

# **Staveley and Copgrove Parish Council**

**Clerk:** Mr B Atkinson  
Danesmead, Main Street, Staveley, HG5 9JY

Minutes of Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2015

## **Present:**

Chairman, Councillor Nick Stringer  
Vice Chairman, Councillor David Child  
Parish Councillor Peter Edwards  
Parish Councillor Kevin Atkinson  
Clerk, Bernard Atkinson

NYCC Cllr R Windass

10 Members of the public

2 Representatives from Yorkshire Water, Michael Denny and Tom Buck

## **1. To receive apologies for absence**

Parish Councillor Lynne Manby  
Parish Councillor Richard Tesseyman  
HBC Cllr A Alton

## **2. To receive declarations of interest**

Parish Councillor Peter Edwards re Abacus planning

## **3. To confirm minutes of the Meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

The minutes of the meeting was accepted as a true record

## **4. Items brought forward from the last meeting**

### **4.1 Staveley Nature Reserve**

#### **Village 'Survey' undertaken by owners of Manor Farm.**

The correspondence received from the owners of Manor Farm since the last meeting was discussed, which include several e-mails and a 3 page letter dated February 1<sup>st</sup> 2015.

The request for the PC to undertake its own survey was noted, but this suggestion was discussed at the last meeting, when it was agreed that it would be pointless since YWT

will not open the track to pedestrians unless the owners of the 5 properties adjacent to the track agree to it.

It was noted that the PC had already responded to this correspondence by way of the following e-mail:-

*From PC to Em Lloyd Davies Tuesday February 3<sup>rd</sup>*

*1. Irrespective of what may have been said at the meeting on 21st June 2011, YWT have stated on several subsequent occasions that they will not open the track to pedestrians unless the owners of the 5 properties adjacent to the track agree to it. It was specifically confirmed in an e-mail from YWT to you dated 23rd April 2013. It is still their position. There is therefore no point to the survey proposed.*

*2. You approached YWT in 2011 asking about the possibility of the footpath being diverted from Manor Farm down the church track. This was refused after YWT sought the views of the 5 households, all of whom strongly objected.*

*3. The Parish Council is fully aware of its duties to be independent and unbiased when representing the village. It is for this reason that the Parish Council will not take sides in an issue which is essentially a disagreement between the owners of Manor Farm and the owners of the 5 houses that border the track.*

*4. The comment in the PC minutes that the owners of Manor Farm have a vested interest in the outcome of the survey was not in any way an attempt to undermine your integrity and reputation within the village and we apologise if it has been misinterpreted that way.*

*If you have any further questions you are welcome to submit them in advance for discussion at the next Parish Council meeting on Thursday March 12th.*

The invitation to attend this meeting was repeated in further e-mails, but declined due to the owners of Manor Farm being out of the country on this date.

One further point to note is that YWT have yet again confirmed their position in an e-mail of the 26<sup>th</sup> February, in which they state:-

*Our position is that we will not open the track by the church to pedestrians unless the owners of all of the properties adjacent to the track agree to it.*

It was agreed that the PC would not be taking any further action in this matter.

**State of the public footpath through Manor Farm garden**

It was agreed that the state of the footpath on its new route through Manor Farm garden is poor and needs sorting out. However the responsibility for doing that lies with NYCC, and it is they who will have to conduct any negotiations that might be necessary with the owners of Manor Farm. However NYCC have stated that they have no funds for any such improvement work.

It was agreed that because of the concern this issue is causing in the village, the PC should offer to help NYCC with the cost. It was also agreed that because YWT also have some interest in this, they should be asked to consider contributing (in view of the fact that the opening of the extended SNR means there is now more foot traffic than previously).

The following plan was therefore agreed:-

1. Obtain an estimate of the costs. Action BA and KA
2. Ask YWT for a 50-50 share in the costs. Action DC
3. Make an offer to NYCC to help with the costs, on the condition that they do the work within, say, 3 months
4. Leave NYCC to do any negotiations and implement the improvements

### **Relationship with YWT**

"It was suggested that the structure of the relationship between the village and YWT didn't fully reflect the concerns of many villagers. It was agreed that DC would discuss these concerns with YWT management in an attempt to permit an improved dialogue."

Post-meeting note: It has also been suggested that YWT be invited to the next meeting of the Parish Council, for a question and answer session with villagers.

### **Nature Reserve Notice.**

No progress, since the cost of a brown sign is prohibitive.

### **Dog walking on the Nature Reserve**

LM has checked the position regarding dogs on public footpaths and on private property. On public rights of way dogs must be 'under control' and keep to within a small distance of the path line. On private property the landowner has the right to request that dogs be kept on a lead.

### **4.2 Highways**

The status on the various works around the village is unchanged from the previous meeting, and is as follows:-

1. **Derestriction signs on exit to village largely sun bleached out.** Outstanding. At the last inspection they did not meet NYCC criteria for replacement but this is reviewed every 3 months.
2. **Gully in Minskip Road cleaned out but now reblocked.** Waiting NYCC action.
3. **Drainage issues by village green** (junction Main Street/Park View). Waiting NYCC action.
4. **Missing Copgrove sign.** Outstanding

In addition to the above it was felt that potholes were appearing faster than they were being repaired. It was agreed that the Vice-Chairman would follow up with NYCC on all the above.

The Chairman has written to NYCC to report that there is an increasing amount of lorry traffic down Arkendale Road from White Cross, and suggesting that a sign saying 'unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles' should be placed at White Cross. Typically, no reply has yet been received from NYCC. *NS to chase up.*

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman have had a meeting with Stewart Hymas to discuss the apparent increase in the number of Hymas lorries coming down Arkendale Road, and a general increase on Sunday mornings, and can report as follows:-

*NS & DC met with Stewart Hymas Feb 3<sup>rd</sup> to discuss. He confirmed 20mph policy on Hymas vehicles through the village. There should be some reduction in lorry movements due to several vehicles being away all week. Traffic on Sundays is only occasional (every other week). Traffic along Arkendale Road is small and going to Coneythorpe. All lorries are now fitted with hydraulic suspension and electric system for pulling covers tight, so noise from empty lorries should be much reduced.*

### **4.3 Recreation Field**

Inspections have taken place satisfactorily.

### **4.4 Changes to HBC Tenancy Conditions**

As previously reported it is believed that the properties were given to the Council on the understanding that they were primarily intended for Staveley villagers. As there are currently no vacant properties, this is not an issue, but evidence of this is being sought. *KA is pursuing this.*

### **4.5 Flooding and drainage problems**

The Vice-Chairman has visited Yorkshire Water's headquarters in Bradford to propose the installation of a new sewer. As a consequence, representatives of Yorkshire Water

attended this PC meeting, and their report is attached. They agreed to report back to the PC when all works have been completed.

The sewer is now on YW's 'business risk' register.

There was a general feeling that these are only once again stop-gap measures, but that remains to be seen.

## **5. Planning Applications**

Abacus – further planning applications have been made for another new building, which the PC has commented on.

It was felt that floodlighting was becoming a serious pollution issue, and those affected by it should make representations to HBC planning.

Little Acres. It was noted that the applicant has appealed against the refusal of planning decision. The PC have re-submitted their comments as previously.

## **6. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the PC, together with the Annual Parish Meeting, will be held on Tuesday May 19<sup>th</sup> at Staveley and Copgrove Village Hall.

**Staveley Sewer Investigations update**  
**Staveley Parish Council 12<sup>th</sup> March 2015**

- **What have we done since the 22<sup>nd</sup> January**

Since Mr Child's attendance at YW we have carried out extensive investigations into the condition of the sewer to understand its performance, we have carried out the following:

- Divided up the sewer into 3 sections of focus, because each section has different issues that need to be investigated & resolved.
  - Section 1 - Head of sewer to Station House
  - Section 2 - Station House to Village Centre
  - Section 3 - Village Centre to connection with trunk main
- CCTV Survey of over 2km of sewer (from the sewers head to the centre of the village Sections 1 & 2)
- Carried out sewer profile levelling surveys to understand the gradient fall on the sewer
- Carried out investigations into connections that could be causing inundation of surface water

- **What works have been carried out on the sewer to improve performance**

- Relayed 250 meters of sewer at its head
- Lined over 250 meters of sewer between its head & station house (Section 1)
- Carried out a full desilting/sewer cleaning operation of the sewer between its head & station house (Section 1)

- **Investigations Update:**

- **Section 1 - 1.2KM**

- Following a full CCTV of the sewer in section 1 and the works to relay 250 meters & line a further 250 meters we are now satisfied that this section of sewer is structurally sound.
    - Sewer profile levelling has indicated that there may well be a section of the sewer that is flat which could cause operational issues (see solution in Medium term plan)

- **Section 2 - 760M**

- Following an initial CCTV survey we discovered parts of the sewer that required minor repairs & also parts of the sewer that are holding flow due to a build up of FOG (Fats, Oils & Greases) and silt.
    - Sewer cleansing work has been carried out to remove these deposits and restore full flow to the sewer

- The minor repairs are planned in to be completed by the end of April, the repairs are needed to resolve minor structural issues which include 2 small holes in the top of the sewer & some displaced joints.
- **Section 3 - 1.3KM**
  - This section will be CCTV surveyed once we have resolved all issues with Section 2.
  - Once completed we will have carried out a condition survey on the full length of sewer running through the village.
- Solutions, 'what next'?
  - Short Term:
    - Finish all repairs on Section 2
    - Confirm if there is a flat section of sewer on Section 1
  - Medium Term:
    - If a flat section is confirmed on Section 1 we will be carrying out some work on the 2 Sewerage Pumping Stations that feed the sewer, this will consist of works to adjust the pumping frequency so that they don't both pump at the same time (intelligently link them)
    - We will also seal down the manholes on the sections of sewer that are confirmed as flat to ensure that the newly regulated flows pass through the sewer smoothly without issue.
    - Carry out annual CCTV inspection of Sections 1 & 2 to ensure there are no issues with the sewer.
  - Long Term:
    - YW will be carrying out a full hydraulic flow survey as part of our AMP 6 programme and regulatory requirements, this is set to be completed by 2020 however we are looking to accelerate the start of the survey. The Survey involves the placement of flow monitors throughout the areas sewer network, these are then left in place to monitor & measure flow for a period of up to 6 months. This Data is then used to produce a hydraulic model of the villages & areas drainage performance.
    - The sewer will be placed on our Business risk model for future investment following our investigations.
- **Is the sewer undersized?**
  - Our current investigations have found no evidence of an overloading issue with this sewer, the sewer itself is a foul only sewer so it should not have any surface water or highway drainage connected to it as during periods of

heavy rainfall the sewer may struggle to cope with the flows.

- The flows coming into this sewer can be controlled by the 2 pumping stations, the works we intend to carry out at them will ensure the flows are evenly pumped into the sewer at a rate it can accept.
- Unfortunately some of the recent sewerage escapes witnessed have been caused by the build up of FOG (Fats, Oils & Greases) within the network, this, in turn allows silt & debris to stick and form restrictions in the sewer. Annual CCTV's will help us identify these & remove them early.
- Its important for all our customers to ensure that they don't dispose of of FOG (Fats, Oils & Greases) down the sewer, YW works with business & customers to help them understand what should & should not go into our public sewers and we would be more than willing to help anyone who may be unsure about this.

We will ensure that we keep the parish council fully updated with our progress and will happily attend further PC meetings if required.