

# BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

## MINUTES

of the proceedings of a Meeting of the  
Northern Works Committee

held at the Offices of the Board on the  
11<sup>th</sup> April 2018 at 15:40pm

### Members

Chairman - \* Mr P Holmes

Cllr R Austin	* Cllr P Bedford
Cllr C Brotherton	* Cllr M Brookes
* Mr K C Casswell	* Mr D Casswell
* Cllr M Cooper	* Mr J Fowler
* Mr R Leggott	* Mr J E Pocklington
* Mr R Needham	* Mr P Robinson
* Cllr C Rylott	Mr N Scott
* Cllr P Skinner	Cllr Mrs S Waring
Mr R Welberry	

(\* Member Present)

In attendance: Mr I M Warsap (Chief Executive)  
Mr D Withnall (Finance Manager)  
Mr P Nicholson (Operations Manager)  
Mr P Green (Works and Engineering Manager)  
Mr K Methley (Assistant Pump Engineer)  
Mr M Rollinson (Chairman Southern Works Committee)

#### 1254 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE - Agenda Item 1

Apologies for absence were received from Mr N Scott, Mr R Welberry, Cllr C Brotherton and Cllr Mrs S Waring. Cllr R Austin was non attendees.

#### 1255 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - Agenda Item 2

##### (a) Ewerby Fen Catchwater (EA Main River)

A declaration of interest was received from Mr N Scott (via email) with regard to Minute 1257(a).

##### (b) Drain 5/30 Bank Slippage - Amulree, Kirton Holme

A declaration of interest was received from Cllr C Rylott with regard to Minute 1257(h).

#### 1256 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING - Agenda Item 3

The Minutes of the Joint Works Committee regarding the Northern Works Committee which was held on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017 copies of which had been circulated were considered and it was agreed the Minutes should be jointly signed as a true record. There were no matters arising.

The Chairman made reference to the picture on the front of the Inspection Brochure which is Drain 7/7 at Kirton Marsh. He explained that this is a drain that was probably from one end to the other only a couple of hundred yards long but with 18 inches / 2 foot depth of water difference from the outfall to where it comes in, due to the snow compacting and drifted into it, it was holding water up as it had gone to ice, luckily there was a 360 Excavator in the area and it was dug out to enable flow.

The Operations Manager presented the Inspection of Works:

(a) Ewerby Fen Catchwater (EA Main River)

Mr N Scott declared interest (see minute 1255(a)).

The Operations Manager referred Members to page 27 & 28 Ewerby Fen catch water drain which is an Environment Agency (EA) main river. It is one of the seven proposed for de-maining within the first tranche of the low consequence watercourses the EA are de-maining. He stated that along with two EA Officers he walked all seven watercourses in August 2017. He directed Members to the onscreen photographs, following that walk over it was decided that this watercourse was in need of some improvement, some bushes need removing. Some culverts within the length were no value to either the landowner or to the Board so it was decided the Board could remove them. This was taken to the Board and the decision was that this watercourse was in a good enough condition to adopt and take on.

Following that decision the Officers informed the EA that we would adopt this watercourse once the process was followed through. Earlier this year landowners from either side of this watercourse both did an independent walk over. The Operations Manager spoke to one of the landowners following that walkover and he expressed his concerns about what he had seen and what he knew about the characteristics of that watercourse, he explained what had happened during a heavy rainfall event and how quickly water levels increase particularly at the top upstream end where the landowner lives and owns the majority of the land. The Operations Manager said the landowner had asked him if he should report it to the EA and the Operations Manager agreed yes. Following on from that the Operations Manager had another meeting on site with both the landowners and an EA representative and the Officers have decided to review the taking on of this watercourse in its current condition but there is no funding available around any improvements to the watercourse as there isn't with any of the other watercourses in this first tranche.

The Operations Manager stated that unless we can agree to take it on in its present condition then the EA have said that there is no funding to improve its current condition so the options are 'to give it up' and it becomes riparian or the Board takes it on in its present condition. He has not had a response back from the EA on whether the Board will continue to maintain it under the Public Sector Cooperation agreement.

Mr J Fowler asked to clarify that there is no commuted sum that would be due to come with this watercourse.

The Operations Manager responded there is section of raised bank which has an asset value, he believes, along that watercourse – but no.

Mr K Casswell added that we have to assume if there is no money to do anything to it, and we don't take it on they will not give us money to maintain it and it will be just left as is therefore it ultimately ends up unmaintained.

The Chief Executive stated that this is an EA low consequence highland runner main river which is a high consequence watercourse to the Board. If we say no and it reverts to riparian control, the riparian owners may not control it or take any care of future maintenance. This could set a precedence and it could go full circle and come back to this Board to make a decision to adopt it as a Board maintained watercourse and this is what he is conscious about not getting involved with this circle of events. There is no more money coming from the EA there is a commuted sum, collectively circa £60,000 coming with the first de-maining tranche with that money do we focus on enhanced maintenance of these watercourse for 2/3 years to bring them into line – yes/no? Knowing that if we say no they sit as they are for a long time. The Operations Manager stated that once we take over the maintenance it's how we maintain them in the future, do we treat them as Board maintained drains and look at putting them into a Board maintained condition. Obviously this will come at a cost and if we accept that cost over how many years do we look to get them into an acceptable condition.

The Chairman explained that every one of these is in a different situation and you would have different landowners with a completely different view and appetite to whether that watercourse be maintained or not. Clearly in this situation we have two landowners both of them fairly well progressive farmers who are keen to get that watercourse and keep it maintained and the de bushing works done. Can we propose to them they get the bushes sorted out and make it fit for purpose and then we are happy to take it on and maintain it in the future, each watercourse is individual and this would not set a precedence.

The Operations Manager responded and classified the landowners have a potential appetite.

Mr K Casswell believes that in the spirit of the de-maining process the EA should be making funds available to put these watercourses in a form that they can be taken on. The de-maining process is going to come to a halt if the EA are not going to do this. They should find the money to put them in a position of acceptance and this the crux of the problem they are not finding the funding locally.

The Chief Executive reiterated this is a problem, he stated he is on the Technical Working Group for the rest of the main rivers and when the central EA Officers tell us in minuted minutes there is the money available and take them to regional level then they say there is not the money available – the message is not getting through. He concluded we are never going to be offered an EA main river whether it be low consequence, medium or high consequence with pristine banks in order to take over.

The Chairman stated that we need to brush over it to say that is the best case scenario we are never going to get a pristine watercourse we have to make plans that its not going to be handed over to us because if the only other option is to walk away and make it riparian.

Mr K Casswell felt that if we walk away and it becomes riparian and in 5 years' time the watercourse is in an even worse state than now and somebody says its causing a problem can you take it on we may as well bite the bullet now. He believes that the Board should try and keep some pressure on the EA about this problem, and he will put it to the ADA Executive in July 2018. The Chairman agreed the Board should be putting all our energy into getting as much help as we can.

The Chief Executive stated that from an Officer point of view that we progress with the rationalising the main river process proposed on the rivers. We have identified and we have said that they are clearly not good enough because we cannot go down either bank with mechanical means for access. At the same time we are looking at our own maintenance regime in order to reduce some of our low consequence watercourses to only every second year cuts or even third year cuts. In some of the watercourses there is no water so we are looking at cost savings on that side to be able to bring that money onto these higher consequence IDB maintained drains albeit they are low consequence EA rivers. I would like us to continue to progress we will re introduce it with a view to stopping it but I do think if we take a negative attitude towards it all it goes against everything we are trying to do and other IDBs are trying to do with opening the Environment Agency up to releasing some control and placing more power with other risk management authorities.

Mr K Casswell stated his concerns were the same, if we identified in this first tranche that there were going to be five he believes we should try and progress with those five the other two were declined for particularly bad access reasons.

Mr Rollinson acknowledged that this is not Cliff Beck this watercourse is maintainable this is not a big job for us to take this on. When we saw the water travelling down that today, and the water in the Skirth it is important we have control of this watercourse. We should approach the landowners for a one off contribution to de bush the banks because their alternative is riparian ownership where they have to fully maintain it. Going forward if the Board maintains that watercourse then it's going to be maintained at a better level than the EA. We should take on this main river from the EA.

Mr R Needham queried if they are going to benefit from the watercourse actually being done out then I think they should contribute, the Chairman responded that the landowners may want to put their own workforce in there to clear it and do it themselves we have to work with them, an approach to them in the first instance.

The Chief Executive stated that it's not just this main river, it's all landowners associated with any demanding issues within the Rationalising the Main River Network (RMRN) budget. As long as we have a process set right for this one this is what we want to continue. All AGREED.

(b) Damage to Concrete Farm Yard - Claydike Farm, Holland Fen

The Operations Manager presented on screen. He outlined the history in 2006 he referred members to page 30 which details previous records. In 2006 the Board had caused damage to the concrete yard area adjacent to Claydike Farm at Holland Fen, but unfortunately he has not been able to find any history before 2006. The Board completed a repair of partial section of the concrete pad before 2006 – but have not established when exactly that was. The Operations Manager stated he met with the landowner in May 2017 when discussing some compensation for crop loss following desilting works the landowner then mentioned the condition of the concrete again.

The Chief Executive met with the landowner on site August 2006 and agreed the Boards machine had caused damage to the concrete area and agreed to monitor the situation, the concrete hard standing remains serviceable for access to Claydike farm at the present time. If the landowner approached the Board now and wished to construct the hard standing in a similar position adjacent to the drain he would now need to apply to the Board for consent to relax the byelaws. It is believed this concrete hard standing was originally put down in the 1970s hence why the byelaw application wouldn't be relevant then. The Operations Manager outlined the following proposals which he would like the Committee to consider;

The area in question is 72m<sup>2</sup> if a c2m (half of the bay width) section is replaced at 200mm thickness this would require c15m<sup>3</sup> RMC - Estimated cost £6,000.

If the whole bay width c4m were to be replaced this would require c30m<sup>3</sup> Estimated cost £10,000.

A decision is required from the Committee -

- i) Do nothing and monitor
- ii) The Board replace the c2m x 36m section at an estimated cost of £6,000
- iii) The Board replace the c4m x 36m section at an estimated cost of £10,000
- iv) The Board replace the c2m x 36m section and agree a level of contribution from the landowner, if so what level of contribution?
- v) The Board replace the c4m x 36m section and agree a level of contribution from the landowner, if so what level of contribution?

The Chairman requested to add another scenario basically if its 4m x 36m section is 30 cube of concrete x £100 is £3,000 he suggested that we say to the landowner that we will offer to pay for £3,000 of concrete for him to get the rest of the work done bearing in mind we are bettering what is there already, we accept responsibility that we probably contributed to the damage over the years but also for him to apply for consent to relax the byelaw to put a structure within the permitted distance from a Board maintained drain we will then waive the £50 fee but then also we then relinquish all responsibility and liability on that concrete pad going forward.

The Finance Manager explained the Board has a standard wording which goes on the consent which says “we will not be responsible for any damage caused because we need access to it”, by applying for the consent that standard statement could go on which will cover it off for the 20 years time when it’s been broken again.

Mr Holmes pointed out that rather than giving him a sum of money, we actually paying for the concrete £3,000 towards the job and its up to him when he does the work and what he does with it and how far he goes with it.

Mr Rollinson clarified so we have commuted liability at the same time – yes; I propose we do this.

Mr Leggott, wondered if I would be tempted at that, I might be at £5,000 but not at £3,000 – Mr Rollinson responded he could come back.

Mr Rollinson added that Mr Leggott is quite correct if we put an initial offer to him of £3,000 he come back and says he will do it for £4,000 it would need to come back to the Board.

The Chairman explained that the concrete is more than half of the job of actually concreting, if he was going to replace the whole slab 36m x 4m and we are contributing £3,000 towards it we are contributing over half certainly half of the whole job.

Cllr Skinner asked if we could phrase it differently ie materials only – the Chairman responded no then there would be hard-core as well. Cllr Skinner asked then do we say it’s a one off and none negotiable.

Mr D Casswell agreed that this would be a good offer to go to the landowner this Board goes across there once a year – that amount of damage is not for just once a year traffic from the Boards machine.

Mr J Fowler asked if the Board could commute any liability to the previously laid concrete as well beyond the patch, the Finance Manager responded only what is within the 9 metres – yes.

The Chief Executive clarified a proposal has been received that the offer to the landowner will be £3,000 of concrete, for the Board to purchase the concrete material for the landowner rather than a sum of money exchange hands. All AGREED.

(c) LCC Highways Culvert Collapse - Middle Drove, Boston West

The Operations Manager referred the Committee to photographs on screen showing the collapsed culvert this was brought to the Boards attention on 13 March 2018. The upstream end started to collapse over the end of the culvert, we contacted LCC as the responsible party involved with ownership of that culvert under the road around removal of the blockage and we went to remove the blockage to allow conveyance of the water through the culvert. Unfortunately the culvert was armco pipe which was in a poor condition so we dug about 2 metres of the pipe away and left a shear face (the photos shows where the piles were placed).

Unfortunately following that removal we had quite a considerable amount of rain, the support was undermined the water got around it and the existing pipe slipped down again. The Operations Manager went out to site during the Easter break, on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2018, and spoke to LCC Highways. Specifications have been agreed around replacing it. They are on site as of 9<sup>th</sup> April 2018 when commencement of removal of the old culvert and replacing with a new one began.

Mr Rollinson asked if the road is still open, the Operations Manager responded no the road is closed, it was closed on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 as it was immediately dangerous.

(d) Drain 12/2 Proposed UV Lining - Langrick Road, Boston

The Operations Manager updated Members on one scheme, we are looking to secure £81,000 value of Grant in Aid towards a £450,000 total scheme cost. This is built up of potential UV lining some of the existing sections of pipeline across Langrick Road, back into the North Forty Foot Drain, this is a continuation of a section of pipeline replaced previously. The North Forty Foot Drain desilting works are proposed on conclusion of a business case that the EA consultants are working on for us at this moment that will be one scheme that will hopefully start this year and be concluded next year,

Mr Rollinson asked about this UV lining of the pipe have we any indication or figures regarding the longevity or how long the pipe will last having been lined, the Operations Manager responded they quote 50 years – so it is worthwhile and cost beneficial.

(e) Proposed De-silting of the North Forty Foot Drain – Cooks Lock Pumping Station

The Operations Manager updated on this scheme for an indication we have shown on item 5 the desilting operation and proposed silt lagoons sites similar to what we built for the South Forty Foot works. No dialogue or correspondence with any landowners around sites for silt lagoons has been undertaken yet this is only a basic outline of the costs and an idea of a proposal.

Mr K Casswell asked the delay in getting permission to do this does this affect the local levy contribution towards this scheme and roll into the same problem? The Operations Manager responded it does not make it any easier.

Mr J Fowler asked is the desilting by Royal Smals pump does the stoning of the drain in a previous time make any difference to the pump. The Operations Manager responded the only consequence when this was discussed onsite was it will slow the process down a little and they will allow for what they call a little more slippage. They would not cut such a tight profile and will lift the cutter head so that stones are not being struck all the time. It is not a problem and will use a different type of head to what has been used on the South Forty Foot works. Allowance for the rougher material going through the pipes has been included in the estimate, the process is slowed down so more control can be placed in the process.

The Chief Executive explained Royal Smals gave us an indication that the machine used in the South Forty Foot is one of the smallest machines and its specifically more focused on urban works, which is this type of work.

(f) Wyberton Towns Drain - Q1 Development

The Operations Manager stated this is a point of interest as an update to where we are with the potential realignment of the Wyberton Towns Drain adjacent to the Q1 site. We have now agreed the realignment with Chestnut Homes. This was indicated on the screen. Since that confirmation of the new line there has been nothing further to report. It would be my preference that works are completed by the Board in order that control is maintained over the specification around the completed works.

The Chief Executive expressed the Officers are quite happy with this realignment there is not really any alternative because there is a large water main with a 4 metre easement and there are 33 kv overheads which have an easement as well, we are on the boundary of these easements, it offers the best realignment. The curve on the drain takes away the awkwardness of the double bend and it enhances the Wyberton Football Club playing field area so it's a win win for two or three organisations and all the works to be carried out with recovered costs from the developer.

The Chairman explained that further down the Towns Drain, there has been problems with slippages. What future comebacks have we got if it slips? The drain took that course for a reason my fear is and knowing how it is further up – the Chief Executive responded we would write conditions into the agreement with them regarding continuation repair work because of slippage.

(g) Culvert UV Lining Works - Washdike Road, Kirton Meeres

The Operations Manager explained due to the present water levels, the current works have been called off, part of the requirement whilst completing these works is that they are lifting the water and moving it around the site whilst a dam is in place and holding water up. With the increase in water levels currently there have been problems moving water around onsite. When water levels are back to normal works can resume. This is a Grant in Aid scheme to value of £37,500. The cost of the re-lining works £27,500 and then once completed there is headwall work by the Board to protect the end of the pipes as per the specification for new culverts.

(h) Drain 5/30 Bank Slippage - Amulree, Kirton Holme

Cllr C Rylott declared an interest.

The Operations Manager explained that this site was viewed on the Inspection Tour along Kirton Drain as there have been problems historically with bank slippage adjacent to this property called Amulree. In 2004 it was agreed with the present householder that the Board would complete revetment to the slippage of the bank at the back of their property. Following the investigation over a number of years before 2004, although there was not any significant bank slip identified from the cross sectional



surveys which were completed, it was agreed to put some revetment along the length of the property on the Kirton Drain bank.

It is now failing, unfortunately due to higher water levels we could not see that today but the photographs on screen shows the revetment with the water level at its normal level and it shows that the wooden revetment is now failing after a 14 year period.

A meeting was held with the property owners in February 2018 to discuss potential options and what they would like to see as their preferred option. I went to meet with them again yesterday to confirm the tour would be visiting tomorrow.

He proposed four options for consideration as follows:

1. Replace existing failing revetment with new timber boards to bank c£3,000.
2. New revetment placed at a higher design level 4m close-piled sheets & re-profile bank, to create a flatter profile and increase the top crest width c£9,000. To take some of that bearing weight off the bank, to provide more stability with a view to curing the problem in its longevity.
3. New culvert past property 30m x 1.2m twin wall plastic, budget estimate c£23,000.
4. Re-align drain c80-100m. Move existing drain over c2m to include revetment to newly created bank profile, budget estimate c£20,000. On site there is a more significant change in direction which equates to around about 80 – 100m where the drain could be moved over which would be another way of curing the potential problem of that bank slip.

The Operations Manager stated he had told the property owners there is not a lot of point in discussing anything further until the Northern Works Committee have met and an option for the Board agreed, then go back to the property owners to discuss terms with them around the Board's option.

He asked the Committee if there were any of the above options for consideration or are there any other options that the Committee would like to consider and what option would we like to go with to take back to the property owner for further discussion.

The Operations Manager stated that after discussion with the owners, their preferred option would be partial revetment, and partial piping.

The caveat in 2004 if the Board were to consider culverting the drain it would be 100% contribution from the owner.

Cllr Cooper commented revetment works did not work last time – the Operations Manager stated it had worked for 14 years. Cllr Cooper expressed that close steel piling would be a better bet if they would go 50% contribution and it would give them confidence in the long time.

Mr Rollinson agreed with what Cllr Cooper is saying but he has extended this property. General consensus by Members was the extension was years ago.

The Chairman asked why can't we contact the owner with the cost of replacing the revetment work will cost £3,000 we are prepared to pay if he would like option 2 if he would like to uplift it then it will cost him £6,000 we are going to pay for £3,000 to do it like for like if he wants a better job.

The Finance Manager asked if the piling and stoning behind, timber piles stone revetment behind it this would give a better option – the Works & Engineering Manager responded you have to start digging out the bank and it would destabilise it.

A Member referred to the steel piling would this cause a health & safety issue because you have it would be circa a metre which is a straight side. The Works & Engineering Manager believes it is 1.2 metre is the level for Health & Safety – you will have a drop off. The Chairman clarified it would only be on one side. The Chief Executive responded if this was the option taken then we would make sure that the occupiers manage that risk.

The Chief Executive explained because of the dwelling and the weight that complex is putting on the bank, not saying that is why it is moving but it must be contributing to it. The modern technique and modern machinery in that these piles are interlocking and floated down they can be bought in various lengths interlocking steel piles to design level along existing line of that revetment timber bank. If the occupiers are prepared to pay for the extra-enhanced works, it is certainly more of a permanent fixture. He added that some enhance flail mowing, some bushes and trees work would be introduced at the same time.

Cllr Brookes expressed his concerns if we proposed it will cost us £3,000 to put it back how it is and we are prepared to uplift if they say they will not pay the extra you just go on and put it back well its going to cost us £3,000 and they are not going to be paying anything you need to be careful how its pitched to them if we just did the revetment work we would still want 50% contribution.

Mr Rollinson reminded Members that they previously paid 50% towards the 2004 works or we only contribute £1500.

The Operations Manager explained the basis of the owner's request was that the concrete around the inspection chamber is cracked. They have re-turfed next to the manhole because of slippage and the path is now at an angle when it was previously straight. There is a lot maybe anecdotal/arguable evidence. Is that bank profile any worse than anywhere else along that drain, probably not, but that house is built there that's where the problem is.

The Operations Manager stated that the historical survey data was in conclusive at the time and the revetment was completed, therefore in a way we have set a little bit of a precedence for ourselves.

Mr D Casswell asked if the revetment option is done do you use wood again as a material as there is no longer lasting type of material to use. The Operations Manager responded normally we use pressure treated timber with an expectance of 15 to 20 years similarly we have just completed a scheme at Bicker village which lasted 25 years using similar treated wooden boards so yes I understand what you are asking if there

was another option ie plastic, I have not looked at a different type of material it may come in at a similar cost or may be a lot more.

Mr Fowler stated that in this case the timber is failing and it does not look like it has stopped the movement of the bank my vote would be piled and the owners asked for a 50% contribution.

Cllr Bedford added that it should be 50% on any option.

Cllr Brookes option 2 and ask for 50% - Members generally agreed yes.

Mr Leggott stated if the owner does not accept option 2 he has to have something which is option 1 as a fall back.

The Finance Manager do we have the fall back or do we wait for it to obstruct the water flow because its not causing a problem for the Board at the moment.

Cllr Brookes the fall back should be option 1 but still pay 50% contribution.

The Chairman proposed option 2 with a 50% contribution from the occupiers and with a fall back of option 1 also with 50% contribution. All AGREED.

(i) Great Hale Pumping Station

The Operations Manager explained within our budgets proposed for next year a refurbishment of the weed screen cleaner at Great Hale pumping station. The basis of the costs is the replacement of the moving parts of the cleaner the cabling etc. Currently we are evaluating between this particular site and also Chain Bridge pumping station weed screen cleaner they are of a similar age but Chain Bridge because of where it is and the characteristics of that catchment the pumps operate more hence the weed screen cleaner works more so purely as a cost benefit exercise it may be that we decide to swap them round and replace Chain Bridge it's a similar cost profile. The other issues at Great Hale we are considering at the moment which is the public access over the concrete deck outfall area and also some of the works we have recently completed to manage the vegetation around the site bushes and trees whereby some have been completely removed and some we have reduced to a more manageable level.

The Operations Manager explained that the access along the side of the pumping station which is currently the only access for the landowner to a circa 10 acre field. It is proposed to investigate firstly the legalities and the Boards responsibilities, the Health & Safety aspect around crossing over those structures, structural integrity we are looking at an initial proposal of stopping the access across all of these accessible points at varying pumping stations around our catchment and asking that any interested parties come back to us and request access across the pumping station.

Mr Rollinson asked if the land is land locked how can they gain entry if they cannot go across the outfall crossing point? The Chief Executive responded there is access through private land, albeit a long way around.

The Chief Executive added we will be following advice from Solicitor we will be erecting public notices in the forthcoming weeks at all pumping stations along the lines of "it is the intention of the BSIDB to stop the use of this pumping station as a crossing point with effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018 if you claim a legal right to use this pumping station as a crossing please inform the Board in writing no later than 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018 claims should be sent to the Operations Manager BSIDB."

He further explained that soon after the 1<sup>st</sup> September we will be implementing a scheme of locking up the crossing points. We are aware there is probably only six that are used other than pedestrian use so there will be a priority list and arguably Great Hale is number one thankfully Network Rail already have a gate at this pumping station therefore after discussions with them its should be just a formality. As and when the particular people who are using the crossing points for whatever reasons prove to us and our legal team satisfactorily that they have the required insurances and that they are prepared to assist with part payment towards gates and locks etc we will agree to them obtaining access.

The Chief Executive continued to explain the scenario that modern tractors with modern trailers carrying heavy loads travelling across these pumping station outfall/suction bays the vibrations going into these structures you can quite easily envisage damage to some of the high tech mechanisms within the control panel and it could cost the Board a lot to repair. A scenario could be that one night when one of our workforce visits a pumping station, slips on a cow pat and falls into the water, there are various items of risk that we have identified that we want to remove. I'm sure we are going to come up with some challenges of historical use, or right of passage but our legal team are prepared to take those on board and address them on an individual case by case. This is the methodology moving forward this is for information only so that if and when you are challenged by any of the individuals using these crossing points once we erect these notices you have answers for them.

The Operations Manager stated that structural surveys are to be completed at each site to establish an asset condition of those structures. That may come back on ourselves because we need to access Great Hale site to get to the dump area at the very minimum with the teleporter to clear away the weed.

Mr J Pocklington asked do you take any excavators over there or not, the Operations Manager responded we have in the past.

The Chief Executive acknowledged that as part of the structural survey will apply a safe weight limit, it may come back on ourselves, we may have to find an alternative route.

The Chairman referred to the plan on page 40, asking is there any way, is there enough area, for the dump area to be on the other side in order to access it and not need to go over the suction bay. The Chief Executive responded that through the Officers own implementation of risk and identifying and controlling that risk it is knowing the heaviest vehicle in the future needing to cross over that outfall bay. The teleporter can remove the weed from the weed screen cleaner dump area which is done anyway we have to wait to see what is said by the Structural Engineer.

The Operations Manager stated in order to make this Committee aware as a point of interest within the bounds of the site at Great Hale pumping station we have been approached by an adjacent landowner to lift water from the South Forty Foot and transfer it into Great Hale pump drain to then retransfer it from Great Hale pump drain into the landowners reservoir this is something which is ongoing.

Mr Rollinson reminded Members that when this item came up before we were going to charge the applicant a wayleave – the Chief Executive responded this has come up at other Committees. The Officers are currently at the position where by an abstraction licence is being granted from the EA to abstract from the South Forty Foot drain. It has been agreed with the Boards legal team that a commuted sum from the applicant (which has been paid) to put the underground apparatus at Great Hale pumping station. The Officers have implemented and agreed and will implement cut off levels that are being indicated to the applicant with regard to draw down levels at the same time as water is being pumped out of the South Forty Foot at Great Hale pump drain the pump that is going to lift it further upstream into the reservoir must be running at the same time to balance all instances. The Officers are quite happy we have covered ourselves with regards to controlling the applicant with regards to abstraction and with no additional costs to the Board.

Mr Rollinson asked would it have been easier to come up with a deal for the Board to close the gravity outfall and back the water up in the drain, the Chief Executive responded this pumping station we very rarely pump during the summer months because the existing abstraction system, we do gravitate but there is not a lot of water that passes out of the catchment.

Mr Needham asked he remember going back 15/20 years that they altered the slack door they lowered it for this purpose on that part to allow for the water to free flow back from the South Forty Foot because I presume it would be a winter abstraction to fill the reservoir. The Chief Executive stated the tilting gate can only tilt one way, out of the Boards system. The Operations Manager added that we could control that level by altering the level of the tilting gate we did that quite recently, if we lift that level to appease a landowner downstream end of the system there is a potential detriment to someone upstream so we have to very conscious of those controls.

(j) Potential South Forty Foot Desilting Works

The Operations Manager stated this is for information; the potential continuation of the desilting of the South Forty Foot Drain after recent conversations with Mr A Clack (EA Officer) the Officers are working towards a completion of the SFFD desilting works upto the A52 this year commencing in October 2018. Then the Officers will be looking at continuation from the A52 working towards the A17 in October 2019. He stated that this is in the early stages of discussions that phase 2 will most likely be phase 2, 3 and 4 because he believes the next phase completed from the A52 downstream will only be 3 km in length of the overall 9 km distance between the A52 and A17. Depending where future lagoon sites can be secured will mean that one lagoon per 3 km section will be required.

If the lagoon is not sited directly adjacent to the Forty Foot banks as previously has been done then obviously this reduces the length Royal Smals can pump and the more lagoons they will need. Future works before each phase will be de-vegetation of the banks the previous year to the desilting works being completed. This year the proposal is that a 3 km section from the A52 more or less to the bottom of Bicker Fen will have all the trees and bushes removed this October 2018 in preparation for desilting works in October 2019.

He is now developing a working programme away from the October start date as some pre works need to be in place around de-vegetation of the channel so the de-silting process works and does not get clogged up with weed. There are some other issues around these particular sections on the A52 to A17 these being Triton Knoll, the Viking Link and the High Pressure Mains Gas. The Viking Link corridor has not been narrowed yet we don't definitively know where that working corridor is going to be.

Cllr M Cooper stated he has a map with the link for the Viking Link now which he can share with BSIDB, also the Triton Knoll haul road which comes up from the A17 past Great Hale pumping station and runs tight to the side of the Forty Foot they are looking to start that this Summer because they are looking at a completion date by January 2019.

The Finance Manager asked if this haul road would go all the way to the pumping station, Cllr Cooper responded yes but it's on the wrong side. Mr Rollinson added that it would go to Bicker Fen pumping station. Cllr Brookes regarding sorting out this road to Great Hale pumping station he wondered if there would be any advantage if and when Viking Link put their road down that side if there could be any arrangement we could come to with Viking Link about sorting that road way out because that would benefit them because they will need access down that side and would benefit the Board in the long run so it might be worth having a word and they do have community funds available. He clarified that they have to build a road down there anyway. Cllr Cooper confirmed that both of them have to build a road to get the haulage in. Cllr Brookes suggested there could be some negotiation to get heavy vehicles down there if there was some way there could be some mutual benefit something which would leave the Board with good roads afterwards. The Chief Executive responded that the Officers will take this on board we have our own thoughts clearly Triton Knoll is more advanced than Viking Link we have regular meetings and contractors are already on site across the County.

The Chairman thanked the Operations Manager and the team for the Inspection tour today.

1258 REPORT ON RAINFALL - Agenda Item 6

The Chairman asked for March 2018 rainfall to be added to the report, sheets were distributed at the meeting.

1259 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Drainage Rate Brochure

The Chief Executive distributed a copy of the drainage rate brochure for information to the Members of the Committee. He highlighted to the Members that this year is an election year and the Returning Officer is already progressing this.

The Finance Manager added that if Members have any feedback on this brochure or any ideas for future years it is something which is produced in house and externally printed, please let the Finance Manager know.

(b) Netherlands Inspection Tour

The Chief Executive explained there have been some questions regarding the Netherlands Inspection tour mainly regarding the mini bus.

He stated everything is in hand and we are very close to finalising the details with regards to the coach from the Office to the airport. A coach has been organised and will collect Members on route to Humberside Airport more information will be given nearer the time, please don't try to organise your own transport or parking at the airport. He explained to the Committee Members asking if there are any Board Members or Works Members that are still interested to go there are places available.

He stated that currently there are thirteen Board & Works Members attending the tour plus one ADA representative the new Press Officer Ryan Dixon who is responsible for the ADA Gazette we have invited him in the same way this Board invited Ian Moodie – Ian has graciously passed this invitation onto Ryan and it has been well received, that this Board is actively looking to get ADA Officers involved.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive and team for keeping our feet dry in these trying and testing times with both rainfall and our partners at the EA.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 17:10.