

# 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  
1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 at 15:55pm

### 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
Cllr Mrs J Harrison	* Mr R Leggott
* Mr J E Pocklington	* Mr R Needham
* Mr P Robinson	* Cllr C Rylott
* Mr N Scott	Cllr P Skinner
* Mr R Welberry	

(\* Member Present)

In attendance: Mr I M Warsap (Chief Executive)  
Mr D Withnall (Finance Manager)  
Mr P Nicholson (Operations Manager)  
Mr C Richards (Pump Engineer)  
Mr K C Casswell (Chairman of the Board)  
Mr M Rollinson (Chairman Southern Works Committee)

Additional attendees on Inspection: Mr G Hutson (Guest)  
Mr M Mountain (Guest)  
Mr O Nicoll (HBP Systems)

The Chairman welcome Mr D Casswell and Cllr R Austin to the meeting who unfortunately were unable to attend the tour. The Chairman also thanked the Operations Manager for organising the Inspection.

### 1087 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE - Agenda Item 1

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr C Brotherton, Cllr Mrs J Harrison and Cllr P Skinner.

### 1088 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

#### (a) Drain 8/3 Ewerby Catchwater

A declaration of interest was received from Mr N Scott with regard to Minute 1091(e).

(b) Drain 14/2 South Kyme Old Pump

A declaration of interest was received from Mr D Casswell with regard to Minute 1091(g).

1089 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING - Agenda Item 2

The Minutes of the Joint Works Committee regarding the Northern Works Committee which was held on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2016 copies of which had been circulated were considered and it was agreed the Minutes should be jointly signed as a true record.

1090 MATTERS ARISING - Agenda Item 3

(a) 2016/17 Defra/EA Funded Grant in Aid Schemes - Minute 1022

The Operations Manager explained for Members information, all of the schemes from (a) through to (g) on pages 3 & 4, with the exception of the following have not received funding from the EA. The North Forty Drain and Langrick Road are now a combined scheme, Sempringham Fen & Damford Ground Pumping Stations, along with Helpringham Fen weedscreen cleaner were all part of a packaged scheme put together for the EA Consultants to progress and ultimately there has been no progress. The EA Consultants have delivered an outline business case and some of the consultants costs are more than the value of the schemes.

The Operations Manager confirmed that funding has been received for the Kirton Meeres Drain 7/11 Scheme to reline the pipeline and this work will be progressing in the next financial year.

(b) Watercourses to Abandon or Commence Future Board Maintenance - Minute 1025

The Operations Manager explained that a desktop exercise has been completed to indicate potential sections of watercourses which either serves only one landowner or where it is not in the interest of the Board to carry on maintaining including end runs and short lengths.

Mr Rollinson explained at the Joint Works Committee meeting it was discussed and felt the first approach could be the "easy wins".

The Chairman suggested that the watercourse sections/runs could be looked at on a "traffic light" basis ie

RED – would not be progressed any further  
AMBER – potential for further investigation  
GREEN – first ones to be progressed

The Operations Manager asked Members to discuss the sections/runs identified regarding their viability to be "given up" to riparian ownership. He explained that once Members have discussed this at the meeting today then Officers can gather more information on each of these particular sites and get some directive resolution around a way forward for the Officers to then progress to the next level.

Mr K Casswell pointed out that once you consult with the landowners you will find out the historical reason why they have been taken over in the first instance. Many of the questions we cannot answer will be answered whether it's from field amalgamations or whatever why they have been taken over in the first place.

The Chief Executive stated the Officers are trying to formulate but each one is bespoke, if the Board uses the traffic light scenario simplistically three green lights;

- GREEN light - if the Officers believe said drain should be "given up"
- GREEN light - that the landowner says yes "I would like it handed back as a riparian drain"
- GREEN light - there is no objection from the Works Committee and thence the Board

The Chief Executive asked Members for direction on what condition should said drain be "given up" in and what delegated powers to the Officers or Operations Manager - will he have to agree with said landowner onsite. He invited opinions on "How do we pass it back" - is it just a summer cut, is it assessed for de-silting, bushing what element of money/budget.

The Chairman enquired if in that situation we could say if the Officers give it a GREEN light and Works Committee Members and therefore the Board give it a GREEN light then we approach the landowner that it is to be handed back to said landowner. If there is any doubt ie there is an AMBER light on any then we don't progress any further.

The Chief Executive acknowledged if this is the case to be delegated to the Officers and the Operations Manager. The Officers have reported to the Works Committee and in turn to the Board that we believe this stretch is to be "given up". What powers should Members agree with the Operations Manager on how it is handled and what condition it should be handed over. He then asked the Committee what if the landowner wants it desilting and cleansing.

Mr Rollinson clarified that if the Board is handing it back, then it should be done in A1 condition.

The Chief Executive asked are the Members agreeing for this to be left to the Operations Manager? If he then has a problem with said landowner it can then be brought back to the relevant Works Committee. Members AGREED.

Mr Rollinson added that it should be handed back in a condition we would be prepared to adopt it in.

The Finance Manager interjected to say that budgets have been set and agreed until March 2018 so if there is over and above scheduled works we will have to find the funding for it otherwise it will have to be included in future years' budgets.

The Chairman responded that this does not have to be done, if we highlight a drain to be handed back it does not necessarily have to be handed back in this financial year it is something to be phased in the future.

The Chief Executive stated that the majority of the watercourses the Board maintain are in a fair to good condition. He believed it is unlikely there is going to be a lot of expenditure involved because the condition it is in after a summer cut, which is within normal duties, is suitable to hand over.

Mr Leggott asked whoever it is who negotiates with these ratepayers' /landowners and they could ask for different things to be done before they are willing to take riparian ownership of them; where do we stand do we have a set formula. The Chairman responded if it is part of the normal cutting maintenance programme on that drain and if it was desilted two years ago it cannot be desilted again. If it was desilted 15 years ago then the landowner may have the right to say could it be de-silted before its handed back.

Mr Leggott asked does the Operations Manager have delegated powers to move in that direction as saying ok we accept this needs a bit more than dyke (a) or (b) there will be different agreement for taking it back. The Chairman responded that there can be no one set formula for agreement. Adding that if the Operations Manager comes up against a problem, then he will have to report it back to the relevant Works Committee. Mr Leggott concluded there are different scenarios of transfers back as long as they can be accommodated within our budgets then he would be willing to recommend.

The Operations Manager replied by saying that if he visits site and throughout the conversation he cannot agree the terms that are offered then he will have to bring it back to the Works Committee.

The Chief Executive stated that this Committee would permit within those terms of agreement that if it is the de-silting and bushing issues, arguably that is the only issue that there could be. The Board will implement this drain within the next three years within our normal desilting programme and then once it had been desilted to hand it back to riparian ownership.

The Chairman stated that as a Committee we can give the Operations Manager the powers to use his own discretion on each individual drain with those guidelines.

The Operations Manager suggested that the decision can be agreed in year, if it is within budget likewise if outside the budget it would have to be agreed and that may be one or two years in the future.

The Chairman explained that when this was proposed there were no fixed timescales and being realistic it was always going to be a ten-year programme because there will be a first stage of green lights and then we will address the amber lights and so on.

The Chairman asked Members for any local knowledge of any other dykes that might be in the same situation this can be passed to the Chief Executive.

The Operations Manager presented the Inspection of Works:

(a) Drain 10/4 Labour In Vain Drain, East Heckington

The Operations Manager stated that during the tour today, he was looking for directive from this Committee regarding the identified drains/dykes and which of these specific sites warrant further investigation for the Board to, in the future, not continue to maintain and relinquish responsibility to the landowner.

The Operations Manager added from an overview of the whole catchment the Officers have identified 75km therefore these presented today are only a small percentage of what has been identified.

The Operations Manager started on page 5 and asked Members for their directive on Drain 10/4 Labour In Vain Drain towards East Heckington. Members agreed GREEN.

(b) Drain 10/15 Northland Dike

The Operations Manager asked Members their directive on Drain 10/15 Northland Dike. Members agreed GREEN.

(c) Drain 10/17 & 10/10 Old Forty Foot, near Willow Farm

Mr R Needham commented on Drain 10/17 Old Forty Foot towards Willow Farm. He was concerned about the fact that there is about 90 acres of land which is drained through Drain 10/17 and if that was to be "given up" then there would be an issue regarding the neighbours cleansing that drain.

The Chairman clarified that this would be a RED.

Mr Needham then commented on Drain 10/10 Old Forty Foot and talking to Mr M Mountain during the tour that is actually quite a deep drain and Mr Mountain made the point and he believes it is a valid point, that in the future he has not got the machinery to actually clean that drain.

The Chief Executive extended on the conversation with Mr M Mountain stating that Mr Mountain had invited suitable contractors to look at the drain and they did not have large enough equipment either so that would be a concern if it was given up and there is a significant relevance about that watercourse because of its profile size.

Mr Needham asked could it be considered that from a cutting point of view it is maintained by the landowner with a view in 5 or 10 years' time then if the bottom needed doing out the Board carried out the works giving the Board an indirect cost saving.

The Chief Executive felt that this watercourse should be left for a future discussion in 2/3 years' time. Members agreed an AMBER.

(d) Drain 8/8 Manor Farm

The Operations Manager asked Members for their directive on Drain 8/8 branch north towards Manor Farm approximately 805m. A question was raised about ownership of the footbridge, the Operations Manager responded the Board do not have and would not use a footbridge. The Chief Executive clarified that it is unconsented and if it were to cause a problem it would be removed. Members agreed GREEN.

(e) Drain 8/3 Ewerby Catchwater Drain

Mr N Scott declared an interest.

The Operations Manager asked Members for their directive on Drain 8/3 Ewerby Catchwater drain approximately 391m. Members agreed GREEN.

Mr K Casswell concluded that Mr N Scott made a point on the tour about another dyke in that vicinity where water does not get away from and which was given up quite a few years ago. He further explained that the neighbours have a riparian duty.

The Chairman clarified that within the Land Drainage Act the IDBs have powers to approach landowners who do not maintained riparian drains if it is causing a nuisance. The Chief Executive added that if there is a specific nuisance, landowners can approach the Board and the Board can enforce said landowner to carry out his riparian duties.

(f) Drain 8/10 Branch North to South Kyme

The Operations Manager stated this is for information for this Committee around future jetting and camera survey works there were points of interest on the tour. The Board have a budget set aside for 2018/19 when some of these will be included on a programme for the Northern Works area.

(g) Drain 14/2 South Kyme Old Pump Drain

Mr D Casswell declared an interest.

The Operations Manager asked Members for their directive on Drain 8/8 branch north towards Manor Farm approximately 400m.

Mr D Casswell pointed out that he has similar issues regarding the depth of this drain for maintaining which would cause problems for agricultural machinery.

Mr Rollinson added that when viewed on the tour this section looked like it required de-silting.

The Chairman acknowledged that we will come up against this more and more that the landowner although willing do not have the machinery to maintain these types of dykes. The Finance Manager pointed out that this could be why the Board took them over in the first place.

Mr Fowler believed this could have been taken on due to the site of the Old South Kyme pump. The Operations Manager then added that with the reconfiguration of the flow it remains as it was until discussed in detail today.

Members agreed AMBER.

(h) Drain 9/7 Sidebar Lane Drain

The Operations Manager stated this outlines future works around CCTV.

(i) Drain 10/9 Branch North to A17 and Garwick

The Chief Executive stated during the tour he saw some alarming views of what was thought to be a maintained watercourse on the opposite side of the road and it was not.

The Operations Manager reiterated that this branch North to A17 and Garwick will be programmed for CCTV works in the future.

(j) Pipelines around Bicker

The Operations Manager stated on page 23, this is for Members information, future programmed works for CCTV and camera investigations.

The Chairman believes that Fen Dyke Lane was proposed to be given up but he thinks it supports three landowners and LCC Highways would have an involvement in the roadside drain along Fen Dyke Lane. Members felt RED.

The Operations Manager explained that future programmed pipe surveying works were discussed at the last Board meeting and the Members were asked for a way forward. He stated that the cost of the CCTV works is around £1,500 to £1,700 per day there are approximately 90km of pipe to be surveyed therefore he proposes to look at a programme of either 10 or 5 yearly depending on how much can be completed over that period.

(k) Clay Dike Cleansing & Holland Fen Pumping Station

The Operations Manager stated that during the tour we looked at the de-silting works currently being undertaken which is a project to desilt the Clay Dike from Holland Fen Pumping Station back up to the Gill Syke approximately 5km this is programmed every 9/10 years, the last time the Clay Dike was desilted was 2008. He confirmed that so far between 400/600mm of silt has been removed which is a worthwhile process.

(l) Drain 5/46 East branch along South side of Beck Bank

The Operations Manager asked Members for their directive on three sections of drain, which are very close together off Frampton Bank.

The Chairman asked how would it affect the Board to give up roadside drains, does the Board have an obligation to offer conveyance to LCC Highways water;

The Chief Executive responded that the Officers would contact Lincolnshire County Council Highways and go through a process, yet to be defined, and the Officers would certainly inform them.

Members agreed GREEN for the Central Section on Drain 5/46.

Mr Rollinson asked could this create problems for the Board if the landowner could argue it is not his water and there are two interested parties involved ie Highways. Mr Welberry informed Members that there is no water coming from the road into those dykes. The Operations Manager stated that if the other interest party was LCC Highways then they will be informed.

Cllr Brookes stated LCC Highways have the right to connect into any roadside watercourse whoever owns it.

(m) Drain 5/45 East connecting drain from Old Hammond Beck to Kirton Drain

The Operations Manager asked Members for their directive on Drain 5/45 East connecting drain from Old Hammond Beck to Kirton Drain approximately 1,055m. Members agreed GREEN.

(n) Drain 5/43 Branch South from Old Hammond Beck along Holmes Lane

The Operations Manager asked Members for their directive on Drain 5/43 South from Old Hammond Beck along Homes Lane approximately 440m. Members agreed GREEN.

(o) Pipelines around Swineshead

The Operations Manager stated that pages 30 & 31 are for Members information as points of interest on the tour today. Some of the piped watercourse sections which the Board maintain and are responsible for, this shows the data the Board holds on each of these particular sections. These will be on a priority based programme for future inspections.

(p) Mackey's Pit, Swineshead – Cleansing Works

The Operations Manager showed Members some public relation work completed on Mackey's Pit, Swineshead. The Board assisted on the cleansing works and he showed a number of photographs.

Cllr Brookes added that there are some additional works required ie the rock armour and fishing platforms.

(q) Proposed diversion of Drain 7/8

The Operations Manager stated this proposed development on pages 34 & 35 had been viewed during a previous Inspection tour. Both the Chairman and the Operations Manager had met with the previous developers to discuss the Boards requirement to gain access to maintain the drain along the Southern edge of this site.



Boston Borough Council as part of the planning application will not allow access for machinery from Horseshoe Lane therefore there is a proposal that the Board could possibly create a new piped section as detailed on the map. An estimated cost will be in excess of c£15,000 as part of any agreement the Board would like a contribution towards the cost of diverting this existing watercourse from the developer.

The Operations Manager added that the existing pipeline which goes under the road is not in great condition and where it outfalls into the open drain from the piped section it is visibly in poor condition and is deteriorating quite badly. He explained that this could be the condition of the entire piped section which would mean either lining it, if it is suitable to be lined or replaced. If this were to be investigated for the possibility of redirecting this watercourse it would take away a future problem.

Mr K Casswell asked if the existing pipeline was up to taking the quantity of water from this site. The Operations Manager responded this is a very low lying wetland and it is continually wet and this pipeline is 2/3rds full for the majority of its life so we know there is going to be a cost to the Board but this will potentially be a solution to take away a problem and redirect the flows.

The Finance Manager asked if the site had SUDS, or was there additional water to come off the site. The Chief Executive did not believe there would be additional water.

Mr Welberry asked how many houses were planned on this site; the Chairman responded they started with eight and now he thought more, this site has been up for a proposal on more than one occasion and always seems to have fallen by the wayside as it is very low lying land.

The Chief Executive proposed the Officers develop the red & purple dotted line as a scheme (map on page 34) and check the levels, develop the costings with a view to putting this in a scheme budget for 2018/19. He added the Operations Manager should approach the developer for said contribution at the same time informing landowners the Board will be giving up the culvert between Lowlands and Kelsey and the stretch of watercourse which is hand roded inside this property boundary.

The Chairman believed that the Board could not give up the culvert between Lowlands and Kelsey; the Chief Executive stated the water will be taken from the south side of Skeldyke Road therefore not going through Kelsey.

Mr Rollinson asked what contribution would this scheme be looking for, the Chief Executive responded that he had initially asked for £10,000 which stopped the previous developer from moving forward, now there is another developer taken over the site and they are not aware yet of this contribution. Members AGREED.

(r) Ewerby Pumping Station access road plus other roadways accessing Pumping Stations

The Chairman stated that one of the proposals was to meet with the landowner to offer a load of crushed limestone or whatever he would want to top the road and spread at will. At Ewerby Pumping Station we are dealing with a single landowner but other Pumping Station roadways are used by more than one landowner. The Officers are seeking guidance and direction regarding other roadways accessing Boards Pumping Stations, as every road is different and looked upon on its own merit.

The Chief Executive acknowledged that it could be a simplistic approach to offer the landowner an amount of stone ie 50mm down, or whatever material, as a contribution by the Board to maintain these access roadways in a shared maintenance approach. He explained that all of these access roadways are bespoke and everyone is used by different equipment at different frequencies.

Mr J Pocklington believes that any landowner would want to help the Board as you are taking the water away and if you cannot get to the pumping station then it's going to affect them.

Cllr M Cooper queried what would be an acceptable standard for the road which is a starting point, then work from there; The Chairman responded he accepts what Cllr Cooper is saying. What is acceptable standard for a farmer taking a tractor up and down it is completely different from one of the pump operatives who is taking his car in the dark and probably on a winters night, that is the standard which is required.

The Chief Executive stated we looked at general pumping station maintenance budgets ie 20 ton of aggregate at approximately £25 per ton is £500 and take a load and explain to said landowner that the Board would expect to get 12 months use out of it and report back on how it is working and at what cost.

Mr Leggott agreed that this is an excellent idea with one problem we don't know what the landowner wants on that roadway, the Chairman responded we can negotiate with the landowner to have aggregate in whatever form ie crushed limestone, 50mm down or hardcore. Members AGREED.

1092 REPORT ON RAINFALL - Agenda Item 5

The rainfall figures at Swineshead were presented, copies of which had been circulated.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 16:55pm.