

BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

MINUTES

of the proceedings of a Meeting of the Board

held at the Offices of the Board on
14th June 2022 at 2pm

Members

Chairperson - * Mr K C Casswell

* Mr W Ash	* Cllr T Ashton
* Mr J Atkinson	* Cllr R Austin
* Mr V Barker	* Cllr P Bedford
* Mr J Fowler	* Cllr M Cooper
* Mr P Holmes	Cllr F Pickett
* Mr M Leggott	Cllr P Skinner
* Mr P Robinson	* Cllr M Head
* Mr M Rollinson	Cllr P Moseley
* Mr R Needham	* Cllr S Walsh
* Mr C Wray	* Mr M Brookes

* Member Present

In attendance: Mr I Warsap (Chief Executive)
Mr D Withnall (Finance Manager)
Mr P Nicholson (Operations Manager)

1983 Recording the Meeting - Agenda Item 1

Members were informed that the meeting would be recorded.

1984 Apologies for Absence - Agenda Item 2

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr F Pickett.

1985 Declarations of Interest - Agenda Item 3

A declaration of interest was received from Mr V Barker in relation to Minute 1978.

1986 Minutes of the last Board meeting - Agenda Item 4

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Board held on the 8th February 2022, copies of which had been circulated, were considered and it was AGREED that they should be signed as a true record.

1987 Matters Arising - Agenda Item 5

There were no matters arising.

(a) Environment Committee

The Chairperson of the Environment Committee presented the unconfirmed Minutes of the Environment Committee meeting held on the 1st March 2022, copies of which had been circulated. The Board RESOLVED that the Minutes should be received.

Matters Arising:

(i) Trapping of Mink - Minute 1937

Cllr M Cooper noted that he is also a member of Welland and Deeping IDB, who have caught 34 mink in 10 traps since August 2021.

The Operations Manager responded that the Board has four remote controlled mink traps, but as of yet, haven't caught any. However, water voles have been caught (and subsequently safely released), which may suggest there aren't mink in that area and so the traps are being relocated.

(ii) Operation Flyswat - Minute 1937

Cllr M Head referred to operation flyswat, questioning if it is in conjunction with the council and whether there are many prosecutions arising from it?

The Operations Manager confirmed that it is in conjunction with Boston Borough Council, North Sea Camp and South Holland District Council and other IDBs. All prosecutions over 20 tonnes are carried out by the Environment Agency from information provided by Boston Borough Council.

To adopt the following:

(iii) Policy 11: Biodiversity Action Plan

The Biodiversity Action Plan was presented.

It was noted that the reference to the Environment Act 2020 should be the Environment Act 2021.

Mr M Brookes referenced the Butterfly Sanctuary at Amber Hill, suggesting it should be added to the list of Non-Statutory Local Wildlife Sites. Mr P Holmes added that the butterfly sanctuary at Kirton Marsh perhaps also should be added.

The Chief Executive responded that they can be added and that if anybody has any information, at any time, the plan can be updated, it is a working document.

The Board RESOLVED that the Biodiversity Action Plan (Policy No. 11) be adopted, with the above amendments.

(b) Structures Committee

The Chairperson of the Structures Committee presented the unconfirmed Minutes of the Structures Committee meeting held on the 22nd March 2022, copies of which had been circulated. The Board RESOLVED that the Minutes should be received.

Matters Arising

(i) Correction in Minutes - Minute 1950

A spelling error was noted; 'sever impact' should be 'severe impact'.

(ii) Correction in Minutes - Minute 1954

Mr V Barker noted that he believed he elaborated more on his point than what is included within the minutes, stating that he suggested there could be two more culverts identified in another 2-3 years' time and therefore increasing the budget required. It was confirmed that the minutes would be amended accordingly.

(iii) Additional access culverts – Minute 1954

Mr V Barker noted his suggestion in the Structures meeting that there may be more culverts identified in the future and has since been informed, by a workforce operative, that there is a list of twelve potential culverts. Mr V Barker felt that the Structures Committee weren't aware of this and noted the expense of it. Mr V Barker suggested the cheaper ways need to be considered, further suggesting the work is put out to tender to the local construction industry to compare to the cost of the Board undertaking the work. It would also help ease the workload if the Board's workforce are too busy. The Operations Manager responded that they will tender for a replacement culvert to see how competitive the Board is.

Mr V Barker next referred to headwalls and that some have sandbags, and some have no headwall at all, of the opinion that it needs to be addressed what is appropriate for the Board's culverts.

The Operations Manager referred to the list of culverts Mr V Barker spoke of, noting that those culverts presented at the Structures Committee meeting are within Board maintained watercourses and can only assume that the other culverts being referred to may be side entry culverts that are not in Board maintained watercourses.

The Operations Manager next referred to headwalls, noting that it is his belief that the Board started to use sandbags in the early 90's, being of the opinion that sandbags may or may not be the right method, dependant on the scenario, like any other methodology. It was decided to use a more substantial protection, to protect the end and longevity of the pipe, and to provide something that doesn't deteriorate over time. This being presented and adopted by the Board at the time.

(iv) Byelaw Infringements and engaging with local planning officers - Minute 1950

Mr W Ash referred to the discussion had with the Boston Borough Council Planning Officer at the Structures Committee meeting, stating he was of the opinion that he had a 'blasé' attitude towards the 9 metre byelaw strip. Mr Ash asked if the Board have the right to say the 9 metre strip needs to be kept clear and he was of the opinion that if that is the case, then he believes it should be implemented.

The Chief Executive responded that as per the Land Drainage Act, the Board can control what does, or doesn't go within the 9 metre easement strip.

The Chief Executive highlighted one of the issues noted at the Structures Committee meeting, that permitted development doesn't require planning permission and so is not necessarily picked up by the Council's planning departments. But, in relation to the 9 metre easement strips adjacent to Board-maintained watercourses, that requires planning permission, the Board could implement a 'no' approach to anything being constructed in that easement strip.

Mr W Ash felt that if developers know that 9 metre easement strips can't be used for development, then they will cost accordingly, acknowledging the danger of setting a precedence.

The Chief Executive noted that the agreement for commuted sum for a Longhurst Housing Association development has just been agreed for £140,000 to cover the extra cost of maintenance to cover a 25 year period. Protection mats have also been provided by the Association to protect their ground materials when the Board's machinery tracks over it.

Cllr M Head questioned if there is anything the elected members of the District Councils can do to help, noting that he is prepared to go back to the NKDC and make a representation on behalf of the Board. Cllr M Head also noted that developers now must look for a 10% biodiversity net gain and the 9-metre easement strip could be used as this on site if the Board weren't tracking on it too frequently.

The Operations Manager noted that there is a uniqueness to each site, noting that the Longhurst Housing Association site being referred to is adjacent to one of the Board's critical watercourses, which is maintained at least three times a year. The Operations Manager further referenced the difficulty with permitted development and that the Board may not be aware of an obstruction until the next time they visit site.

Mr W Ash felt that the least that should be done, is a classification of drains in which it is insisted that nothing can be constructed within the 9 metre easement strip adjacent to critical, high priority watercourses.

The Operations Manager agreed that unrestricted access is what the Board ideally require, but that the developers want to maximise their land, acknowledging that planning departments also have targets to meet. The Operations Manager added that it is about making everyone aware of the work the IDB do, why it is necessary and what is required to be able to complete that work.

Mr J Fowler noted that he took from the meeting an increased communication system between the planning department and the Board.

Mr P Holmes expressed his dismay from the discussion had with the Boston Borough Council Planning Officer at the Structures Committee meeting, of the opinion, that no matter how much discussion takes place, he does not believe they will assist the Board in this matter.

Mr P Robinson felt that advantage has been taken by developers, feeling that the Board haven't been strong enough in the past by allowing development within the easement strip. Adding his concern that when it floods, it will be the Board that will be subject to criticism.

Mr W Ash added that if all the easement strips were added up on the total land for development it would be a very small percentage of the total area.

The Chief Executive suggested that he writes to all the district and borough planning departments, with a map to highlight all of the IDB maintained watercourses in their catchment and request their views on the proposal the Board is contemplating of taking an approach that allows nothing to be consented within a 9 metre easement strip. All AGREED.

Mr M Rollinson questioned, that when the new structure plan comes into operation, are those designing the structure plan aware of the fact that they will not be able to build within the 9 metres?

Cllr M Cooper responded that they are aware and that it is the problem of the developer, the issue being that they pay too much for the land and then need to be able to get as much on site as possible to enhance profit. Also noting that the government has increased the number of houses allowed per hectare.

To adopt the following:

(i) Structures Committee Terms of Reference

The Structures Committee Terms of Reference was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the Structures Committee Terms of Reference be adopted.

(ii) Policy No. 9: Structures Replacement Policy

The Structures Replacement Policy was presented, the increase in fee from £250 to £300 being highlighted.

The Board RESOLVED that the Structures Replacement Policy (Policy No. 9) be adopted.

(c) Audit & Risk Committee

The Chairperson of the Audit & Risk Committee presented the unconfirmed Minutes of the Audit & Risk Committee meeting held on the 12th April 2022, copies of which had been circulated. The Board RESOLVED that the Minutes should be received.

Matters Arising:

(i) Insurance arrangements - Minute 1961(c)

The Finance Manager gave an update to the Board, explaining that the NFU are currently working on the quote, he has a meeting booked with The Risk Factor in a few weeks' time and Towergate will also be providing a quote, which will give three quotes for review.

(ii) Paper meeting agendas - Minute 1963(b)

The discussion around paper versus electronic agendas was highlighted. It was suggested that anybody that would prefer an electronic copy only, to contact the administration office to let them know.

To adopt the following:

(iii) Audit & Risk Committee Terms of Reference

The Audit & Risk Committee Terms of Reference was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the Audit & Risk Committee Terms of Reference be adopted.

(iv) Policy No. 1: Risk Management Strategy

The Risk Management Strategy was presented.

Mr M Brookes highlighted some of the significant changes proposed:

- Risk Assessment Matrix – The monetary values associated with the different levels of impact are proposed to be changed to the following:
 - Medium: between £20,000 and £100,000
 - Low: up to £20,000
- Risk 1.1(b) – Fluvial flooding from failure of overtopping of defences – This risk is associated with the awaited Environment Agency documentation about the operation of the Black Sluice Complex. The Audit & Risk Committee have reviewed the documentation and deem is acceptable to be able to lower the potential likelihood of risk to 'low', reducing the risk level to 3.
- Risk 1.8 – Loss of Senior Staff – This has a risk level of 6 due to the ongoing circumstances of the Chief Executive.
- Risk 8.5 – Risk of breach in cyber security – The Finance Manager gave an update on this, as follows. The Duo system withdrew the control element of their system, which meant it was no longer suitable. An alternative Microsoft 365 multifactor authentication system was sourced; however, it was then found that it only protected data within the cloud, meaning that all ratepayer information stored on the physical server was not going to be protected. Therefore, both systems are now required, although it being an increased cost (£1,364), the Finance Manager felt it a prudent action to protect the information the Board holds.

The Board RESOLVED that the Risk Management Strategy (Policy No. 1) be adopted.

(v) Policy No. 3: Financial Regulations

The Financial Regulations were presented, highlighting the change that the Board's general reserves are now at a target of 30%, as agreed by the Board on 23 November 2021.

The Board RESOLVED that the Financial Regulations (Policy No. 3) be adopted.

(vi) Policy No. 10: Delegation of Authority

The Delegation of Authority was presented, highlighting the change that the Executive Committee's expenditure allowance has been increased to £50,000, as agreed by the Board on 8 February 2022.

The Board RESOLVED that the Delegation of Authority (Policy No. 10) be adopted.

(vii) Policy No. 13: Emergency Response Plan – Documentation provided by the Environment Agency outlining the operation of the Black Sluice Complex (for inclusion within the plan)

The documentation provided by the Environment Agency outlining the operation of the Black Sluice Complex, for inclusion within the Emergency Response Plan was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the documentation provided by the Environment Agency outlining the operation of the Black Sluice Complex be included within the Emergency Response Plan (Policy No. 13).

(viii) Policy No. 17: Members Code of Conduct

The Members Code of Conduct was presented, highlighting the change to protocol if a member has a non-financial interest in a matter.

The Board RESOLVED that the Members Code of Conduct (Policy No. 17) be adopted.

(ix) Policy No. 18: Whistle Blowing Confidential Reporting Code

The Whistle Blowing Confidential Reporting Code was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the Whistle Blowing Confidential Reporting Code (Policy No. 18) be adopted.

(x) Policy No. 19: Anti-Bribery

The Anti-Bribery policy was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the Anti-Bribery policy (Policy No. 19) be adopted.

(xi) Policy No. 43: Electronic Information and Communications Systems

The Electronic Information and Communications Systems policy was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the Electronic and Communications Systems policy (Policy No. 43) be adopted.

(xii) Policy No. 47: COVID-19 Business Continuity Plan

The Board RESOLVED that the Business Continuity Plan (Policy No. 47) be withdrawn, with the Chief Executive having the ability to re-instate it at any necessary point.

To approve the following:

(xiii) Internal Auditors Report 2021/22

The Internal Auditors Report 2021/22 was presented.

Mr M Brookes highlighted that the Board achieved 'substantial assurance' with no recommendations. The Chairperson noted that he spoke with the Internal Auditor and thanked him for his support this year given the circumstances of the Chief Executive. Mr M Brookes, and the Board, thanked everybody involved in the achievement of substantial assurance in the internal audit.

The Board RESOLVED that the Internal Auditor's Report be noted.

(xiv) Audit Programme 2022/23

The Audit Programme 2022/23 was presented.

The Board RESOLVED that the Audit Programme 2022/23 be noted.

(d) Executive Committee

The Chairperson of the Executive Committee presented the Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held on the 17th May 2022, copies of which had been circulated. The Board RESOLVED that the Minutes should be received.

Matters arising:

(i) Electric charging facility for vehicles – Minute 1974(g)

Mr V Barker raised the thought of electric vehicles and electric chargers. The Chairperson noted that this has been considered previously but is of the opinion that it is not advanced enough yet, noting the restricted mileage range and towing capacity.

The Chief Executive noted that the Board may try to align providing company vehicles for the workforce (i.e., vans) with the change to electric vehicles, but that the electric vehicle situation is constantly being monitored by the Board's Officers.

Mr V Barker agreed with everything said, further questioning if charging facilities should be put in? The Chief Executive noted that there is currently one employee with a hybrid vehicle, however, if the Board end up with a fleet of electric vehicles, then a fleet of charging points will also be required.

Mr M Rollinson noted the depot's solar panels, noting that the Board may be able to charge employees cars for nothing.

To approve the following:

(ii) Period 12 Management Accounts

The Board RESOLVED that the Period 12 Management Accounts be approved.

(i) 10 Year Schemes Budget (Amended)

The Board RESOLVED that the Capital Schemes Budget be approved.

(ii) 10 Year Plant Replacement Budget

The Board RESOLVED that the Plant Replacement Budget be approved.

(iii) 10 Year Estimates to reflect scheme updates and 2021/22 year end position

The Board RESOLVED that the 10 Year 2022/23 Budget and Estimates be approved.

1989 Approval of the Draft Unaudited Financial Statement for Year Ending 31 March 2022 - Agenda Item 7

The Finance Manager explained that the draft unaudited financial statements are a summary of the Period 12 Management Accounts, in UK GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) accounts format, from 2009, the last time they had to be produced in that format.

The Board RESOLVED for the Chairperson to sign the unaudited financial statements for the year ending 31 March 2022.

1990 To review and approve the Annual Governance Statement - Agenda Item 8

The Finance Manager explained that this is part of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return 2021/22, which is a further summary of the unaudited financial statements.

The Board RESOLVED that the Annual Governance Statement be signed and approved.

1991 Approval and authorisation for the Chairperson to sign the Annual Governance and Accountability Return for the year ending 31 March 2021 - Agenda Item 9

The Finance Manager presented the Annual Governance and Accountability Return.

The Board RESOLVED that the Annual Governance and Accountability Return for the year ending 31 March 2022 be signed and approved.

1992 To receive a report on Drainage Rates - Agenda Item 10

The Finance Manager referred to the revaluation within the report, confirming that he has visited site and there are no longer glasshouses on site, all AGREED to the write off of £2,519.72.

Account Ref	Location of Revaluation	Description	Existing Valuation	Proposed Valuation	Write Off
3093	Meeres Lane, Kirton	Glass houses removed	£19,100	£466	£2,519.72

The Finance Manager also informed the committee that he has authorised the below write off:

Account Ref	Location of Land	Description	Write Off
2349	Heckington Fen	Unable to trace previous owner for last year's rates demand, new owner only due to pay from date purchased (04/02/2022)	£56.26

1993 To receive the minutes of the ADA Joint Lincolnshire Branch and Nene Branch Meetings - Agenda Item 11

(a) 2nd December 2021

The Chairperson presented the minutes of the meeting.

(b) 23rd February 2022

The Chairperson presented the minutes of the meeting.

1994 To review the Risk Register - Agenda Item 12

The Board RESOLVED the Risk Register be accepted.

1995 Reports on the following: - Agenda Item 13

(a) Monthly Accounts: (February 2022 – May 2022)

The Board's monthly accounts, inclusive of February 2022 - May 2022, were circulated.

The Board RESOLVED that this report be noted.

(b) Monthly Accounts: Woldmarsh (February 2022 - May 2022)

The Board's monthly Woldmarsh invoices, inclusive of February 2022 - May 2022, were circulated.

The Board RESOLVED that this report be noted.

(c) Schedule of Consents (February 2022 - May 2022)

The Chief Executive presented the Schedule of Consents, consisting of February 2022 - May 2022, copies of which had been circulated. Viking Link consents being in red.

Mr V Barker made reference to consent 2022-C05; it was confirmed that this has been completed and is in relation to new properties.

The Board RESOLVED that this report be noted.

The consent applications / contraventions were discussed as below:

(i) Application to reroute Drain 28/30, New House Farm, Morton North Drive, Morton Fen following the collapse of Culvert No. 16 - FX1772

The Operations Manager noted that the landowners are considering developing the barns and, in light of the cost of replacing the culvert, have questioned whether the Board would consider an application to re-direct the drain around the site, as shown in red below, which will result in open watercourse being double the length of the current existing.



The Operations Manager noted that the Board has not been on site yet to confirm the levels given as part of their survey. The Operations Manager has taken levels from an existing survey, which shows 120mm difference between the two points, compared to their survey showing a difference of 420mm between the two points.

The Operations Manager noted that this has already been discussed by the Structures Committee and the Executive Committee, but felt the Board needed to decide whether such an application should be considered.

The Operations Manager gave his initial thoughts, noting that if it was agreed to then ideally there would need to be a 9-metre access strip left either side of the new watercourse. The landowners are prepared to accept the costs of digging the drain, but the Board needs to consider the conveyance of the proposed watercourse and future maintenance.

The Chairperson and Mr V Barker referred to concern of ground conditions.

The Operations Manager noted that they have informed the landowner, that if the Board were to consider the application, the ground conditions would have to be proven suitable through ground investigations and that if the new cut failed, the landowner would have to pay the extra cost associated with repair.

Mr M Leggott noted his concern for the lack of fall and that it would regularly silt up, noting that the levels would need re-measuring. The Operations Manager noted that it would be checked to ensure that the figures are true and exact.

Mr M Brookes highlighted that the Board would have more watercourse to maintain going forward and the associated increase in cost, questioning whether a commuted sum might be required? The Operations Manager responded that, yes, a commuted sum could be requested.

Mr P Holmes referred to previous discussion at the Structures and Executive Committee meetings and the general feeling of not being in favour of the proposed new watercourse.

The Operations Manager added that the watercourse proposed, shown by the red line, wouldn't work in practice as water doesn't travel around corners well, so consideration needs to be given in regard to the potential bank stability issues and scour/erosion at each 90 degree turn.

Cllr T Ashton asked how the Board currently access for maintenance? It was confirmed it is maintained from the road. Cllr T Ashton was of the opinion that it is creating a lot of work for the future, to solve the problem of the culvert collapsing, which isn't the responsibility of the Board.

Cllr M Cooper noted that it is the landowner's culvert that has collapsed and therefore didn't see it as the Board's problem to have the hassle of the new watercourse, of the belief that the landowner should just replace the collapsed culvert.

All AGREED not in favour of the application for a new watercourse.

(ii) Applications to place protective structures within a watercourse to protect existing HP Gas Mains land west of Bungley Lane and east of London Road, Kirton

The Operations Manager referred to the application from Cadent Gas over a safety concern for unconsented HP Gas Mains in a board-maintained watercourse.

A meeting was held around a potential way forward to prevent the gas mains being endangered by a machine, with their methodology being a concrete sheet going from top of the bank to top of the bank. The Board's Officer's expressed they were not happy with this and have 'met in the middle' approach, laying the concrete canvas as a raft.

The Board were of the opinion to support what the operations team felt acceptable and viable to ensure the mains gas is not endangered. Mr M Leggott added that there is no cost considerations for the safety of the Board's employees.

The Operations Manager added that in addition to the concrete canvas below the bed, there is also fencing as markers, and it is also plotted on the GIS system.

Mr C Wray questioned, if by making a recommendation for work that the Board are happy with, we become liable? It was confirmed that the Board don't have any liability.

All AGREED for the works to go ahead.

(d) Rainfall

The rainfall figures at Swineshead and Black Hole Drove were presented, copies of which had been circulated.

Mr V Barker noted that a lot of water coming into the Board's system is highland water, of the opinion that it would be prudent to have a monitoring system somewhere in that area. Mr V Barker suggested potential sites with the Richardson family, however, for this side of the catchment, he would suggest George Tickler or George Atkinson.

The Chief Executive acknowledged Mr V Barker's point but highlighted the difficulty that the upper rainfall catchment is c20,000 ha, including 8 uncontrolled gravity fed highland carriers and so one or two rain gauges are not going to be representative. Further questioning whether it is just something that is nice to have, or whether it would actually be used.

Mr V Barker referred to the Black Sluice complex and when to open it during an event and that it would help to have an understanding of the rainfall in that area.

The Chief Executive noted that part of the Environment Agency's actions of opening the gravity doors to release water prior to an event is through monitoring of their gauges. Mr V Barker felt that these gauges were too low down the system.

The Chief Executive suggested that the Board contacts large landowners in the area to see if they will allow the Board access to their rainfall monitoring.

Mr M Rollinson noted that it is all public data, can be accessed through platforms such as Sencrop etc.

The Board RESOLVED that this report be noted.

1996 Any Other Business - Agenda Item 14

(a) Audit & Risk Committee and Executive Committee Meeting Date

It was noted that the new proposed date of Tuesday 20th September for the two committees to review the insurance arrangements is no longer viable.

It was AGREED that the Audit & Risk Committee will meet at 11:00am on Wednesday 14th September and the Executive Committee will meet at 1:00pm on the same day.

(b) Crop Loss Compensation Rates

The Chief Executive informed the Board that the Works Manager has been approached by some farmers to see if the Board will be reviewing the crop loss compensation rates, in light of the current farming climate?

The Board were reminded of the current rates, as below:

- Summer Cutting
 - Cereals:25p per metre
 - Oil Seed Rape:44p per metre
- Other Maintenance Works
 - With Notice: £1,310 per Hectare
 - Without Notice:
 - Cereals: £1,495 per Hectare
 - Oil Seed Rape: £1,720 per Hectare

The Chief Executive reminded the Board that there are very few IDBs that pay any compensation, but that he felt by the Board offering compensation, it enables a good working relationship between the Board and farmers.

The Chairperson noted that if the Board react to the current price increase, it creates a 'yo-yo' situation, whereby a reaction would be needed if the prices then dropped.

Cllr M Head questioned the monetary value paid out in crop loss? The Finance Manager noted that the total last year was £7,800.87 and the year previous to that was £4,157.

Mr P Holmes and Mr M Leggott felt that the compensation rates should stay as they are.

The Chairperson added that if the prices stay high for an extended period of time, then it could perhaps be reviewed.

Cllr T Ashton noted that the Board's compensation rates are more generous than those of neighbouring IDB's who don't pay compensation at all.

Cllr R Austin felt it is money well spent to maintain good relationships with farmers and landowners.

(c) Desilting of the North Forty Foot Drain

Mr M Leggott questioned why the desilting of the North Forty Foot Drain has not continued?

The Operations Manager noted that it is due to complications around movement of spoil. The Operations Manager further explained that only one movement of the spoil is allowed under the Environment Agency (EA) licence held, otherwise it is classed as waste transfer, noting that it is aimed to stop contamination. Mr M Leggott understood this but felt the EA regulations were quite obstructive in this scenario.

The Operations Manager also noted that they ran out of time, wanting to complete before the end of March 2022, further adding that they will look at how they can complete the section.

Mr J Atkinson referred to the chopping down of bushes along the South Forty Foot Drain in the southern area and noted that they are now growing again, despite how much money and effort was made to stop them growing.

The Operations Manager responded that it has been mentioned to the EA, but that the Board are restricted by what work the EA want the Board to do.

Mr V Barker added that it is only on one side of the bank, questioning if there is anything that could be used to flail either side bank. The Operations Manager noted that it is possible, but that it is the EA that would fund that work, so he can only ask the question of the EA.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 15:37.