Board.

Mr V Barker highlighted to the Members that the bed bottom has been removed which has exposed the foundations of the bridge.

The Committee AGREED to recommend that this bridge be replaced with a piped culvert.

923 TO REVIEW A PRESENTATION OF THE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROCESS - Agenda Item 8

The Operations Manager reported that following the last meeting Officers have identified approximately 160 bridges (excluding concrete box culverts and most brick arches) over Board maintained watercourses.

- 25 – road/rail assumed to be LCC/Network Rail responsibility

- 58 – footbridges assumed to be LCC/landowner responsibility
- 32 – noted as private responsibility in BSIDB database (would require further research to confirm)
- 45 - unknown/unclear responsibility

The Operations Manager stated that quotations to conduct bridge surveys were received and Lincolnshire County Council were given the job of initially surveying six bridges of varying types at a cost of £300 per inspection. The Operations Manager presented slides with the detailed results of these inspection report forms using a key code system: severity between 1 - 5 and extent A - E ie extensive failed bridge receiving "5E".

The Committee then viewed a number of photographs of various angles on each of the following;

LCC Report 24/11/2015 Culvert 1710 Bleak House Farm, Wyberton Marsh
LCC Report 24/11/2015 Culvert 1551 Great Hale Drove, Great Hale Fen
LCC Report 24/11/2015 Culvert 1975 South of A17, near Kirkby-la-Thorpe
LCC Report 19/11/2015 Culvert 2931 Gosberton High Fen
LCC Report 19/11/2015 Culvert 1313 Long Drove, Rippingale Fen
LCC Report 19/11/2015 Culvert 3098 Spalding Road, Bourne North Fen

Mr V Barker asked if there was any weight guidance on culverts and/or bridges. The Chief Executive responded that there is no guidance on existing, any culverts (only) replaced the pipe supplier will issue weight restriction guidance subject to cover level and depth. Mr V Barker added that maximum weight limit should be calculated and displayed.

Mr P Holmes stated ownership of these bridges and responsibility is unclear, if the bridge collapses. The Chief Executive responded that if a bridge collapses and is holding back water then the BSIDB will remove it. The Board uses bridges and culverts for accessing and maintaining watercourses but ownership is difficult to identify.

Mr R Leggott stated should the rationalisation of the use once identified, how many times it is used and whether access can be identified using one crossing rather than a number on the same drain.

Mr V Barker added bearing in mind that every bridge is individual could options include replacing with a culvert with an average cost of £10,000, using varying sizes in the pipes would be more cost effective.

The Chief Executive stated that previously a leaflet has been sent out to rate payers giving information about Culverts & Bridges and byelaws. This could be an avenue but would need to include landowners which would require updating information on land ownership.

Mr P Holmes said that every bridge is individual and any fixed policy will be difficult to put together, landowners through consultation could clarify their belief of ownership as a starting point bearing in mind the Boards usage.

The Committee felt that the most cost effective way to progress was to seek legal advice to understand who the owners of these structures are.

924 TO REVIEW A PRESENTATION OF THE SIDE DYKE CULVERT PROCESS
- Agenda Item 9

The Operations Manager presented a slide showing examples of side dyke culverts, which sometimes have to be placed alongside riparian owned dykes where maintenance access is required from alternate sides of the drain bank. This can mean that landowners have a potential security access issue onto their land, in some cases wooden gates, padlocked chains between posts have been used to alleviate issues surrounding security.

The Chief Executive stated that a policy could be implemented to make the landowner more aware of the process involved in side dyke culverts.

Mr P Holmes stated that out of all the incidences involving a side dyke culvert most are on land owned by the same landowner. If they are between two different landowners, which makes up less than 10%, it is difficult to create a policy for a small amount of occasions. He believed it should be encouraged to be a more open discussion between the Board and each respective landowner and if a barrier is offered it be at the landowners cost.

A policy can be implemented via notification through perhaps cleansing notices that the Board is considering the option of installing a piped side dyke, whilst explaining this will benefit the landowner in giving additional drainage of their land. If they have a requirement to impose any restrictive access at their own cost but the BSIDB will still require a right of passage.

Determine the cost benefits involved and these works will be carried out by the Board. The Operations Manager stated that a BSIDB padlock can be provided.

925 TO REVIEW HOW AWARE DEVELOPERS, FARMERS AND THE PUBLIC
ARE REGARDING BOARD BYELAW CONSENTING - Agenda Item 10

The Chief Executive stated that at the Board meeting on the 17th June 2015 it was recommended that this Committee review a question "how aware developers, farmers and the public are regarding the Boards byelaws".

The Committee looked at the process especially access for maintenance purposes with the emphasis that both sides of the drain should be accessible.

The Culvert & Bridges leaflet could be updated enhancing byelaws relevant points.

The leaflet should be sent out to landowners, sometimes this information is not collated within the Boards rating database. Riparian ownership should be highlighted with the responsibilities of drain maintenance and outcome regarding blockages and cleansing.

925 Cont.....

The Chief Executive will email to the member's headings for the leaflet and request comments.

926 ANY OTHER BUSINESS - Agenda Item 11

(a) Britt Broadbent Pension Scheme

The Chief Executive presented a letter received from Pygott & Crone which has raised questions regarding two culverts and a bridge which span over a maintained watercourse.

The Operations Manager presented a slide detailing on the map culvert 3130, culvert 1959 and a bridged culvert 2931 which is used by the Board to access Surfleet drain.

The Operations Manager stated he has spoken with Mr Hammond and identified a culvert replacement on 1959 with an offer of contribution from the Board. As culvert 3130 is not used by the Board the preferred option is a piped outfall into the Mill drain. Bridge 2931 needs replacing whereby a culvert could be constructed with a specified pipe diameter.

The Committee agreed that the works should be priced and a contribution by the Board recommended.

The Operations Manager then asked if the option was available to sub contract these works. The Committee agreed if the project was controlled and overseen.

Mr V Barker stated that consideration be given to the depth of the bridge as it may be required to be deeper in the future as nothing has been done to this drain.

(b) Graft Drain

Mr V Barker and Mr J Fowler have visited this drain recently and would like to report that the contractor has left a lot of spoil and hard core in the drain from the bridge along the channel which may need to be hand cleared. The bank sides have been over engineered downstream with water standing above the wooden boards and the scouring has left holes in the bank.

The Chief Executive responded that they have spoken with the contractor and agreed that some additional work is required. The Operations Manager will review the CCTV survey results upon receipt.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4:50pm.