NOTICE OF MEETING AND SUMMONS TO ATTEND
You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Poringland Parish Council at 7pm on Wednesday 27th June 2018 at Poringland Community Centre.

The business to be transacted at the meeting is as follows:-

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

2. Declarations of interest for items on the agenda and applications for dispensations
   Members are invited to declare personal or pecuniary (prejudicial) interests in any items on the agenda. It is a requirement of the Parish Council (Code of Conduct) that declarations from a Member include the nature of the interest and whether it is pecuniary or an interest other than pecuniary. In the case of a pecuniary interest being declared and no dispensation being sought or approved, the member must disclose the interest and withdraw from the meeting when the item is discussed. If any Member has made a public comment and/or reached a predetermined view prior to attending a meeting it could invalidate the Council’s decision, therefore the Member concerned cannot take part in any discussion and an interest must be recorded.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd May 2018

4. Matters arising including Clerk’s Report
   a. Rosebery Park S106 Transfer

5. Report from the Chairman

6. Adjournment for public participation, district and county councillors, and councillors with any pecuniary interests
   a. District Councillors (7 mins total)
   b. County Councillor (5 mins total)
   c. Public Participation (15 mins total)

7. Planning
   a. Applications Received
      i. 2018/1210 Land west of Mill Close: Erection of single dwelling and garage.
      ii. 2018/1211 Land south of Mill Close: Erection of single dwelling and garage.
      iii. 2018/1302 126B The Street: Extension to provide orangery, bedroom bay window and covered parking. Converting garage to exercise / treatment / carers accommodation.
   b. Planning Decisions
      i. 2018/0718 Community Centre, Overtons Way: Extension to existing car park.

8. Correspondence and Consultations
   a. Dog Friendly Gated Areas
   b. Carer Friendly Communities
   c. Parish Partnership Fund

9. Finance
   a. Receipts, payments and bank reconciliation for May 2018
   b. Accounts for payment
   c. Additional Signatories on Investment Accounts

10. Committee and Advisory Group Reports and Recommendations
a. Neighbourhood Plan Committee

11. Other matters
   a. Cemetery Groundwater Audit Report
   b. Fence at Playing Field Play Area
   c. Devlin Drive Hedge Cutting Proposal for Delegated Authority

12. Date of next Parish Council meeting: Wednesday 25th July 2018 2017, 7pm, Poringland Community Centre

Dated the 21st June 2018 Clerk.................................
Minutes of the Meeting of Poringland Parish Council  
Wednesday 23rd May 2018 7pm Poringland Community Centre

Present:  Tim Boucher (Chairman)  
David Gooderham  
John Henson  
David Hewer  
James Landshoft  
Lisa Neal  
John Overton  
Trevor Spruce  
Catherine Moore (Parish Clerk)

Also attended: County Councillor Vic Thompson and 3 members of the public in attendance.

1. Election of Chairman  
Tim Boucher was elected Chairman, proposed by David Hewer, seconded by John Henson, all in favour.

2. Election of Vice Chairman  
Trevor Spruce was elected Vice Chairman, proposed by David Gooderham, seconded by Tim Boucher, all in favour.

3. Apologies  
Apologies for absence were received from Chris Walker, Steve Aspin and Lisa Neal.

4. Declarations of Interest and Applications for Dispensation  
There were no declarations of interest.

5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting  
The minutes of the meeting held on 25th April 2018 were agreed, proposed by David Hewer, seconded by John Henson, all in favour.

6. Update on matters arising from the minutes  
The Clerk presented her report into matters raised. Further updates:  
- The price for Mulberry access prevention would be £1,300 and had been commissioned under delegated authority.  
- The Tubby Drive dog bin had been ordered.  
- All waste from public bins was treated as general waste, so there would be no benefit in installing separator bins for recycling.

7. Committees and Advisory Groups  
a) Neighbourhood Plan Committee Terms of Reference  
The Terms of Reference were reviewed. It was agreed that the make-up of the Committee would be amended to 6 councillors and 9 co-opted members of the public, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.  

b) Committee and Advisory Group Membership
The following changes were made to the memberships:

- John Joyce moved to Councillor representative on Neighbourhood Plan Committee
- Remove representative of Framingham Earl Parish Council from Facilities Strategic Advisory Group
- Trevor Spruce to replace David Gooderham as ex-officio Vice Chairman, and John Joyce to replace Trevor Spruce on HR Advisory Group
- James Landshoft to replace David Gooderham on the Six Strategic Group

Proposed by John Henson, seconded by James Landshoft, all in favour.

8. Report from the Chairman
The Chairman reported that the transfer of land from Norfolk Homes was expected in July, as earth was being moved around the site.

9. Public Participation

Standing orders were suspended to allow the County Councillor, District Councillors and members of the public to speak, proposed by John Henson, seconded by James Landshoft, all in favour.

a) District Councillors
John Overton reported that a group had met with David Wilson Homes (DWH) on site at Phase 2 and issues had been raised and discussed. Trinity would be cleaning ditches and maintaining the lagoons and hydrobrakes. The system had stood up to extreme rainfall. The piling related to 49 properties, and was resulting in a £1M overspend. John did discuss residents issues from Phase 1 and the developers have attempted to make contact. This was an HBC issue, not a local authority issue.

The issues in Caistor Lane would be addressed once Phase 1 was complete. DWH would be looking into the issue of the misaligned fence, as well as the tree line issue. A fence preventing through-access had been erected at Clearview Drive.

b) County Councillor
Vic Thompson had circulated his report.

c) Public Participation
A member of the public noted that his queries relating to Norfolk Homes had not been answered. It was confirmed that the vehicle activated sign had been installed, the 20mph zone in Shotesham Road would be installed in the coming weeks, and that the spine road would be opened once operations on the site allowed.

He asked when the 20mph repeaters would be installed on Shotesham Road – Clerk to enquire.

He asked when the redesigned pavement would be completed – Clerk to enquire.

He asked whether the replacement fencing at Rosebery Park had been through planning permission. It was confirmed that this discharge of condition application had been approved under application number 2018/0828. He suggested that the Council should look at confidential options on Gmail.
accounts, preventing emails from being forwarded.

A member of the public raised concerns about the raised kerb on the new cycleway which presented a trip hazard. The Clerk was asked to enquire. A query was raised regarding the maintenance strip at the David Wilson Homes site, noting that this buffered the Norwich Road properties. It was confirmed that this was a result of the Parish Council objecting to the original plans.

A complaint was raised regarding a large area of grass verge being left uncut, the Clerk was asked to check whether this was one of the areas instructed to be left due to daffodil bulbs.

Standing orders were reinstated.

10. Planning

a) Applications Received

i) 2018/0878 14 Boundary Way: Ground floor kitchen extension, first floor bedroom extension with balcony and internal alterations.

Trevor Spruce had viewed the plans and visited the site. There were concerns regarding the balcony, and the extent to which it would overlook neighbouring properties.

It was agreed to make no comments, proposed by Trevor Spruce, seconded by James Landshoff, all in favour.

ii) 2018/0986 Casa Florenza, Bungay Road: Two storey rear extension to dwelling and front boundary wall.

Chris Walker had viewed the plans and visited the site, sending in his comments for the meeting. It was felt that the two metre wall at the front of the property was too high and would dominate the street scene. It was felt that this should be no more than 1.2 metres high to be in keeping with the area.

It was agreed to recommend refusal, proposed by John Henson, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

b) Planning Decisions

i) 2016/1627 Land to the north of Heath Loke: Erection of 19 dwellings with access and all other matters reserved. REFUSED

ii) 2017/2652 Land south of Burgate Lane: Outline application for the erection of up to 165 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage. REFUSED

iii) 2018/0640 41 Howe Lane: Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of rear extension. APPROVED

iv) 2018/0748 Land west of Norwich Road and south of Caistor Lane: T66 – Oak tree to the side of footpath link – Minor deadwooding, remove the northern lower lateral, trim back the branches to the northern aspect clear of overhead lines by no more than three metres, remove ivy from the trunk. Fell the small
v) 2018/0784 15 The Footpath: Erection of gate. **APPROVED**

vi) 2018/0791 Evangelical Free Church, Carr Lane: Non-material amendment to permission 2017/0047 – change to brick type and gutters. **APPROVED**

vii) 2018/828 Land north of Shotesham Road: Discharge of condition 15 – hard and soft landscaping of permission 2011/0476. **APPROVED**

viii) 2018/0993 21 Clearview Drive: Discharge of condition 4 from planning consent 2018/0264 – External materials. **APPROVED**

11. **Correspondence and Consultations**

a) **Resident Parking Schemes**

The consultation from South Norfolk Council was presented. It was **agreed** that this would not be required for any areas in Poringland.

b) **Draft Guidelines for Recreational Provision**

The consultation from South Norfolk Council was presented. There were no further comments made.

12. **Finance**

a) **Receipts, Payments, and Bank Reconciliation**

The receipts, payments and bank reconciliation for April 2018 were presented and **noted**.

b) **Accounts for Payment**

It was **agreed** to pay the following accounts, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Gooderham, all in favour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>£6,249.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMRC PAYE &amp; NIC</td>
<td>£2,142.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Pension Fund Superannuation</td>
<td>£2,206.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Henson Councillor Mileage</td>
<td>£18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT Telephone and Broadband</td>
<td>£45.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing Solutions Internal Audit</td>
<td>£504.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk ALC Allotment Training</td>
<td>£162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCC Norfolk Summer Conference</td>
<td>£148.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Copiers Printing</td>
<td>£51.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microshade Hosted IT</td>
<td>£217.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gas &amp; Power CC Electricity</td>
<td>£1,613.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police &amp; Crime Commissioner Police Shed Lease</td>
<td>£240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Electrical Electrical Repair</td>
<td>£255.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Contract Services Relief Caretaking</td>
<td>£883.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldPay Card Machine Charges</td>
<td>£0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kym’s Karaoke Event Fee</td>
<td>£150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R McCarthy Event Expenses</td>
<td>£11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply Perfect Princess Parties Event Deposit</td>
<td>£275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland Leisure Products Play Equipment Repair</td>
<td>£3,722.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vortex Grounds Maintenance Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£191.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Landscapes Grounds Maintenance - Extras</td>
<td>£276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclaycard Various</td>
<td>£859.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Landscapes Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Guardian Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£870.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Veolia Waste £74.23
Rialtas Business Solutions Year End Accounts Closure £300.00
Hollinger Print Newsletter Printing £141.00
C Moore Mileage £28.88
Fairy Tale Party Packages Fete Character Appearance £130.00
R McCarthy Mileage £34.74
PHS Group Hygiene Bins £217.44
C Moore Petty Cash Top Up £55.52

(c) Fidelity Investment Valuation
The statement was noted.

d) Reinvestment of Hampshire Trust Bond
It was agreed to reinvest the Hampshire Trust into a one year bond, proposed by David Gooderham, seconded by James Landshoft, all in favour.

(e) Investments
A report on the current cash position was presented by the Clerk. It was agreed to:
- Invest £85,000 in Charity Bank instant access immediately.
- Invest £50,000 in United Trust 100 Day Notice account immediately.
- Invest £40,000 in CCLA once the money from Rosebery Park was received.
- Invest £60,000 in Santander 1 year bond once the money from Rosebery Park was received.
- Move money into Nationwide from Norfolk Homes CLP and autumn 2018 CIL when received.

Proposed by David Hewer, seconded by John Joyce, all in favour.

(f) Report from Internal Auditor
The report from the internal auditor was presented. It was noted that the precept figure for 2018/19 was £150,922.12. It was noted that the Chairman was required to initial each page of the minutes, and that the Chairman of the Finance and Governance Advisory Group should check the bank statements on a quarterly basis. It was noted that the signatories authorising the release of BACS payments should check and initial the invoices.

g) Review of Internal Controls
The Clerk presented the review of internal controls which was agreed, proposed by David Gooderham, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

h) Annual Governance Statement
The annual governance statement was approved, proposed by Trevor Spruce, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

(i) Annual Accounting Statement
The annual accounting statement was approved, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

13. Committees and Advisory Groups
a) Neighbourhood Plan Committee
The report of the meeting was noted. John Henson noted that a sub-committee had looked at draft policies which had been a productive discussion. The consultant would be drafting policies for further review. An invitation from South Norfolk Council to join a community led planning workshop series was highlighted. It was agreed that John Joyce and John Hodgson would be put forward for this, with Trevor Spruce nominated if a third place became available.

14. General Data Protection Regulation
a) Risk Assessment
The GDPR risk assessment was presented and approved, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Gooderham, all in favour. The Clerk was asked to ensure that risk scores were included in the assessment.

b) Privacy Notices
The GDPR privacy notice was presented and approved, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Gooderham, all in favour.

c) GDPR Preparation
The Clerk’s report into the preparations for GDPR was noted.

County Councillor Vic Thompson joined the meeting and was invited to give his report.

Norfolk County Council had elected a new leader following the resignation of Cliff Jordan. The NDR Western Link consultation was open for comments. The NDR (Broadland Northway) was fully open. Hales roundabout had already seen its first collision. Various Trading Standards issues were highlighted. The web link was available for the mobile phone mapping, but this was a work in progress.

15. Other Matters
a) Complaints Policy
The Complaints Policy was agreed with no changes, proposed by David Gooderham, seconded by John Henson, all in favour.

b) Community Centre Price Review
The price review was presented by David Gooderham. It was agreed to retain the prices but to remove the discount for Framingham Earl residents, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

c) Event Proposal
A report from the Community Centre Manager was presented requesting permission to run two events: a Take That tribute night; and a swing cabaret night. It was noted that the events were in 18 months time, and that the Community Centre Manager was being encouraged to maximise the use of the Centre. It was noted that there would be a busy 12 months coming up with Parish Council projects and that the balance needed to be right with the role of supporting the Clerk. It was agreed to approve the two proposed events, proposed by David Gooderham, seconded by Trevor Spruce, all in favour.
d) **Tree Surveys**  
The Clerk presented the prices received for the tree surveys. It was agreed to appoint Eastern Tree Care to carry out the works, proposed by Trevor Spruce, seconded by James Landshoft, all in favour.

e) **Door Processor**  
The Clerk reported that the front door of the Centre needed a significant repair, and gave the prices. It was agreed to appoint MPS Doors to carry out the work, proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

f) **Pavilion Heating Scheme**  
The Clerk presented the responses to the professional advice requested, and it was agreed that SymTech had given adequate responses and would be appointed to the work, proposed by John Henson, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour. It was agreed that the Clerk could commission the gas installation works, proposed by David Hewer, seconded by James Landshoft, all in favour.

g) **Annual Action Plan**  
The 2017/18 Action Plan was signed off, and the 2018/19 Action Plan was presented and agreed. Proposed by James Landshoft, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

16. **Exclusion of the Press and Public**  
It was resolved to exclude the press and public for the duration of item 16 on the agenda proposed by Tim Boucher, seconded by Trevor Spruce, all in favour.

a) **Rosebery Park Legal Transfer**  
The legal paperwork was presented and it was agreed to proceed with the transfer as presented, proposed by David Hewer, seconded by Trevor Spruce, all in favour.

b) **Clerk’s Appraisal**  
The Clerk’s appraisal was noted and agreed.

17. **Date of next meeting:**  
- Wednesday 27th June 2018, 7pm, Full Council, Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 9.25pm.

**CHAIRMAN**
BLANK PAGE FOR AGENDA COLLATION PURPOSES
Clerk’s Update on Matters Raised at Previous Meetings

The following matters have been raised at previous meetings, and updates are noted below for information. This document does not include matters within the agenda.

- **Vehicle Activated Sign / 20mph Shotesham Road / Opening of Spine Road** – 12.06.18 – VAS installed. Spine Road not ready to be opened until is safe to do so. 20mph limit in Shotesham Road installed w/b 11.06.18 (remaining 30mph repeater to be removed has been chased). **COMPLETED**

- **Access to Mulberry Village Green** - knee rail fencing installed w/e 08.06.18, bollards installed w/e 15.06.18. **COMPLETED**

- **Rosebery Park S106 Transfer** – 18.06.18 – exchange confirmed 20.06.18, awaits completion date. **ONGOING**

- **Community Land Project Transfer** – confirmed Council wishes to proceed. Norfolk Homes are moving earth and levelling on site, will then proceed with the transfer once complete. 12.06.18 – anticipate handover July 2018 **ONGOING**

- **Play Area Inspection Repairs** – Repairs completed. Bins installed w/e 15.06.18. **COMPLETED**

- **Tubby Drive Dog Bin** – location identified and permission has been given from Norfolk Homes. Dog bin purchased. Due to be installed 21.06.18 – South Norfolk notified. **COMPLETED**

- **White lining on Norfolk Homes estate roads** – Emailed Highways Engineer for price 06.06.18 **ONGOING**

- **New burial ground** – Letters will be written when time allows and other backlogged urgent tasks have been cleared. **ONGOING**

- **Redesigned pavement Shotesham Road** – currently sits with Norfolk County Council for design approval - 12.06.18. **ONGOING**

- **Trip hazard on cycleway** – this has been smoothed out and is built to the specification. **COMPLETED**

- **Patch of verge being left uncut** – this is due to the presence of daffodil bulbs. **COMPLETED**

- **White lining on cycleway** – taken up with Breheny 13.06.18. **ONGOING**

Catherine Moore
Clerk to the Council, 21st June 2018
To whom it may concern,

My name is [redacted] and I am Canine Behaviourist and Behaviour centre manager working in a busy veterinary practice in Norwich. I live on the new estate on Mentmore way and train dogs with behaviour problems in Norwich and the local area.

I have noticed over the past couple of days that the area on Lansdowne drive which has a dog bin on the inside and secure gates has now been dismantled and have heard that dogs will now not be allowed in the area. I have used this space as has most of the dog owners on the estate as a way of getting to know my community whilst free running my dogs, not only have I made many friends whilst doing this, I have been able to re-habilitate many dogs that would still be anti-social had they not been able to learn their social skills running with their own kind in this secure space.

I am completely dismayed at your decision as the park was a great way for pet owners to meet and socialise with each other. This has resulted in many people who take their dogs to the park, meeting others and starting conversations about commonalities and shared interests. Through these interactions, a community has been fostered. This dog area has also offered a de facto dog training school environment where training tips have been shared, and owners with more experience in training good behaviour have provided tips and education to the less experienced.

In my experience areas identified as dog parks provide an identifiable safe place where dogs are not limited by the needs of humans and humans not inconvenienced by the needs of dogs, they provide a great source of socialisation for dogs to interact with other dogs, and other people. Well-socialised dogs are less likely to exhibit fear aggression, threatening and disruptive behaviours. In addition, this encourages dog training amongst the dogs who use the park. As most dogs are lead restrained when they are outside of the home, increasing incidents of “Lead Aggression” are seen in built up areas where dogs do not have the opportunity to interact and learn social skills in a way that is free and natural to them; Dog parks provide a space and opportunity for dogs to engage in vigorous, physical activity, therefore, the dog park may be the only place where dogs are allowed to learn lifelong skills that make them happy and safe members of the community. The more exercise that a dog receives also helps to decrease anxious and destructive behaviours in the home.

I also feel that Dog areas encourage people to exercise and spend time in the outdoors. Physical activity and fresh air are proven to enhance both physical and mental health. Socialisation with other people can decrease mental health issues by decreasing depression and loneliness. They also provide people with limited mobility the opportunity to allow their dogs to get free exercise.

I would like to think that this email will be considered by your council and not just dismissed because dogs are not deemed to be important. There is another open space next door to this and also a playground not more than 20 paces away that are not utilised by children and those that do not wish to be in the company of dogs and its a shame that the ONLY space that was used is the one that you are taking away.

Your sincerely

[Redacted]
Dog Behaviourist
Companion Care Vets
Norwich group
24 May 2018

Carer Friendly Communities

Norfolk Family Carers has the opportunity to create and build Carer Friendly Communities in up to 8 towns and villages in Norfolk. Over 3 years we can offer dedicated staff time to each place and along with some additional resources to do this.

While we do not envisage that a huge commitment will be required on top of all you do, we would like to work with Parish Councils and other local groups and initiatives such as Good Neighbourhood Schemes to do more to improve public understanding of informal caring and raise awareness of the emotional and peer-to-peer support available for carers and to enable them to have a life of their own outside of their caring role.

In the first place, we are inviting expressions of interest from local communities to be part of the programme by no later than the 14th June 2018.

Carer Friendly Communities are places where carers feel supported to look after their family or friends, and are recognised as individuals with needs of their own. They have some understanding of a carer’s daily reality, recognising that they are often under a lot of pressure and tend to be hidden from view. In a Carer Friendly Community, a service might offer carers appointment times to fit around their caring responsibilities; an employer might offer flexible working hours, a school could offer a student an extension with course work or the hairdresser recognises a person needs support and knows where to signpost them to. Essentially, Carer Friendly Communities are places that reach out to support carers.

We are aiming to reach the significant majority of family carers who do not access support from statutory provision or other services. A carer is defined as someone of any age who provides unpaid support to family or friends who could not manage without their help due to illness, disability, a mental health difficulty or an addiction. Nationally, 8 in 10 (83%) carers report that they have felt socially isolated as a result of their caring responsibilities. 57% of carers have lost touch with friends and family as a result of caring.
The model makes caring the norm as the majority of us will be carers ourselves. We wish to:

- Promote and develop community solutions and combine resources wherever possible.
- Identify, train and support individuals who actively know the local area and activities and services available there. We will work with the practical skills, knowledge, passions and interests of local residents in ways that motivate them in their support of family carers.
- Promote awareness and train ‘Carer Supporters’ amongst public facing businesses. We will support them in this by providing timely information to pass on in their interactions with family carers.
- Recruit different groups within communities to commit to befriend carers in isolation through letter writing, phone calls and occasional assistance and visits.
- Encourage peer support between carers and former carers to share experience of the caring role.
- Build on our relationships with other voluntary (large and small) providers, statutory organisations and businesses and draw on the things they have to offer to enhance carers’ experience so that they add value to the overall offer in supporting the needs of family carers.

As well as providing an active community development role, our locality based ‘facilitators’ will be able to:

- Support families to have the important and often difficult conversations and to make informed choices about their care and wellbeing.
- Offer clear ‘up to the minute’ information, practical support
- Meet informally with carers along with their family, friends and neighbours to have conversations, ‘problem solve’ and develop ideas that make positive differences e.g. restarting something they enjoy or reconnecting with a community of interest.

For further information and to express an interest please contact me on 01603 219924 or tim.allard@norfolkfamilycarers.org.

Carers need communities and communities need carers! Help us to make support for caring the norm.

Sincerely,

Tim Allard
Executive Manager

Norfolk Carers Support trading as Norfolk Family Carers
Registered Charity No. 1155684 & Co. Ltd by guarantee No. 08565078
From the Chairman of the County Council’s Environment, Development & Transport Committee

Dear Sir/Madam

Delivering local highway improvements in partnership with Town and Parish Councils

I am delighted to inform you that due to the success of working in partnership with Parish/Town Councils for the last seven years the Parish Partnership Scheme Initiative will again be repeated in the financial year 2019/20. Further supporting information, including possible funding sources for your share of the bid, is available on our website (click on this link).

The County Council has again provisionally allocated £325,000 on a 50/50 basis (There is an upper limit on Norfolk County Council funding support of £25,000 per bid) to fund schemes put forward by Town and Parish Councils to deliver projects that are priorities for local communities. We are particularly keen to encourage and support first-time bids.

This letter provides more information on the process, invites you to submit bids, and explains how the County Council can support you in developing your ideas. The closing date will be the 7 December 2018. If you need any advice in developing your ideas, especially around the practicalities and cost estimates, please consult your local Highway Engineers based at your local Area Office.

Once all bids have been received we will assess them and inform you of our decision in March 2019 following approval by the ETD committee.

Continued …/
To encourage bids from Town and Parish Councils with annual incomes (precepts plus any another income) below £2,000, we are offering the following support:

- 75% County Council contribution
- £5,000 maximum bid value
- Offer available only once to any bidder

We will also accept bids from unparished County Council wards. Such wards can always opt to become a formal Parish Council, but otherwise we are offering support on the basis that the ward raises the required 50% funding. Kings Lynn Borough Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council and Norwich City Council have kindly indicated their willingness to consider proposed schemes and potential funding for them. Further details are in the relevant committee report on our website (click on this link).

What sort of schemes would be acceptable?

- Small lengths of formal footway
- Trods (a simplified and low cost footway),
- Improved crossing facilities
- Improvements to Public Rights of Way.
- Flashing signs to tackle speeding. We would encourage you to consider Speed Awareness Mobile Signs (SAM2) - which flash up the driver’s actual speed rather than fixed signs (VAS) - which flash up the speed limit. The number of VAS in Norfolk has grown, and checks show that speed reduction benefits can be minimal. Whilst we will still consider bids for fixed VAS, we will need to be satisfied that they will be effective in reducing speed. We consider that SAM2 mobile signs, which are moved around on an agreed rota, are better at reducing speed; **SAM2 can be jointly purchased with neighbouring Parishes, and would be owned and maintained by the Parish/Town Council**

- Part-time 20mph signs with flashing warning lights, outside schools. The County Council trialled these in 2008/9, and generally had a favourable community response, with some moderate reductions in average speeds during peak times. Whilst the County Council supports the aspiration to have part-time 20mph speed limits outside each school in Norfolk, to do this would cost in the region of £3,750,000.

“Keep Clear” carriageway markings outside schools. Applications will be considered for new school keep clear carriageway markings (which must be supported by the local school), however, these will not be enforceable without a Traffic Regulation Order which is outside the scope of the Parish Partnership Scheme. If you wish to enforce the Order it would have to be wholly funded by the Parish or the Local Member.

New Bus Shelter. A copy of Norfolk County Councils guidance for new bus shelters is available on our web site (click on this link). **Any new shelter would be owned and maintained by the Parish/Town Council.**
Schemes can be within or off the highway provided they are linked to the highway. If they are off highway the future responsibility for the maintenance will fall to the Parish or Town Council.

Schemes should be self-contained and not require other schemes or works to make them effective.

Schemes that support the Local Transport Plan (LTP) objectives will have a higher priority for funding. The LTP can be found on our website (click on this link).

With the County Council’s agreement Parishes can employ private contractors to deliver schemes. Any works on the highway would be subject to an agreed programme, inspection on completion, and the contractor having £10m public liability insurance.

**What schemes will not be considered?**

- Bids for minor traffic management changes such as speed limits or waiting restrictions or any Traffic Regulation Order will not qualify.
- Bids for installation of low-energy LED lighting in streetlights to help cut energy bills and maintenance.
- Mirrors in the highway

**What information should you include in your bid?**

- Details of the scheme, its cost and your contribution.
- A plan/map of the extents of the scheme
- Who, and how many people will benefit.
- How it supports the objectives of the Local Transport Plan.
- Local support, particularly from your local Member, frontagers and land owners.
- For ‘off highway’ schemes, your proposals for future maintenance.

Please find a simple bid application form attached to this letter. When assessing your bid we will consider the points above, but also:

- The potential for casualty reduction.
- Any ongoing maintenance costs for the County Council.

Your bids should be emailed to ppschemes@norfolk.gov.uk (or posted for the attention of the County Programme Engineer, Linda McDermott, at the above address). If you need further information on the bid process please contact Linda, by email or by phoning 01603 228905. For advice on the scheme practicalities and/or likely costs, please contact your local Highway Engineer.

Yours sincerely

Martin Wilby
Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee
# Parish Partnership bid application form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fund applied for:</strong></th>
<th>Parish Partnership Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant details:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submitted by/contact:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum applied for:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total project cost:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project title:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project detail:</strong> (please include a plan/map of the extents of the scheme):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>plan/map attached:</strong></td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any other funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish Income:</strong></td>
<td>Precept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for works:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any relevant supporting documents (e.g. supportive correspondence):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussed with:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Bank - Cash and Investment Reconciliation as at 31 May 2018

## Account Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank Statement Balances</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Barclays Current</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unity Trust</td>
<td>26,252.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cambridge &amp; Counties 120 Day</td>
<td>74,086.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hampshire Trust Bond 1</td>
<td>55,847.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Barclays Deposit</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Unity Trust Deposit</td>
<td>205,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nationwide Instant Access</td>
<td>60,628.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**421,815.92**

## Other Bank & Cash Balances

| Petty Cash                  | 550.00     |
| Cashbook Suspense           | 0.00       |

**550.00**

**422,365.92**

## Unpresented Payments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/04/2018</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>215.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/2018</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2018</td>
<td>300001</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**293.22**

**422,072.70**

## Receipts not on Bank Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/05/2018</td>
<td>All Receipts Cleared</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**0.00**

## Closing Balance

**422,072.70**

## All Cash & Bank Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>25,959.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds &amp; Savings</td>
<td>395,562.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bank &amp; Cash Balances</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Bank & Cash Balances**

**422,072.70**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Chq no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Cunningham</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>£6,008.51</td>
<td>SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cunningham</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>£2,070.56</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R McCarthy</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Assistant Clerk</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Gooderham</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Gooderham</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>BACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Warminger</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Warminger</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>BACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Moore</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Moore</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>BACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Duffell</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Duffell</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>BACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMRC</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>PAYE &amp; NIC</td>
<td>£2,070.56</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Pension Fund</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>£2,150.76</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>Telephone &amp; Broadband</td>
<td>£43.92</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Copiers</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>£52.63</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse Eastern</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>Printing - Annual Report</td>
<td>£699.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Parish Training &amp; Support</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>Chairmanship Training</td>
<td>£75.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microshade</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>Hosted IT</td>
<td>£217.62</td>
<td>SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Online</td>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>£70.80</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gas &amp; Power</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>£748.96</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPO</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Gas - May 2018</td>
<td>£51.09</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPO</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Gas - April 2018</td>
<td>£101.17</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>£230.91</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldPay</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Card Machine Charges</td>
<td>£3.22</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS Doors</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Door Repair</td>
<td>£2,274.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Hyde Flooring</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Floor Refurbishment</td>
<td>£1,816.20</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Grapes</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Repair Kitchen Door</td>
<td>£35.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Electrical</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Replacement Hand Drier</td>
<td>£248.54</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin &amp; Ruddock</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Air Conditioning Repair</td>
<td>£466.20</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R McCarthy</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Event Expenditure</td>
<td>£50.85</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Roberts</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Disco Sept 2019 - Deposit</td>
<td>£100.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Brothers</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Dreamers</td>
<td>£800.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave</td>
<td>Burial Ground</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>£10.75</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Blinds</td>
<td>Playing Field</td>
<td>Blinds - Pavilion</td>
<td>£576.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eon</td>
<td>Playing Field</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>£380.02</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Development Services</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Groundwater Audit</td>
<td>£4,320.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Memorials</td>
<td>Commuted Sums</td>
<td>Memorial Repairs</td>
<td>£1,470.00</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasdon</td>
<td>Outside Spaces / Commuted Sums</td>
<td>Bins</td>
<td>£1,307.05</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vortex</td>
<td>Commuted Sums</td>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£191.66</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Guardian</td>
<td>Comm Sum / O-Spaces / P-Field</td>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£870.22</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veolia</td>
<td>Comm Centre / Burial Ground</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>£99.56</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Landscapes</td>
<td>Comm Centre / BG / Mem Garden</td>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£945.00</td>
<td>SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Landscapes</td>
<td>O-Spaces / Comm Sums</td>
<td>Bin Install / Mulberry Access</td>
<td>£1,729.32</td>
<td>BACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclaycard</td>
<td>Comm Centre / Admin / Salaries / Proj</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>£662.26</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BACS salary payments to staff are the 2018/19 pay award uplift - this has now been changed for Julys payroll*

£30,885.78
Poringland Parish Council

An Environment Agency T2 Assessment for the current cemetery off Rectory Road, Poringland, NR14 7SL. Grid Ref: 627262; 302123
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1.0 Executive summary

The site is considered to be **moderate risk** with the risk mainly attributed to the presence of shallow groundwater, the proximity to surface waters and the permeable nature of the superficial deposits. This is mitigated somewhat by low predicted burial numbers. **Most significantly, the groundwater is within 1m of the base of a normal grave over much of the site. This contravenes EA standing advice for cemeteries which requires at least 1m of dry ground beneath the base of a grave.** Furthermore, the presence of perched water within layers of sands and gravels further up the soil profile gave rise to running sand conditions in two of the pits excavated making it practically very difficult, if not impossible, to dig stable graves in such conditions. Though the occurrence of such layers will vary over the site, and may improve in summer, it adds complexity to managing this site efficiently.

A source of pollutants is present in the form of burials with the nearest receptor in the form of groundwater within as little as 0.6m under a normal double grave or 1m under a single grave. This groundwater will feed the nearby stream and given the free-draining nature of the subsoil materials the rate of transfer of pollutants from the cemetery to the stream could be fast. This stream is the most sensitive receptor as there are no wells recorded in the vicinity of the site and the groundwater in question is associated with local superficial deposits rather than strategically important groundwater supplies. That said, ammonium is a major pollutant of surface waters and thus surface waters fed by this aquifer may be at increased risk due to burials in this cemetery. The risk can be more accurately defined by undertaking flux modelling for ammonium and nitrate at this site.

The overall risk posed by the site is mitigated somewhat by the low burials numbers, thus total loading each year is also likely to be low and the EA may deem this to be acceptable. It is important to discuss the finding of this assessment with the EA at the earliest opportunity in order to be develop a mitigation strategy that protects sensitive receptors. Such mitigation may be in the form of deep drainage to de-water the soil to a depth of at least 1m below a normal double grave, and in so doing also reduce the risk of running conditions occurring at burial depth by removing perched water. The problem with this approach on this site is a lack of space to move the machinery around the site as needed, a lack of access and a lack of space to treat any such water effectively ahead of discharge.

By way of grave-specific mitigation, the addition of Zeolitic compounds could be added to the base of graves. Zeolites such as Clinoptilolite have CEC values exceeding 150 meq/l and when placed in the base of the grave will absorb significant amounts of Ammonium via cation exchange processes in addition to the existing capacity of the clay soil (Rozic et al 2009).

Calculations would suggest that at least 90% of the human nitrogen (1.8 kg) release could be absorbed by 150 kg of Clinoptilolite or a high CEC clay material such as Bentonite.

Based on the above it is recommended that contact be made with the local Groundwater Protection Team as soon as possible in order to get more advice from the EA and determine the best way to manage this site. There is a risk that the EA may deem the site too risky to allow burials to continue and that if no suitable remediation options are found, the cemetery may need to be closed.
2.0 Introduction

Cemetery Development Services Ltd. has been asked to carry out a Tier 2 assessment for the current Poringland Cemetery and the planned extension area. This site will be considered on the basis of groundwater risk and as part of this, a T2 study based on the criteria required by the Environment Agency has been carried out. This is because sites that do not meet the requirements of the Environment Agency may need mitigation works to avoid groundwater pollution associated with burials. In the worst case, where mitigation is unlikely to work or cannot be accomplished, burials may need to cease and cemeteries close.

The site has been assessed on a 1 km area of influence: grid reference 627262; 302123, nearest postcode: NR14 7SL. The site is calculated as being approximately 0.5 hectares (1.2 acres).

Figure 1a. Map of the site
Figure 1b. Aerial photograph of the site, (site boundary marked in red)

This report will review the site in accordance with the requirements of the Environment Agency’s Tier 2 survey. For the purposes of this study the anticipated burial rate for this site is estimated as being in approximately 12-15 per year.

3.0 Background

This section sets out the relevant legal and policy advice relevant to the grant of planning permission for new and also the operation of existing cemeteries. New cemetery developments or extensions to existing cemeteries can be very emotive. However, these concerns are often disproportionate to the actual environmental risk.

Whilst the Local Planning Authority is the principal controlling body in determining approval for new sites or site extensions, significant information is required to ensure that the environmental risks are examined and that the Environment Agency’s views are considered. Therefore, measures to prevent pollution must be undertaken and reported. Any regulatory decision-making is based on sound scientific knowledge. On this basis, a review of potential pollution from cemeteries was undertaken by the Environment Agency in collaboration with the British Geological Survey.
The aim was to review old and new cemeteries and measure the effects of contamination from viruses, bacteria and other microbiological pathogens and to assess the potential of chemical contaminants affecting groundwater supplies from decomposition processes. Preliminary results showed that the operating cemetery examined in the study (25 years old) did show some evidence of bacterial contaminants in groundwater derived from corpses. However, no viruses were detected and the overall contaminant loading was found to be low. The studies found that degradation and attenuation was occurring indicating that potential risks were low. Whilst the outcome of this research found contaminant risk to be low, it should be reviewed in the context that natural attenuation processes may have been optimum at these sites. Therefore, to optimise natural attenuation and reduce the risk of possible groundwater contamination, a series of guidelines have been drawn up that are directly applicable to cemeteries.

The most up-to-date guidance issued by the Environment Agency is provided in:

- 'The Environment Agency’s approach to groundwater protection' (February 2018 Version 1.2), which updated ‘Groundwater protection: Principles and practice (GP3) (2013)’; and
- ‘Cemeteries and burials: prevent groundwater pollution' which was published in March 2017 and updated in February 2018. The purpose of the guidance is to help those operating cemeteries to understand how to manage cemeteries and burial of human and animal remains, to prevent or limit groundwater pollution.

Failure to manage and reduce any environmental risk to a minimum may result in action being taken under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Anti-pollution Works Notice Regulations 1999.

### 3.1 Groundwater protection policy

Initial risk screening starts with the tools contained in the 'The Environment Agency’s approach to groundwater protection' (previously Principles and Practice for the groundwater protection), Section L: Cemetery developments GP3.

Tools include Groundwater Vulnerability and Source Protection Zone (SPZs) maps. These maps highlight where there are likely to be particular risks posed to groundwater from surface activities. Groundwater Vulnerability (GWV) Maps show the damage from pollution to groundwater and the relative importance of the aquifer to water supplies. Risk assessment is made with reference to soil leaching potential and the levels of water tables above major and minor aquifers.

Source Protection Zones are delineated areas around groundwater abstractions used for public consumption and defined by travel, time of biological or chemical contaminants.

The zones are classified in three groups:

- Zone 1 High risk
- Zone 2 Intermediate to high risk
- Zone 3 Intermediate risk

In its Position Statement L1 (p109 of ‘The Environment Agency’s approach to groundwater protection’) the Agency advises that it will object to the grant of planning permission for any new cemetery, or the extension of an existing cemetery, within Zone 1 of an SPZ or 250 metres from a well, borehole or spring used to supply water that is used for human consumption, whichever is the greater distance.

Position Statement L3 advises on the protection of groundwater in highly sensitive locations. The Agency advises that it will apply a risk-based approach to assessing the suitability of sites outside of...
the zones noted in position statements L1 and L2 (concerning mass casualty emergencies). It will place a high priority on protecting groundwater within principal aquifers and groundwater catchments for drinking water supply; and seek to avoid new cemetery developments for greater than 100 graves in these high vulnerability areas except where the thickness and nature of the unsaturated zone, or the impermeable formations beneath the site protect groundwater, or the long-term risk is mitigated by appropriate engineering methods. It advises that all cemetery developments and burials must maintain an unsaturated zone below the level of the base of the grave(s) and that the Agency will work with the local authorities to identify alternative options where necessary.

Whilst groundwater is a major part of policy concerns, other water point sources are also considered as requiring an evaluation of risk. These sources include surface water in the form of ditches, spring lines and surface run-off.

The factors influencing the risk of groundwater vulnerability include:

- Soil nature and type
  - Physical, mechanical and chemical properties
- Geomorphology
  - Depth to water table and or height above aquifers
  - Groundwater flow mechanisms
  - Aquifer type
- Abstractions
- SPZs
- Proximity to water courses, ditches and drains

Therefore, prior to any consent being given by the Environment Agency, an assessment of risk should be undertaken. The degree of assessment is measured through a series of stages namely:

- Hazard identification
- Identification of consequences
- Magnitude of consequences
- Probability of consequences
- Significance of risk

3.2 Tiered risk assessment

There are 3 Tiers of Risk assessment. The associated size and position of the site will in-part determine which Tier is appropriate.

Tier 1
Desktop study of all appropriate documentation including GWV and SPZ maps, topographical, hydrological and geomorphologic maps. After adopting a systematic approach to the assessment of risk, a weighting can be given which is assessed as low, medium or high. If the overall risk is low, the proposal may be accepted by the Agency without further detailed assessment. However, the following practical guidelines would be recommended as appropriate controls to minimise pollution risk:

- 250 m distance from groundwater supply
- 30 m minimum distance from groundwater or spring
- 10 m distance from field drains
- No burials in standing water
Tier 2
Should the risks not be clearly defined by the desktop study then further “ground truthing” might need to be undertaken. This may include field studies and monitoring of groundwater within the proposed area, comprising of the installation of up to three boreholes.

Tier 3
If the risk is considered high, i.e. the number of yearly burials exceeds 1,000; a full audit will be required. This would include, but not be limited to, a detailed site investigation including boreholes and monthly monitoring.

3.3 Water Resources Act 1991 – S161A Anti-Pollution Works Notices

The EA has powers under s161A of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Anti-Pollution Works Regulations 1999, allowing Works Notices to be served to require specified steps to be taken to prevent or remedy pollution of controlled waters.

3.4 Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016

Burial of human corpses can result in discharge of hazardous substances and non-hazardous pollutants to groundwater. They are, therefore, covered by the requirements of the EU Groundwater Daughter Directive, issued under the Water Framework Directive 2006 and now transposed in England and Wales by the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016 (EPR 2016). It is an offence to cause or knowingly permit pollution of controlled waters other than under and in accordance with an environmental permit.

4.0 Site investigation

British Geological Survey and Cranfield University data was used in this report.

4.1 Topography and surface drainage

The site is an existing cemetery with the main site almost full and an extension area adjacent to the main cemetery about to be commissioned fully (it currently holds one burial). The site has residential houses and gardens to the west, north and east and the existing cemetery to the south. The nearest watercourse is a small unnamed, culverted stream running east some 15m from the site boundary. In addition to this, there are a series of small ponds to the south west, south and south east of the site varying between 77m, 135m and 315m from the site respectively. A small stream also occurs on the OS map to the south of the site approximately 130m from the southern boundary with a wet ditch also shown on the OS map some 57m to the south east of the site.

The site falls from around 52.5 m AOD along the northern boundary of the site to around 51m AOD along the boundary between the existing cemetery and the extension area at an average grade of around 2.3%. The main fall is to the south / south east but with a slight cross fall from west to east.
Figure 2. Topography of the site.

4.2 Soil type

The Soil Survey of England and Wales map the site as containing soils belonging to the Newport 1 Association as described in Table 1 and Figure 3.
Figure 3. Soil Associations in the vicinity of the site.

Table 1. Soil Associations in the vicinity of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Association</th>
<th>Sub Groups</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>511d Newport 1</td>
<td>Wick Blackwood</td>
<td>Deep, well-drained sandy and coarse loamy soils. Some sandy soils affected by groundwater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These soils are generally well drained and easy to work. Where the glacio-fluvial deposits occur over impermeable subsoils or bedrock material perched water or groundwater can occur and should this be shallow enough to occur within 1m of the base of a grave the site would not comply with EA standing advice on burials (no burials permitted where groundwater occurs within 1m of the base of a grave).

4.2.1 Trial pits

Site investigations were undertaken on 11th May 2018 with 3 trial pits dug to between 1.4 metres and 2.1 m (Figure 5). Figure 4 shows the profiles of the pits excavated.
Figure 4. Trial pit soil profiles

Pit 1 profile. Pit 2 profile. Pit 3 profile.
The trial pits revealed a complex soil pattern over the area tested. All pits had a sandy topsoil (LOAMY SAND to SANDY LOAM texture) which varied between a shallowest of 0.42 m deep in Pit 1 and a deepest of 0.85 m in Pit 2. The soil was dark brown black in colour, loose and friable. It is likely that the soils have formed in the glacio-fluvial superficial deposits that begin to tail-off over the site, thinning towards the east. This is reflected in the subsoil variability.

In Pit 1 the topsoil is underlain by a distinct orange coloured mottled layer of SANDY GRAVEL with some stones. The mottling present is indicative of a layer in the soil which is periodically waterlogged. When waterlogged parts of the soil become anaerobic and this produces reducing conditions in the soil. When the iron in the soil is reduced from Ferric to Ferrous iron it changes colour from orange to greenish grey, hence creating the mottled pattern visible in this soil. This layer extended to a depth of 0.77 m and became wetter with depth, less mottled and greyer in colour.

Between 0.77m and 1.3m was a layer of grey, saturated clay-bound SANDY GRAVEL which began to flow at a moderate rate into the pit. The sides were unstable and began to collapse into the pit within minutes of opening it. Between 1.3 and 1.48 m was a drier layer of SANDY CLAY however it was not possible to excavate below this due to repeated collapse of the pit sides and running conditions in parts of the soil above. It is likely the water in the saturated layer between 0.7m and 1.3m is perched within the sandy gravel over a the less permeable sandy clay at 1.3m. This perched water is unlikely to be in hydraulic connection with local surface water but may be connected to the underlying true groundwater in places. This layer coincides with burial depth and in this location would make excavating a stable grave almost impossible as the soils were flowing and would run under shuttering and side supports. In addition, if a burial was possible, the water would gather around the grave meaning that the site would not comply with EA standing advice of not burying into standing water. It would also make digging adjacent graves difficult without a significant gap between graves as adjacent graves would be likely to collapse into new graves when dug in such conditions.
In Pit 2 (downslope from Pit 1), the topsoil was very deep, loose and friable and overlaid a thinner layer of orangey grey, mottled SANDY GRAVEL which occurred between 0.85m and 1.17m. Though wet, this layer was not saturated in this location and remained stable with no side wall collapse. This suggests that water held in this layer is localised and not general under the site as a whole. Though an issue in Pit 1, the perched water was not encountered in Pit 2 though it was excavated within 40 m of Pit 1. This makes planning the use of the cemetery extension area difficult as some areas may be possible to use whereas others within even a few meters may be impossible to dig a stable grave in.

Between 1.17m and 1.84m there was a layer of SANDY CLAY with gravel which became wetter with depth. At 1.84m was a layer of saturated, plastic clay which gave way to a saturated fine sand at 2.04m. Water began to flow into the base of the pit immediately and rose quickly to a depth of 10 cm within 15 minutes. Some side wall collapse was observed from the saturated clay layer but was not extensive.

The water encountered in Pit 2 is likely to be the true groundwater associated with the glacio-fluvial deposits rather than a layer of perched water such as that found in Pit 1. It is likely this groundwater would also have been struck in Pit 1 if it was possible to dig the pit deeper in that location. The presence of groundwater at this depth indicates that the site would fail to meet the EA standing advice requiring there to be no water table within 1m of the base of a grave. With groundwater present at 2.04 m this makes even single burials non-compliant with EA advice.

Pit 3 was excavated in the existing cemetery area at the base of the slope and some 10m from the nearest burial. The topsoil again a dark brownish black LOAMY SAND / SANDY LOAM extending to a depth of 0.56m. This was underlain by an orange brown, mottled layer of clay-bound SANDY GRAVEL with some stones. This layer became wetter with depth to 1.1m. Between 1.1m and 1.6m was a grey clay-bound SANDY GRAVEL which was saturated and quickly began to flow into the excavated pit. Between 1.6m and 1.8m there was a drier though plastic layer of SANDY CLAY, over which the water in the layer above was perched. The pit was dug to a depth of 2.1m where saturated fine sand was stuck and groundwater began to flow into the pit base. The pit could not be extended further and began to fill rapidly with running sand from higher in the profile and significant side-wall collapse. The pit was filled to avoid further side wall collapse.

Pit 3 was effectively a combination of the conditions encountered in Pits 1 and 2, with a perched water layer between 1.1m and 1.6m and then true groundwater struck between 1.8 and 2.1m. In this location not only would it be very difficult to practically dig a grave deeper than 1.1m due to running conditions, side wall collapse and water gathering around a burial, but there is also groundwater within 1m of the base of a grave, even a single grave.

In summary a combination of shallow, localised perched water in the upper subsoil makes the practical excavation of a grave difficult in parts of the site, with some areas being stable and some areas being unstable but there being no way of knowing which areas will be suitable or not until a grave is attempted. This may improve over summer as the perched water layer begins to dry but this cannot be guaranteed. From a groundwater pollution perspective, there is groundwater within 1m of the base of a grave over the site generally and with a permeable layer of sand, gravel and clayey sand between the base of a grave and this groundwater the risk of pollutants released from burials entering the groundwater is high. Though unlikely to be used for potable purposes, the groundwater is likely to supply the local streams and rivers via base flow and as such any pollutants within the groundwater are likely to impact the surface waters.

The risk from the site is reduced significantly by the low burial rate of between 12 and 15 per year and the EA may take a view on this in respect to overall risk from the site. More detailed flux modelling of the site is recommended ahead of speaking with the EA to provide a better assessment of the risks posed. It should be noted that even if the risk to ground and surface water from the site is deemed to be acceptable, the practical issues of digging graves in ground that is saturated in places will remain. In addition, if burials into saturated ground are made, then re-opening such graves will be difficult and any water removed from the grave as
part of that process much be treated as polluted and taken off site in a tanker for disposal at a licensed water treatment plan.

The only way to mitigate both the perched water and to reduce the groundwater level to a depth more than 1m below the base of a grave would be to install deep drains to depths between 2.8 – 3.0m. This requires larger machinery which given the access issues to the site may not be possible to bring in. In addition, all water flowing from the drains would need to be treated ahead of discharge assuming a suitable discharge point can be found. The simplest way to do this would be to pump water from the drains into the nearest foul water sewer but there may not be capacity in the sewage system to deal with the additional flow. Otherwise an on-site treatment system such as a small package treatment system would be needed and a suitable surface water outfall found for the cleaned water. The cost is likely to be very high, the practical issues associated with digging and installing such a system are hard to overcome and the impact on available remaining burial space is also likely to be significant within such a small site. Given all these issues, the council may be better advised to look for a new site for a cemetery, restrict burials to single depth in areas where digging graves is practical (assuming the EA allow it) or using this site for ashes interment only in future.

4.3 Geology

The following headings cover the aspects of geology of the immediate area of the proposed development.

4.3.1 Artificial ground

![Figure 6. Artificial ground in the vicinity of the site.](image)

Search area indicated in red
This is ground at or near the surface that has been modified by man. It includes ground that has been deposited (Made Ground), landscaped, disturbed, excavated (Worked Ground) or some combination of these (Figure 6). No Artificial Ground has been recorded by BGS up to the time of map publication in 1975 and the site is not located in a built-up area. There is a borehole within the search area but not within the site that has indicated the presence of artificial ground to 2 m depth located within a nearby housing development.

Modern and historic Ordnance Survey maps from 1887, 1908, 1929, and 1951 to the present day show that the site has not had any previous development apart from some small buildings close to the road. Artificial Ground might be present, such as landscaping, and should be considered.

4.3.2 Superficial deposits

These are relatively young geological deposits formerly known as ‘Drift’, which lie on the bedrock in many areas. They include deposits such as unconsolidated sands and gravels formed by rivers and clayey tills formed by glacial action. They may be overlain by landslide deposits, by artificial deposits or both (Figure 7). The superficial deposits on site are variable, complex and the thickness is not well constrained as there are no boreholes on site.

![Figure 7. Superficial deposits in the vicinity of the site.](image_url)
Head deposits – Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel
Head deposits are mapped in the south of the site. They are probably composed of gravelly sandy clay but can be of variable lithology. They are formed from downslope mass-movement (solifluction) of upslope materials under past conditions of cold climate. They are thickest on the lower slope and valley bottoms. Head deposits may be more extensive than shown on the geological map, but discontinuous and up to 3 m thick.

Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation
The whole site is on the Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation with the eastern 10 metres mapped as on the Lowestoft Till Member and the rest of the site on sand and gravel. The Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation was deposited between about 420 000 and 480 000 year BP, during the Anglian glacial period. It is composed of beds of glacial till, sand and gravel (glaciofluvial), and silt and clay (glaciolacustrine). In this area the Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation is composed of an upper layer of sand and gravel and lower gravelly sandy clay of the Lowestoft Till Member.

Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation – upper Sand and Gravel
This unit comprises sandy gravel and gravelly sand with a few cobbles. It is clayey in part; the clay is brown, sometimes grey and slightly sandy. The gravel is composed of flint with minor quantities of quartz, quartzite and chalk. This unit, where present, might be up to 8 m thick based on local borehole records.

Lowestoft Till Member - Lowestoft Formation – Glacial Till
The Lowestoft Till Member is composed of calcareous, gravelly, sandy clay with a low cobble count (glacial till). The gravel is composed mostly of chalk and flint and the coarser gravel and cobbles are of flint. Chalk content might increase with depth. There is a moderate potential for a shrink-swell hazard associated with the Lowestoft Till Member. Drilling records in the area indicate that this deposit could be between 10 and 20 m thick.

Beneath the Lowestoft Till Member there might be a few metres of sand and gravel and/or brown sandy clay with occasional flint gravel of the Happisburgh Glacigenic Formation. If present it is probably 3 to 5 m thick. Alternatively, if there is only a sand and gravel it is probably the Crag Group.

4.3.3 Rockhead depth
The depth to rockhead (bedrock) is not known with any degree of certainty, but it is estimated to be around 17 to 33 metres. However, the Crag Group (geological bedrock) can be difficult to distinguish from overlying superficial deposits.

4.3.4 Bedrock geology
Crag Group
The Superficial Deposits are underlain by the Crag Group, which is almost entirely of Pleistocene age. The Crag Group consists of an upper part of sand and gravel (‘Wroxham Crag’) becoming mainly glauconitic (green mineral), locally shelly, fine-to medium-grained sand with increasing depth. Also,
with increasing depth, thin beds and lenses of grey clay occur sporadically. The lower part of the Crag Group commonly contains thick beds of grey clay. The Crag sand is typically greenish-grey when unweathered but weathers to yellowish brown. Beneath this site the Crag Group is probably at least 10 m thick. The Crag Group can be difficult to distinguish from overlying superficial deposits.

White Chalk Subgroup
Below the Crag Group is the White Chalk Subgroup, Late Cretaceous, which consists of white, fine-grained limestone (chalk) consisting principally of the silt-sized, calcareous remains of planktonic algae with beds of flint, gravel to cobble-sized, sometimes small boulder-size, flint, stronger chalk (hardgrounds) and marl seams, which are common at many levels in the succession. It is probably over 300 m thick.

**Key to Bedrock geology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map colour</th>
<th>Computer Code</th>
<th>Name of geological unit</th>
<th>Rock type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRAG-XSV</td>
<td>Crag Group</td>
<td>SAND AND GRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5 Schematic geological cross-section

This sketch (Figure 9) represents an interpretation of the geometrical relationships of the main rock units described in the text. It is not to scale. The blue line indicates ‘rockhead’; that is the base of superficial deposits. This is the ‘geological rockhead’, as distinct from the ‘engineering rockhead’, which is the base of ‘engineering soil’ (in the sense of BS5930:1999).

Not to scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National grid references for site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West 627110, 302090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 627440, 302120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. A schematic representation of the underlying geology of the site.
4.4 Additional geological considerations

Figure 10. A summary of the geological hazards associated with the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrink / Swell</th>
<th>Landslides (slope instability)</th>
<th>Soluble rocks (dissolution)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The geological hazards found on the site are explained in Table 2.

The hazard levels are described as A (least) to E (greatest), or as ‘No Hazard’. Levels A and B are not considered significant and are not shown on the maps.

The geological hazards found on the site are explained in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geological hazard</th>
<th>May be significant within site area (Yes/No)?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Natural Ground Stability Hazards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrink-Swell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Level C = Potential for hazard to become active is at a level where it should be considered in decisions about construction, building maintenance and land use. There is potential for a moderate shrink-swell hazard associated with Lowestoft Till Member (Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation). The clay is slightly susceptible to shrink-swell behaviour in response to changes in water content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslides (slope instability)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Level B = Potential for hazard is not significant and is at a level such as to cause problems only in exceptional circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluble Rocks (dissolution)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Level B = Potential for hazard is not significant and is at a level such as to cause problems only in exceptional circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressible Ground</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Level A = Potential for hazard to be active is either zero or insignificant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapsible Deposits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Level B = Potential for hazard is not significant and is at a level such as to cause problems only in exceptional circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Sand</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Level B = Potential for hazard is not significant and is at a level such as to cause problems only in exceptional circumstances. However, if the Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation sand and gravel contains beds of water bearing sand, such as above the Lowestoft Till Member, or sand within the Crag Group might be prone to run if intersected by pit or borehole. This appears to be the case on this site where water is present and perched within the sands and gravels overlying either the Lowestoft Till Member or a clayey phase of the Lowestoft Glacigenic Formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Potential Hazards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Limited potential for groundwater flooding to occur below ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Land Gas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unlikely to encounter gas from bedrock and coal mining; unlikely to encounter gas from peat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of protective measures: NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Hydrogeology

In lowland areas of the UK with little topographic variation, groundwater is likely to be found at shallow depths of only a few metres. Water table fluctuations will be small as they will be constrained by the ground surface and the base level of the local perennial streams and rivers.
In upland areas, precipitation is usually high and the dominantly metamorphic and igneous rocks often have relatively shallow groundwater levels.

This is due to preferential groundwater storage in near-surface weathered and fractured zones with limited drainage into the underlying un-weathered lower permeability rock. Exceptions can occur where higher permeability rocks, such as sandstone or limestone, allow faster through flow of groundwater towards the nearest stream or other discharge point.

Perched water tables occur where a less permeable horizon (e.g. a clay layer) in an otherwise permeable sequence retains a body of groundwater above the level of the regional water table. They usually occur at shallow depths in alluvial and glacial sediments and can be difficult to identify or to delimit.

An aquifer becomes confined when it is overlain by a less permeable horizon that restricts the upward movement of groundwater. When this less permeable horizon is penetrated (e.g. by drilling), the groundwater level rises above where struck to a level controlled by the hydrostatic pressure. If this is above ground level, overflowing artesian conditions will be encountered. Confined conditions should be anticipated, where possible, in order to plan for the problems they can generate.

Individual sites will always require more detailed assessments to determine the specific impact on groundwater resources. The maps represent conditions only at the ground surface. Where the soil and/or underlying formations have been disturbed or removed the vulnerability class may have been changed and site specific data will be required. Sites in urban areas and restored or current mineral workings are classified as having high (urban) soil leaching potential until proved otherwise.

Evidence from shallow boreholes in the superficial deposits in the area (within half a kilometre of the site) indicate that water is likely to be struck at shallow depths, if permeable deposits are encountered. Where permeable deposits underlie low permeability deposits the water level may rise above the level at which it is first struck. None of the borehole records describe overflowing water levels, but most of them were located at slightly higher ground elevations (about 55 m above OD) than the site.

The Crag and Chalk aquifers can be in hydraulic continuity, depending on whether clay layers are present in the Crag Group. The site lies close to a Chalk groundwater divide, so there is some uncertainty over the direction of groundwater flow in the Chalk aquifer at depth, it could be westwards towards the River Tas, but may be north or eastwards.

The hydrological information for the site is summarised in Table 3.
### Table 3. Hydrogeology summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geological unit</th>
<th>Groundwater potential</th>
<th>Water level and strikes</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>EA groundwater vulnerability classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head deposits (if present).</td>
<td>Typically low permeability, but may be permeable in part.</td>
<td>No data.</td>
<td>No data.</td>
<td>Not classified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft Formation, upper sand and gravel.</td>
<td>Highly permeable, intergranular flow.</td>
<td>Shallow groundwater may be encountered within 2m of the surface.</td>
<td>No data but likely to be hard and contain some iron.</td>
<td>Secondary aquifer with high vulnerability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft Formation, Lowestoft Till Member.</td>
<td>Generally low permeability but may contain some water if contains any coarser – grained, more permeable horizons.</td>
<td>Shallow groundwater may be encountered within 2m of the ground surface.</td>
<td>Hard and often iron rich.</td>
<td>Secondary aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crag Group</td>
<td>Highly permeable, intergranular flow.</td>
<td>Will be saturated. Water may rise above the level where first struck.</td>
<td>Hard and typically iron rich.</td>
<td>Principal aquifer with low vulnerability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation (White Chalk subgroup).</td>
<td>Important regional aquifer, fracture flow.</td>
<td>Rest water level about 10 – 15m above OD, i.e. water may rise above where first struck (depending on depth to rockhead).</td>
<td>Hard with chloride ion concentration less than 50 mg/l, and in places iron rich</td>
<td>Principal aquifer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5.1 Groundwater vulnerability

This section reviews all components of hydrology, geology and top soil surface water drainage to assess risk notably to groundwater.

### 4.5.2 Source Protection Zones

The position of the site relative to current groundwater protection zones is shown in Figure 11.
Source Protection Zones (SPZs) provide an indication of the risk to groundwater supplies that may result from potentially polluting activities and accidental releases of pollutants. Generally the closer the activity or release is to a groundwater source the greater the risk. Three zones (an inner, outer and total catchment) are usually defined although a fourth zone (zone of special interest) is occasionally defined.

The Agency has subdivided groundwater source catchments into four zones. Two of these are determined by the travel time of potential pollutants, the third by the source catchment area itself and the fourth is a "Zone of Special Interest". This fourth zone highlights areas where known local conditions mean that potentially polluting activities could impact on a groundwater source even though the area is outside the normal catchment of that source.

- **Zone I (Inner Protection Zone)** - This zone is defined by a travel time of 50-days or less from any point within the zone at, or below, the water table. Additionally, the zone has, as a minimum, a 50-meter radius. It is based principally on biological decay criteria and is designed to protect against the transmission of toxic chemicals and water-borne disease.
- **Zone II (Outer Protection Zone)** - This zone is defined by the 400-day travel time, or 25% of the source catchment area, whichever is larger. The travel time is derived from consideration of the minimum time required to provide delay, dilution and attenuation of slowly degrading pollutants.
- **Zone III (Total catchment)** - This zone is defined as the total area needed to support the abstraction or discharge from the protected groundwater source.
- **Zone of Special Interest** - For some groundwater sources an additional Zone of Special Interest may be defined. These zones highlight areas (mainly on non-aquifers) where known local conditions mean that potentially polluting activities could impact on a groundwater source even though the area is outside the normal catchment of that source.

The proposed development site lies outside of any source protection zones and though SPZ’s do occur to the north and west, they are over 250 m from the site.
4.5.3 Aquifer vulnerability

The Groundwater Vulnerability maps are produced at 1:100,000 scale. They show, by means of colour coding, those areas of the country where water-bearing rocks (aquifers) are present. They also show the vulnerability of groundwater to pollution. The aquifers are classified into major, minor and non-aquifers according to their physical properties and their consequent value as a resource.

The classification of the land surface reflects the ability of contaminants to leach through the covering soils and pose a potential risk to groundwater at depth. The maps also indicate areas where the presence of low permeability drift may provide additional groundwater protection.

These maps can therefore be used for an initial screening assessment of the vulnerability of groundwater to contaminants applied to the surface of the ground. They do not provide all information relevant to the determination of vulnerability, such as the depth to water table or nature of the drift deposits. Site-specific information would always be needed for a detailed assessment of vulnerability at a given location. The original groundwater vulnerability maps were produced some time ago.

Groundwater Vulnerability Maps provide information on how significant the ground waters are likely to be and if they are vulnerable to pollution occurring at the land surface. The maps have descriptions on them to explain the different aquifer and soil types.

Areas shown as "major aquifers" have strategic significance for water resource; they often support large abstractions for the public water supply.

Minor aquifers have a more localised significance to domestic, agricultural and industrial users (although they may still be used for drinking water). Non-aquifers do not store significant amounts of groundwater. However, in some areas they can support local supplies: e.g. small springs feeding individual properties.

Figure 12. Superficial drift aquifer designation associated with the site
Groundwater Vulnerability Maps provide information on how significant the ground waters are likely to be and if they are vulnerable to pollution occurring at the land surface. The maps have descriptions on them to explain the different aquifer and soil types. Areas shown as "major aquifers" have strategic significance for water resources, they often support large abstractions for the public water supply. Minor aquifers have a more localised significance to domestic, agricultural and industrial users (although they may still be used for drinking water). Non-aquifers do not store significant amounts of groundwater. However, in some areas they can support local supplies: e.g. small springs feeding individual properties.

Major and minor aquifers may be important in contributing to the base-flow of streams and rivers. The maps show where groundwater is protected from above by rocks with a low permeability, such as glacial clay. They also show the characteristics of the soil above.

Superficial drift deposits which overlay the solid geological strata can sometimes be substantial in thickness. They are often variable in composition changing from highly permeable outwash gravels to low permeability clays over short distances both laterally and vertically. The presence of permeable drift deposits is recognised as Minor Aquifers except where these overlie a Major Aquifer and they then assume the status of a Major Aquifer.

The site is partially over a Secondary A Aquifer and a Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifer associated with the superficial deposits and over a Principal Aquifer in respect to the bedrock. The groundwater
vulnerability associated with this site is considered to be intermediate with reference to the Principal Aquifer. The site is not within a drinking water safeguard zone nor is it within a water Nitrate Vulnerable Zone associated with either surface or groundwater.

4.5.4 Flood risk

The site is within Flood Zone 1 land which is very low risk – less than 1 in 1000 in any given year (Figure 15). The site is not covered by flood warnings issued by the Environment Agency.

If areas of impermeable surfaces such as buildings, roads etc. are constructed on a greenfield site, a surface water management system designed in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS) will be required.

4.5.5 Wells in the vicinity of the site

If areas of impermeable surfaces such as buildings, roads etc. are constructed on a greenfield site, a surface water management system designed in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS) will be required.

4.5.5 Wells in the vicinity of the site

Figure 16. Well records

Number of records within a 300 m radius of the centre of the site: 0

Search area indicated in red
4.5.6 Boreholes in the vicinity of the site

Figure 17. Borehole records
Number of records within a 300 m radius of the centre of the site: 4
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4.6 Meteorological data

The agro climatic index number for this site is 24 with a mean annual rainfall of 623 mm, the Standard Average Annual Rainfall (SAAR) for the site itself is 600 mm.

4.7 Surface water issues

The site generally has a very low risk of surface water flooding within it (less than 0.1% chance of surface water flooding occurring in any year) however a strip running through the centre of the site has a low risk of surface water flooding (less than 1% chance in any year). Any works which might increase the risk of flooding on or off site need to be identified and the risks assessed and mitigated using a suitable SUDS compliant approach.

Figure 18. Map of Surface Water Flood Risk
5.0 Pollutant risk

Due to the approximately 12 - 15 per annum number of full burials at the site, the cumulative ammoniacal nitrogen concentrations are likely to be high with similar levels of total organic compounds (TOC).

Pathogens

There has been some evidence from recent studies of the occurrence of Enterococci and Clostridium bacteria found in drainage water of cemeteries. Enterococci are bacteria that are commonly found in the bowel of normal healthy individuals. They can cause a range of illnesses including urinary tract infections, bacteraemia (blood stream infections) and wound infections.

The two most common species of Enterococci are E. faecalis and E. faecium. During the mid-1980s, enterococci with resistance to glycopeptide antibiotics such as vancomycin and teicoplanin emerged, termed glycopeptide-resistant enterococci (GRE). Most GRE are E. faecium.

Due to the nature of the soil and geomorphology, there is unlikely to be much movement of pathogenic organisms, notably Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Faecal streptococci, even given the free draining nature of the sands and gravels. Pathogens tend to be short lived away from the host and if there is no immediate ground water risk or potable well supply, the risk may be considered acceptably low. In this case however, perched water and shallow groundwater is at or close to burial depth and as a result, any water which gathers around a burial is highly likely to become contaminated with pathogenic micro-organisms, though the risk will decline over time. Thus, the greatest risk would be present if re-opening a grave when the burial was less than 1 – 2 years old. Any water encountered should be pumped to a tanker and disposed of at a suitably licensed waste facility. It should not be discharged over the surface. All gravediggers should also wear suitable PPE. Given the shallow depth of water on this site, EA standing advice on burials has not been met and thus without mitigation the EA may determine the risk to groundwater is too significant for burials to continue at this site. Even if suitable mitigation can be carried out, the EA may deem the residual risk too high to allow burials, though the low number of annual burials may reduce overall risk sufficiently to continue to use the site where ground conditions allow.

6.0 Depth of burial

The key practical limitation to burial depth is the incidence of running sands at or close to burial depth. Where running sands occur within grave depth then even shuttering and supports are unlikely to prevent sidewall collapse, making burials impossible. Running conditions within the extension area were variable, so some places may be suitable for burials but the location of such areas cannot be predicted and may vary according to the time of year. As noted above, the site does not meet EA standing advice on burials in respect to depth to groundwater and as a result Agency advice should be sought in relation to using the site in the future for burials and whether the site, following mitigation works (if any are possible), may be suitable for use.

7.0 Archaeology

It is recommended that consultation with the county archaeological team be undertaken to ascertain any archaeological interest in the area.
8.0 Risk evaluation

Assessment of general hazards
The potential of a number of pollutant pathways and the degree of associated risk assessed numerically on a 0-10 score with 10 being the highest risk is shown in Table 4. From the resultant data, the final values are assessed against burial number and a determinant of risk calculated from EA flow charts and nomographs.

Table 4. Summary of pollution risk associated with the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Assessment High, moderate, Low</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burials per annum</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Expected to be around 12-15 per annum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift / superficial data</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Present as sands and gravels</td>
<td>8-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift thickness</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Around 3-5m</td>
<td>6-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to water course</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>The nearest water course is 15 m away</td>
<td>10-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to land drains</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>The land is unlikely to be drained</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth to Water Table</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Water table encountered within 2.5m of the surface</td>
<td>10-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Wells or potable water source</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>No wells within 500 m radius</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow mechanism</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intergranular flow sands and gravels</td>
<td>8-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifers</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Secondary A aquifer</td>
<td>6-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPZ</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Outside Zone 3</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met data</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Annual rainfall moderate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to housing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Residential housing in close proximity of the site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None observed but will require County</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Archaeologist assessment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 is assessed using the groundwater vulnerability-ranking criteria in Table 5. The total score comes to 54-45 and is considered as moderate to high risk. These data are then assessed against the burial rate of 60 per annum on the groundwater risk nomograph p.37 of PP223. The final assessment of risk for this site according to the nomograph (Figure 19), would class it as being Moderate.
Table 5. Groundwater ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Very Low 2-1</th>
<th>Low 4-3</th>
<th>Moderate 6-5</th>
<th>High 8-7</th>
<th>Very High 10-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drift Type</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Silty sand</td>
<td>Sand/gravel</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift Thickness</td>
<td>&gt;5 m</td>
<td>&gt;3-5 m</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>0-3 m</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth to water Table</td>
<td>&gt;25 m</td>
<td>11 – 25 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td>5 – 9 m</td>
<td>&lt;5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow mechanism</td>
<td>Intergranular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fissured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 250 m from private potable supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift Type</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Silty sand</td>
<td>Sand/gravel</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift Thickness</td>
<td>&gt;5 m</td>
<td>&gt;3-5 m</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>0-3 m</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth to water Table</td>
<td>&gt;25 m</td>
<td>11 – 25 m</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td>5 – 9 m</td>
<td>&lt;5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow mechanism</td>
<td>Intergranular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fissured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 250 m from private potable supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer type</td>
<td>Non Aquifer</td>
<td>Minor aquifer</td>
<td>Major aquifer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractions and SPZs</td>
<td>Outside Zone 3</td>
<td>Within Zone 3</td>
<td>Close to boundary of Zone 2</td>
<td>Within Zone 2</td>
<td>Within Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water courses and springs</td>
<td>&gt;100 m</td>
<td>&gt;50 &lt;70 m</td>
<td>&gt;30 &lt;50 m</td>
<td>&lt;30 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drains</td>
<td>&gt;100 m</td>
<td>&gt;40 &lt;100 m</td>
<td>30 – 40 m</td>
<td>&gt;10 &lt;30 m</td>
<td>&lt;10 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Groundwater risk nomograph
9.0 Conclusion

The site is considered to be moderate risk with the risk mainly attributed to the presence of shallow groundwater, the proximity to surface waters and the permeable nature of the superficial deposits. This is mitigated somewhat by low predicted burial numbers. Most significantly, the groundwater is within 1m of the base of a normal grave over much of the site. This contravenes EA standing advice for cemeteries which requires at least 1m of dry ground beneath the base of a grave. Furthermore, the presence of perched water within layers of sands and gravels further up the soil profile gave rise to running sand conditions in two of the pits excavated making it practically very difficult, if not impossible, to dig stable graves in such conditions. Though the occurrence of such layers will vary over the site, and may improve in summer, it adds complexity to managing this site efficiently.

A source of pollutants is present in the form of burials with the nearest receptor in the form of groundwater within as little as 0.6m under a normal double grave or 1m under a single grave. This groundwater will feed the nearby stream and given the free-draining nature of the subsoil materials the rate of transfer of pollutants from the cemetery to the stream could be fast. This stream is the most sensitive receptor as there are no wells recorded near to the site and the groundwater in question is associated with local superficial deposits rather than strategically important groundwater supplies. That said, ammonium is a major pollutant of surface waters and thus surface waters fed by this aquifer may be at increased risk due to burials in this cemetery. The risk can be more accurately defined by undertaking flux modelling for ammonium and nitrate at this site.

The overall risk posed by the site is mitigated somewhat by the low burials numbers, thus total loading each year is also likely to be low and the EA may deem this to be acceptable. It is important to discuss the finding of this assessment with the EA at the earliest opportunity in order to develop a mitigation strategy that protects sensitive receptors. Such mitigation may be in the form of deep drainage to de-water the soil to a depth of at least 1m below a normal double grave, and in so doing also reduce the risk of running conditions occurring at burial depth by removing perched water. The problem with this approach on this site is a lack of space to move the machinery around the site as needed, a lack of access and a lack of space to treat any such water effectively ahead of discharge.

By way of grave-specific mitigation, the addition of Zeolitic compounds could be added to the base of graves. Zeolites such as Clinoptilolite have CEC values exceeding 150 meq/l and when placed in the base of the grave will absorb significant amounts of Ammonium via cation exchange processes in addition to the existing capacity of the clay soil (Rozic et al 2009).

Calculations would suggest that at least 90% of the human nitrogen (1.8 kg) release could be absorbed by 150 kg of Clinoptilolite or a high CEC clay material such as Bentonite.

Based on the above it is recommended that contact be made with the local Groundwater Protection Team as soon as possible in order to get more advice from the EA and determine the best way to manage this site. There is a risk that the EA may deem the site too risky to allow burials to continue and that if no suitable remediation options are found, the cemetery may need to be closed.
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Cemetery Development Services (CDS) Terms and Conditions for the Supply of Services

Interpretation

In these Conditions:

AGREED FEE means the charges agreed between CDS and the Client in relation to the Specified Service.

CLIENT means the person named on the Specification Sheet for whom CDS has agreed to provide the Specified Service in accordance with these Conditions.

CONTACT means the contract for the provision of the Specified Service in these Conditions.

DOCUMENT includes, in addition to a document in writing, any map, plan, graph, drawing or photograph, any film, negative, tape or other device embodying visual images and any disc, tape or other device embodying any other data.

INPUT MATERIAL means any Documents or other materials, and any data or other information provided by the Client relating to the Specified Service.

OUTPUT MATERIAL means any Documents or other materials, and any data or other information provided by CDS relating to the Specified Service.

SPECIFICATION SHEET means the sheet to which these Conditions are appended.

SPECIFIED SERVICE means the service relating to geographical surveys of land to be provided by CDS for the Client and referred to in the Specification Sheet.

CDS means CDS (registered in England under number 05088927) or its subsidiary as stated on the Specification Sheet.

The headings in these Conditions are for convenience only and shall not affect their interpretation.

Supply of the Specified Service

CDS shall provide the Specified Service to the Client subject to these Conditions. Any changes or additions to the Specified Service or these Conditions must be agreed in writing by CDS and the Client.

The Client shall allow CDS adequate access to its property at reasonable times and for so long as is necessary to enable CDS to provide the Specified Service in accordance with the Contract.

CDS shall not be liable for any delay or damage, costs, expenses or other claims for compensation arising from any Input Material or instructions supplied by the Client which are incorrect, incorrect, illegible, out of sequence or in the wrong form, or arising from their late arrival or non-arrival, or any other fault of the Client.

The Client shall ensure the accuracy of all Input Material.

CDS shall have no liability for any loss or damage, however caused, to the Input Material. All Output Material shall be at the sole risk of the Client from the time of delivery to or on the order of the Client.

The Specified Service shall be provided in accordance with the Specification Sheet subject to these Conditions.

Further details about the Specified Service, and advice or recommendations about its provision or utilisation, which are not given in CDS’s brochure or other promotional literature, may be made available on written request.

CDS may correct any typographical or other errors or omissions in any brochure, promotional literature, quotation or other document relating to the provision of the Specified Service without any liability to the Client.

CDS may at any time without notifying the Client make any changes to the Specified Service which are necessary to comply with any applicable safety or other statutory requirements, or which do not materially affect the nature or quality of the Specified Service.

Charges

Subject to any special terms agreed, the Client shall pay the Agreed Fee and any additional sums which are agreed between CDS and the Client for the provision of the Specified Service or which, in CDS’s sole discretion, are reasonably incurred as a result of the Client’s instructions or lack of instructions, the inaccuracy of any Input Material or any other cause attributable to the Client.

All charges quoted to the Client for the provision of the Specified Service are exclusive of any Value Added Tax, and without any set-off or other deduction (together with any applicable Value Added Tax, and without any set-off or other deduction) within 30 days of the date of CDS’s invoice.

Any additional sums payable shall be paid by the Client (together with any applicable Value Added Tax, and without any set-off or other deduction) within 30 days of the date of CDS’s invoice.

If payment is not made on the due date, CDS shall be entitled, without limiting any other rights it may have, to charge interest on the outstanding amount (both before and after any judgment) at the rate of 4% above the base rate from time to time of Barclays Bank plc from the due date until the outstanding amount is paid in full.

Rights in Input Material and Output Material

The property and any copyright or other intellectual property rights in:

any Input Material shall belong to the Client;

any Output Material and any amendments or variations to the Input Material made by CDS shall, unless otherwise agreed in writing between the Client and CDS, belong to, subject only to the right of the Client to use the Output Material for the purposes of utilising the Specified Service,

any Output Material or other information provided by the Client which is so designated by the Client and any Output Material shall be kept confidential by CDS, and all Output Material or other information provided by CDS which is so designated by CDS shall be kept confidential by the Client, but the foregoing shall not apply to any Documents or other materials, data or other information which are public knowledge at the time when they are so provided by either party, and shall cease to apply if at any future time they become public knowledge through no fault of the other party.

The Client warrants that any Input Material and its use by CDS for the purpose of providing the Specified Service shall not infringe the copyright or other rights of any third party, and the Client shall indemnify CDS against any loss, damages, costs, expenses or other claims arising from any such infringement.

Warranties and Liability

Warranties to the Client that the Specified Service will be provided using reasonable care and skill and as far as reasonably possible, in accordance with the Specification and at the intervals and within the times referred to in the Specification Sheet. Where CDS supplies in connection with the provision of the Specified Service any goods (including Output Material) supplied by a third party, CDS does not give any warranty, guarantee or other term as to their quality, fitness for purpose or otherwise.

but shall, where possible, assign to the Client the benefit of any warranty, guarantee or indemnity given by the person supplying the goods to CDS.

CDS shall have no liability to the Client for any loss, damage, costs, expenses or other claims for compensation arising from any Input Material or instructions supplied by the Client which are incomplete, incorrect, illegible, out of sequence or in the wrong form, or arising from their late arrival or non-arrival, or any other fault of the Client.

Except in respect of death or personal injury caused by CDS’s negligence, or as expressly provided in these Conditions, CDS shall not be liable to the Client by reason of any representation (unless fraudulent), or any implied warranty, condition or other term, or any duty at common law, or under the express terms of the Contract, for any loss of profit or any indirect, special or consequential loss, damage, costs, expenses or other claims (whether caused by the negligence of CDS, its servants or agents or otherwise) which arise out of or in connection with the provision of the Specified Service or their use by the Client, and the entire liability of CDS under or in connection with the Contract shall not exceed the amount of CDS’s charges for the provision of the Specified Service, except as expressly provided in these Conditions.

CDS shall not be liable to the Client or be deemed to be in breach of the Contract by reason of any delay in performing, or any failure to perform, any of CDS’s obligations in relation to the Specified Service, if the delay or failure was due to any cause beyond CDS’s reasonable control.

Termination

Either party may (without limiting any other remedy) at any time terminate the Contract by giving written notice to the other if the other commits any breach of these Conditions and (if capable of remedy) fails to remedy the breach within 30 days after being required by written notice to do so.

Insolvency of Client

This clause applies if:

the Client makes any voluntary arrangement with its creditors (or (being an individual or firm) becomes bankrupt or (being a company) becomes subject to an administration order or goes into liquidation (otherwise than for the purposes of amalgamation or reconstruction); or

an encumbrancer takes possession, or a receiver is appointed, of any of the property or assets of the Client;

or

the Client ceases, or threatens to cease, to carry on business;

or

CDS reasonably apprehends that any of the events mentioned above is about to occur in relation to the Client and notifies the Client accordingly.

If this clause applies then, without prejudice to any other right or remedy available to CDS, CDS shall be entitled to cancel the Contract or suspend any further provision of services under the Contract without any liability to the Client, and if the Services have been provided but not paid for the price shall become immediately due and payable notwithstanding any previous agreement or arrangement to the contrary.

General

These Conditions (together with the terms, if any, set out in the Specification Sheet) constitute the entire agreement between the parties, supersede any previous agreement or understanding and may not be varied except in writing between the parties. All other terms and conditions, express or implied by statute or otherwise, are excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law.

Any notice required or permitted to be given by either party to the other under these Conditions shall be in writing addressed to the other party at its registered office or principal place of business or such other address as may at the relevant time have been notified pursuant to this provision to the party giving the notice.

No failure or delay by either party in exercising any of its rights under the Contract shall be deemed to be a waiver of that right, and no waiver by either party of any breach of the Contract by the other shall be considered as a waiver of any subsequent breach of the same or any other provision.

If any provision of these Conditions is held by any competent authority to be invalid or unenforceable in whole or in part, the validity of the other provisions of these Conditions and the remainder of the provision in question shall not be affected.

Any dispute arising under or in connection with these Conditions or the provision of the Specified Service shall be referred to arbitration by a single arbitrator appointed by agreement or (in default) nominated on the application of either party by the President for the time being of Institute of Arbitrators.

English law shall apply to the Contract, and the parties agree to submit to the non-exclusive jurisdiction of the English courts.

Cemetery Development Services - Terms and Conditions
Proposal: Devlin Drive Hedge

Over the last three years I have received an increasing number of complaints about the hedge along Devlin Drive, on the right as you drive towards The Ridings. It is on Highways land, between the verge and the pavement, and was mistakenly taken on by Norfolk County Council (confirmed in an email dated 1st July 2015 noting that Environmental Services had received the commuted sum from Norfolk Homes, and promising ongoing maintenance).

Since that time, personnel in Norfolk County Council change and this information is lost, although I have it in writing. NCC has a reluctance to maintain the hedge, despite owning it, and the nettles, brambles and overgrown areas are an increasing nuisance.

My proposal is that, in a similar style to the verge cutting delegated agreement, Poringland Parish Council lobbies Norfolk County Council to set up a delegated agreement to maintain the hedge twice per year, including removal of growth underneath, for an agreed sum per year. This would be a rolling year on year delegated agreement, with the option to withdraw at any time. It would solve the problem of this scruffy area which visually ruins an otherwise very smart area of the village.

For Norfolk County Council, this is ‘thinking outside the box’ and they are currently reluctant to do something new – however my thinking is that it’s a problem for them, an eyesore for us, and just because there isn’t a template, doesn’t mean the Councils can’t write one between them. Localism is about devolving services to the local level, and this seems to be an ideal opportunity. County Councillor Vic Thompson supports this proposal, and I would be prepared to take it to senior levels in Norfolk County Council to look at it.

As it stands, the hedge will need significant initial maintenance as it has been neglected for two years. I have received a quotation for an initial cut at a cost of just under £1,000, and then ongoing maintenance at a cost of £600 per cut (two cuts per annum suggested).

My proposal to Norfolk County Council would be an initial agreement to fund the £1,000 cut to deal with the neglect, and then an annual delegated agreement at £1,200 (increases linked to RPI) to undertake the cuts.

This report recommends approval of the above approach, and asks Councillors agree that the Clerk can negotiate with Norfolk County Council on this matter.

Catherine Moore
Parish Clerk
June 2018