

# **UPPER MEDWAY INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING of the BOARD**  
held via **Zoom Conference Call**  
on **Tuesday 25 August 2020 at 1pm**

**Members of the Board Present**

Chairman: H Rogers

M Boughton  
O Baldock  
M Davis  
D Goff  
P Harper  
S Highwood  
C Mackonochie  
S McLeod  
S McGregor  
G Swift  
W Thompson  
C Wheeler

In attendance

O Pantrey – Acting Clerk  
L Carey – Finance Officer

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from M Round.

The Chairman welcomed the Members to the meeting and introduced Lorna Carey, the new Finance Officer to Board Members. He also went through GDPR requirements and that the meeting would be recorded.

**2. PLANNING CONSENT & DEVELOPMENT**

**RECEIVED** the Planning & Byelaw Strategy.

**(As attached to these Minutes – Appendix 1)**

**RECEIVED** the Development Control & Charges Fee.

**(As attached to these Minutes – Appendix 2)**

**RECEIVED** the Capital Financing & Reserves Policy.

**(As attached to these Minutes – Appendix 3)**

**RECEIVED** the Drainage Consent Application Form.

**(As attached to these Minutes – Appendix 4)**

The Chairman asked the Acting Clerk to introduce the reason for why the documents were important to the Board moving forward.

The Acting Clerk explained that after visits to Kings Lynn IDB the Surface Water Development Contributions (SWDC) were seen as vital as part of a sustainable planning and drainage. After discussing it was deemed that charging for creation of impermeable land was the correct way to go.

The Acting Clerk explained that commuted fees were relating to readoption and responsibility of conveyance. This was further explained by Cathryn Brady of the WLMA Sustainable Development Team previously.

He explained that the WLMA would be taking on processing consent applications and that the finance committees had adopted SWDC fees in principle to improve our ability to finance and work on future projects.

The Acting Clerk explained that Phil Camamile – Chief Executive, Water Management Alliance had asked us to create and adopt a strategy for sustainable development. This strategy would offer a way for the Board to exercise its byelaws to gain contributions towards future projects from developers. The Acting Clerk stressed that this was an application of our byelaws and not Kings Lynn's. He also clarified that WLMA had been told that the Board would retain the right to accept or refuse the advice given.

He explained that these documents enabled the Joint Services decision to carry out SWDC and use the WLMA for our consents work in the future.

The Chairman offered members to ask questions of the received documents.

O Baldock said that this was an excellent way forward for the Board and that it had been very well put together. He noted that the appointment of the external consultant was good because it offered great experience and expertise for the Board to utilise.

The Chairman agreed and said that although the Board had the experience, we did lack the skills to get certain elements through. He extended his thanks for Pete Dowling's involvement previously to help us with technical elements of planning in Mike's absence.

M Davis said that it was good to have this specialised help. He asked to what extent these are new to the Board and were they replacing procedures that already existed.

The Acting Clerk explained that it has its own set of byelaws and these can be applied in various ways that the Board previously had not utilised. He explained that to aid with sustainable development and future upgrading of watercourses as demand increased these documents expanded on the byelaws. He explained the Board had never charged before, but the application of the byelaws was always there. He said that Phil was conscious that we had our own documents and that is why they were sent to us to be changed to suit the needs of our Board.

The Acting Clerk explained the arrangement for SWDC collection was that we would not be charged for the work that went into this. Instead the Board would pay 20% of the final received fee. This allowed us to sample how the SWDC may be in the district without a significant financial outlay upfront.

M Davis asked how the hours would work and if they were flexible?

The Acting Clerk said the Board should understand that the consents work and the collection of SWDC were separate. Our hours would be spent on consents advice while if there was an opportunity to collect SWDC that would be done at the expense of the WLMA.

The Chairman said that a lot of work had gone into the documents but that a few minor changes needed to be made to make sure it was clear that the Board was not part of the WLMA. He said it was not important to the principle but should be addressed.

The Acting Clerk said he would get the changes made to ensure that the wording was correct.

The Chairman commented that this same document went through the Lower Board unanimously and without change.

The Acting Clerk confirmed this. He also said that a comment from the LMIDB regarding what would and would not go to Phil's team highlighted that in reality we would use common sense to determine what we could handle in house.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions about the appendix supplied?

C Mackonochie asked if the charges have gone up and would they likely go up in the future?

The Acting Clerk said that the fees were based on the likely cost of maintenance in the event of development increase modelling upon drainage. He explained that these were reviewed every 5 years by the WLMA. He said we did not have the experience to set these figures and should use WLMA figures for the time being. The Acting Clerk confirmed Phil's team would be contacting our LPA's to let them know about the charges being brought in and developing a relationship with the LPA's regarding our adopted strategy.

The Chairman noted that our relationship with planning did not seem to be that good and we needed to improve it, especially surrounding mineral extraction.

There was then a discussion about mineral extraction around the Tudeley area. The Acting Clerk said he felt we didn't get involved enough locally and that he was working with EA and KCC to get a better relationship regarding flood management.

D Goff said that this was an excellent addition to our Board's approach to development. He also agreed we needed to try and do a lot more with fellow LPA and FFA's.

S McGregor asked if the developers would be paying these rates and not the councils? He also asked if we didn't know what the fees were, we should review them to check they weren't too low for the area.

The Acting Clerk confirmed that developers would be paying these charges. He also said that a review was a good idea in 18 months. This would give us an idea about income and opportunity.

The Chairman noted the review date was August 2021 and we should look at it again then.

C Mackonochie asked if this was being mixed with the section 106 money?

The Acting Clerk said that 106 did not cover surface water drainage and therefore was a separate issue under the Land Drainage Act.

The Chairman then asked for a proposal to accept the documents and the sustainable planning strategy.

On a proposition by H Rogers seconded by D Goff it was **AGREED** to accept both the sustainable development strategy and accompanying documentation.

### **3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **a) Scheme of Delegation**

**RECEIVED** the Scheme of Delegation with the proposed CEO to Acting Clerk amendment.

**(As attached to these Minutes – Appendix 5)**

The Chairman asked the Acting Clerk to confirm this was a simple acknowledgment to a modification from CEO to Acting Clerk.

The Acting Clerk agreed it was a change in title wording only.

On a proposition by H Rogers seconded by D Goff it was **AGREED** to accept changes to the Scheme of Delegation.

## **b) PSCA for the Upper Medway IDB**

M Boughton asked if the Acting Clerk could investigate a PSCA with the Environment Agency to improve the lack of maintenance carried out on certain key main watercourses?

He invited O Baldock to confirm that this was something he felt was needed.

O Baldock said that he agreed but perhaps we should be enforcing our byelaws on the EA?

The Chairman agreed it should be looked into and said it we could charge under PSCA for the work done.

C Wheeler said this was a difficult situation as the EA were having issues with furloughed administration staff. He said however, there was a large amount of red tape and process slowing down works consistently.

The Acting Clerk said this was the main point of the PSCA so that the EA bureaucracy was missed out and the work could get done. He asked that this be actionable, so we did not put it off longer than was needed as the paperwork took time to put in place.

D Goff said we had not had a satisfactory report from the EA of Upper precept spending and that a meeting should be set up with Sally Harvey to address communication problems.

The Chairman did note that Ghada Mitri's report was very detailed and that while level of work was not ideal at least there was some movement in their approach.

C Wheeler agreed it was a good report, but we needed more.

O Baldock asked if the Board would take up the offer of contacting the EA regarding PSCA work?

The Acting Clerk said he would instigate a meeting with the EA as soon as possible.

## **4. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next Board meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 10 November at 1pm.

An extraordinary meeting date to discuss the potential office move was TBC.

## **5. CLOSURE**

There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed and thanked the Board for their attendance.