

# **BLACK SLUICE**

## **INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**



## **Culverts and Bridges Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 2pm**

**Station Road, Swineshead, Lincolnshire PE20 3PW**

# BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

I M Warsap  
Chief Executive

Station Road, Swineshead  
BOSTON, Lincs PE20 3PW

General Email: [mailbox@blacksluiceidb.gov.uk](mailto:mailbox@blacksluiceidb.gov.uk)

Our Ref: IMW/DPW/B10-1

Tel: 01205 821440

Fax: 01205 820671

[www.blacksluiceidb.gov.uk](http://www.blacksluiceidb.gov.uk)

Date: 5<sup>th</sup> January 2017

To all Culverts and Bridges Committee Members

Dear Member

## **Culverts and Bridges Committee Meeting – 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 2pm**

Please find enclosed the papers for the Culverts and Bridges Committee Meeting to be held at the Board's offices on Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017 commencing at **2pm**.

Yours sincerely



Chief Executive

## **AGENDA**

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of interest.
3. To receive and if correct sign the Minutes of the Culverts & Bridges Committee Meeting held on the 6<sup>th</sup> April 2016 (**pages 1- 8**).
4. Matters arising.
5. Proposal to rename this Committee to the "Structures Committee".
6. To review the Structures Committee Terms of Reference (**page 9**).
7. To review the Structures Replacement Policy, a current suspended Culvert & Bridges Replacement Policy is included for information and comparison (**pages 10 - 17**).
8. To review a report on Third Parties Crossing Over Suction and/or Outfall Decks at Pumping Stations (**page 18**).
9. Any other business.

# BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

## MINUTES

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

held at the offices of the Board on  
6<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 2pm

### Members

Chairman - \* Mr J G Fowler

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

\* Member Present

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

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

There were no apologies.

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

##### (a) Culvert 2931 - Gosberton High Fen

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

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

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

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

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

#### 919 MATTERS ARISING - Agenda Item 4

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

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

919 (a) Cont.....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. PURPOSE

Second paragraph: add "bridges or"

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

5. DELEGATED POWERS

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

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

6.1 CLEAR SPAN BRIDGES CARRYING HIGHWAYS

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

6.6 GUIDELINES

Lines regarding items (b) and (d):

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

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

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

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

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

1. GENERAL

First paragraph – remove “SEVEN” and replace with “**EIGHT**”  
- “The Committee shall have **EIGHT** members .....

Remove and delete the second paragraph completely.

The final paragraph should remain the same.

2. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

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

### 3. POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE

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

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

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

### 4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

The first sentence, remove "be" and replace with "include:"  
Therefore, it should read: - "The responsibilities of the Committee shall include:"

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

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

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

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

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

### Culvert Works 2015-16

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

Culvert Replacement 2016-17

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



923 Cont.....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

925 Cont.....

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

926 ANY OTHER BUSINESS - Agenda Item 11

(a) Britt Broadbent Pension Scheme

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Graft Drain

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

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

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

**BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**

**CULVERTS & BRIDGES COMMITTEE - 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**DRAFT - STRUCTURES COMMITTEE – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. **GENERAL**

The Committee shall have EIGHT members who will be appointed by the Board.

The Chairman shall be appointed by the Board at the tri-annual meeting being the first meeting following an election.

2. **MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee shall meet at least once in every 12 month period and a quorum shall be FOUR members. For any additional agenda items requiring review a Committee meeting can be convened.

No one other than the Committee members shall be entitled to attend Committee Meetings, but any other persons may attend meetings if invited by the Committee.

3. **POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

If a Board replacement structure benefit contribution cannot be agreed between the Officers and an Owner/Occupier the Committee will have final determination as highlighted in section 6.6b(i) & 6.9 of The Structures Replacement Policy.

Delegated powers are given to the Chief Executive and the relevant Structures or Works Committee Chairmen to reconstruct structures as long as the budgets are not exceeded and the Owner/Occupier pays a contribution towards the cost in line with the guidelines in the Structures Replacement Policy. In all other cases, the power to determine applications is delegated to the Structures Committee, the appropriate Works Committee or the Executive Committee, unless a Board meeting is more timely

4. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE**

The responsibilities of the Committee shall include:

- a) To operate within the guidelines of the Structures Replacement Policy.
- b) To determine all other relevant decisions relating to structures and report these to the Board.



## **BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**

Tel: 01205 821440  
Fax: 01205 820671

Station Road  
Swineshead, Boston  
Lincs, PE20 3PW

### **CULVERT AND BRIDGE REPLACEMENT POLICY**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

This document sets out the policy of the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board concerning the repair or replacement of culverts or bridges where the structure of the culvert or bridge deteriorates to such an extent that it is unable to convey the necessary flow in the drainage channel, or if it becomes unsafe for either vehicle or pedestrian traffic to cross the watercourse.

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

#### **2. INTRODUCTION**

The structures that will be included in this policy include:

- a) Clear span bridges constructed to take all types of vehicles
- b) Clear span bridges for pedestrian use only
- c) Culverts constructed to provide access across the watercourse.
- d) Culverts constructed for the purpose of maintaining the flow in watercourses where there is instability to the banks.

#### **3. BLACK SLUICE POLICY**

This policy is concerned with the replacement of existing culverts and bridges only.

The Board has a separate policy which addresses applications to place new culverts in watercourses. The policy concerning culverting discourages the construction of new long lengths of culverts in Board's Watercourses.

#### **4. REASONS FOR THE POLICY**

The policy formalises the baseline conditions above and gives written guidelines for more specific instances. The benefits of the policy are:

- Fairness and uniformity in Owners and Occupiers contributing to the cost of reconstructing sub standard culverts.
- The provision of clear guidelines to Owners and Occupiers.
- Powers are delegated giving a more efficient and timely service

However this policy is not intended to cover every eventuality and the Board (in formal meeting) may waive the policy and make a determination on the basis of reasonable fairness to all parties.

## 5. DELEGATED POWERS

Delegated powers are given to the Chief Executive and the relevant Works Committee Chairmen to reconstruct culverts as long as the budgets are not exceeded and the landowner or occupier pays a contribution towards the cost in line with the guidelines in this policy. In all other cases, the power to determine applications is delegated to the Culverts and Bridges Committee, the appropriate Works Committee or the Executive Committee, unless a Board meeting is more timely.

## 6. GUIDELINES

Guidelines are given below on the following types of culverts and bridges:

- a) Clear span bridges carrying Highways maintained by LCC
- b) Clear span bridges capable of carrying all vehicles
- c) Clear Span Footbridges
- d) Culverts under Highways maintained by LCC
- e) Culverts Used for Access by both the Board and the Occupier
- f) Access culverts that are solely for the benefit of the Owner or Occupier
- g) Culverts constructed by the Board to allow free drainage of the land.

### 6.1 CLEAR SPAN BRIDGES CARRYING HIGHWAYS

It is generally the case that all clear span bridges carrying LCC highways are owned and maintained by LCC. If replacement is required because the structure is substandard then LCC will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

### 6.2 CLEAR SPAN ACCESS BRIDGES

These in general provide access for farm machinery to fields or to individual properties. They are mostly constructed in large watercourses.

These in general will not be used by Board's machinery to gain access to the opposite side of the watercourse.

If refurbishment or replacement is required because the structure is substandard, then the Owner or Occupier will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

However, if a substandard structure is used by the Board, and the Owner or Occupier of the structure proposes to refurbish or reconstruct the bridge, the Board may offer a contribution towards the cost of this work.

### 6.3 CLEAR SPAN FOOT BRIDGES

It is generally the case that all clear span footbridges which carry footpaths over Board's watercourses are owned and maintained by LCC. If replacement is required because the structure is substandard, then LCC will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

### 6.4 CULVERTS UNDER HIGHWAYS

It is generally the case that all culverts under LCC highways are owned and maintained by LCC. If replacement is required because the structure is substandard then LCC will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

### 6.5 CULVERTS USED FOR ACCESS BY THE OWNER AND BY THE BOARD

These culverts are required by the Board as well as the landowner to gain access for maintenance of watercourses.

The cost of any reconstruction of substandard culverts in this category will be paid for by the Board and the culvert will remain as a structure to be maintained by the Board.

### 6.6 ACCESS CULVERTS ONLY USED BY THE OWNER

- a) These culverts are only required by landowners to gain access to their land.
- b) If a culvert is substandard and in need of reconstruction it should be removed by the Board.

Provided there is a proven need for a culvert at this location, the landowner should be offered the opportunity for the Board to replace the culvert if a contribution of 50% of the cost of a 900mm diameter culvert (at present 50% of £7,000) is paid.

After the culvert has been reconstructed, it will be deemed that the landowner will be responsible for its future maintenance.

- c) Before any consideration is given to the reconstruction of the culvert, the landowner should be approached to ascertain if there is a future need for the structure. Consideration should be given to removing two or more accesses into a field and the provision of one in the future.
- d) If there is a proven need for the culvert, then the Board will reconstruct the culvert on condition the standard contribution is paid. The definition of the standard contribution is in Clause 6.8.

The culvert shall be constructed with a top width of 6.0 metres. If a landowner requests a culvert with a wider top width, then he shall pay for the total extra cost of this work.

- e) If a culvert has been constructed in the Board's watercourse, and there is clear evidence that the Board has written to the landowner confirming the future maintenance arrangements, then the landowner shall be totally responsible for the reconstruction of the culvert.
- f) If a culvert is removed by the Board because it is holding up the flow of water, and has not been replaced by a new culvert within a period of five years, then the offer of contribution will no longer be applicable and the landowner will be required to pay the full cost of the construction of a new culvert at this location.
- g) After the culvert has been replaced, the landowner will be responsible for any future maintenance, as deemed necessary by the Board, or reconstruction of the structure.
- h) If the Board undertake a watercourse improvement scheme which includes the reconstruction of culverts, the Board will pay the total cost of the reconstruction of the culvert, but the landowner will be required to be responsible for the future maintenance, as deemed necessary by the Board, of the structure.

#### 6.7 CULVERTS USED FOR FREE DRAINAGE

Examples of these lengths of culverts are:-

- Lengths of watercourse culverted instead of undertaking revetment works
- Lengths of watercourse culverted to allow disposal of excavated soil.

These are the Board's responsibility, and any reconstruction required will be paid for by the Board. Responsibility for the future maintenance of the pipe will remain with the Board.

#### 6.8 STANDARD CONTRIBUTION CHARGE

The standard contribution charge is defined as 50% of the cost of construction of a 900mm diameter culvert 12.0 metres long.

#### 6.9 REDUNDANT CULVERTS

If the Board agrees with an Owner or Occupier that a culvert is redundant, the Board will remove the culvert and backfill material and deposit these materials on the field adjacent to the location of the culvert.

If agreed and required the Board will dispose of the excavated material.

#### 6.10 FURTHER GUIDANCE

If a landowner is unhappy about the circumstances of a particular culvert designation, then this should be referred to the Culvert & Bridges Committee for final determination.

Board Approved: 17 June 2015

# Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board

## Policy No: 7

### Structures Replacement Policy

Review Dates:

Board Approved	
----------------	--

#### 1. PURPOSE

This document sets out the policy of the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board concerning the repair or replacement of structures where the integrity of the structure deteriorates to such an extent that it is unable to convey the necessary flow in the drainage channel, or if it becomes unsafe for either vehicle or pedestrian traffic to cross the watercourse.

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

#### 2. INTRODUCTION

The structures that will be included in this policy include:

- a) Clear span bridges constructed to take all types of vehicles.
- b) Clear span bridges for pedestrian use only.
- c) Culverts constructed to provide access across the watercourse.
- d) Culverts constructed for the purpose of maintaining the flow in watercourses where there is instability to the banks.

#### 3. BLACK SLUICE POLICY

This policy is concerned with the replacement of existing structures only.

The Board has a separate policy which addresses applications to place new structures in/over watercourses.

#### 4. REASONS FOR THE POLICY

The policy formalises the baseline conditions above and gives written guidelines for more specific instances. The benefits of the policy are:

- Fairness and uniformity in **the Owner/Occupier** contributing to the cost of reconstructing sub-standard structures.
- The provision of clear guidelines to **the Owners/Occupier**.
- Powers are delegated giving a more efficient and timely service.

However, this policy is not intended to cover every eventuality and the Board (in formal meeting) may waive the policy and make a determination on the basis of reasonable fairness to all parties.

#### 5. DELEGATED POWERS

Delegated powers are given to the Chief Executive and the relevant **Structures or Works** Committee Chairmen to reconstruct structures as long as the budgets are not exceeded and the **Owner/Occupier** pays a contribution towards the cost in line with the guidelines in this policy. In all other cases, the power to determine applications is delegated to the Structures Committee, the



appropriate Works Committee or the Executive Committee, unless a Board meeting is more timely.

## 6. GUIDELINES

Guidelines are given below on the following types of structures:

- a) **Structures** carrying Highways maintained by LCC.
- b) **Structures used by the Owner/Occupier.**
- c) **Structures used** by both the Board and **the Owner/Occupier.**
- d) **Structures** constructed by the Board to allow free drainage of the land.

### 6.1 STRUCTURES CARRYING HIGHWAYS

It is generally the case that all clear span bridges **and culverts** carrying LCC highways are owned and maintained by LCC. If replacement is required because the structure is substandard then LCC will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

### 6.2 CLEAR SPAN FOOT BRIDGES

It is generally the case that all clear span footbridges which carry footpaths over Board **maintained** watercourses are owned and maintained by LCC. If replacement is required because the structure is substandard, then LCC will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

### 6.3 CLEAR SPAN ACCESS BRIDGES

These in general provide access for farm machinery to fields or to individual properties. They are mostly constructed in large watercourses.

If refurbishment or replacement is required because the structure is substandard, then **the Owner/Occupier** will be responsible for the total cost of the reconstruction.

**These in general will not be used by Board's machinery to gain access to the opposite side of the watercourse.**

However, if a substandard structure is infrequently used by the Board, and **the Owner/Occupier** of the structure proposes to refurbish or reconstruct the bridge, the Board may offer a contribution in line with clause 6.6 (b) towards the cost of this work.

### 6.4 STRUCTURES OWNED BY THE BOARD AND USED FOR ACCESS BY THE OWNER/ OCCUPIER

These **structures** are required by the Board as well as the landowner to gain access for maintenance of watercourses.

The cost of any reconstruction of substandard **structures** in this category will be paid for by the Board and the **structure** will remain as a structure to be maintained by the Board.

### 6.6 STRUCTURES USED BY ALL PARTIES

- a) These **structures** are required by **the Owner/Occupier** to gain access to their land and could be used by the Board for their maintenance activities.

- b) If a **structure** has been inspected and reported as substandard and in need of reconstruction the landowner will be notified in writing.
- (i) Provided there is an accepted need for a **structure** at this location, **the Owner/Occupier** and Operations Manager will meet. A reconstruction quotation will be offered along with a benefit contribution in relation to the Board's use of the **structure** as a crossing point.
  - (ii) After the **structure** has been reconstructed, it will be deemed that the landowner will be responsible for its future maintenance.
  - (iii) If a benefit contribution cannot be agreed the Operations Manager will send all the relevant information to the Structures Committee for further review and determination.
- c) Before any consideration is given to the reconstruction of the **structure**, **the Owner/Occupier** should be approached to ascertain if there is a future need for the **structure**. Consideration should be given to removing two or more accesses into a field and the provision of one in the future.
- d) A culvert shall be constructed with a top width of 6.0 metres. If **the Owner/Occupier** requests a culvert with a wider top width, then **they** shall pay for the total extra cost of this work.
- e) After the culvert has been replaced, **the Owner/Occupier** will be responsible for any future maintenance, or reconstruction of the structure.
- f) If a **structure** has been constructed in a Board maintained watercourse, and there is clear evidence that the Board has written to **the Owner/Occupier** confirming the future maintenance arrangements, then **the Owner/Occupier** shall be totally responsible for the reconstruction of the **structure**.
- g) If a **structure** is removed by the Board because it is holding up the flow of water, and has not been replaced by a new **structure** within a period of five years, then the offer of contribution will no longer be applicable and **the Owner/Occupier** will be required to pay the full cost of the construction of a new **structure** at this location.
- h) If the Board undertake a watercourse improvement scheme which includes the reconstruction of **a structure**, the Board will pay the total cost of the reconstruction, but **the Owner/Occupier** will be required to be responsible for the future maintenance of the structure.

## 6.7 CULVERTS USED FOR FREE DRAINAGE

Examples of these lengths of culverts are:-

- Lengths of watercourse culverted instead of undertaking revetment works.
- Lengths of watercourse culverted to allow disposal of excavated soil.

These are the Board's responsibility, and any reconstruction required will be paid for by the Board. Responsibility for the future maintenance of the asset will remain with the Board.

## 6.8 REDUNDANT STRUCTURES

If the Board agrees with **the Owner/Occupier** that a **structure** is redundant, the Board will remove the **structure** and **all** backfill material and deposit **any suitable** materials on fields adjacent to the location of the culvert.

If agreed and required, the Board will dispose of the excavated material at an agreed cost **with the Owner/Occupier**.

## 6.9 FURTHER GUIDANCE

If **the Owner/Occupier** is unhappy about the circumstances of a particular structure designation, then this should be referred to the Structures Committee for final determination.

Contractors may be appointed by **the Owner/Occupier** to complete the works, the Board will set an invert level on site, offer specification suggestions and inspect the works during the construction phase, a set fee of £250.00 + VAT will be offset against any contribution made by the Board.

**BLACK SLUICE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**

**CULVERTS & BRIDGES COMMITTEE - 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

**AGENDA ITEM No 8**

**THIRD PARTIES CROSSING OVER SUCTION OR OUTFALL DECKS  
AT PUMPING STATIONS**

We are encountering an ever increasing number of unofficial crossings at our Pumping Stations, for example:-

**Great Hale Pumping Station:** - Vehicles crossing the outfall deck as the only access to a field. Spoil left on the deck becomes a health and safety hazard.

**Ewerby Pumping Station:** - Vehicles and livestock crossing the suction deck as a means of access from bank to bank. Spoil and excrement left on the deck becomes a health and safety issue and hazard.

**Swineshead Pumping Station:** - Livestock crossing the outfall deck along the South Forty Foot bank. Damage to the guttering downpipe on the building from the cattle has been an issue and a metal post was installed in front of downpipe to stop this happening. Excrement left on the deck becomes a health and safety issue and hazard.

**Dyke Fen Pumping Station:** - We have received a request to use the access track and outfall deck for vehicle/farm equipment access. Possible problems arising from this would be the same as above along with any possible damage to the structure/handrails etc due to heavy equipment being used.

**Black Hole Drove Pumping Station:** - The concrete path over the outfall deck is used as a walkway by the public to cross the South Forty Foot Drain. Damage doesn't appear to be an issue but we could be leaving ourselves open to an insurance claim if a member of public injures themselves using our crossing point? NB; a quotation is being obtained to install a gate either end of walkway (£1,225.00 + VAT).

**Chain Bridge Pumping Station:** - The concrete path over the outfall deck is used as a walkway and now has a locked gate restricting access by the public.

Officers seek direction from the Structures Committee regarding future health and safety issues, insurance claims and general upkeep towards these 'crossing points' (and possibly others in the future).