

GARFF PARISH DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

Wednesday 15th September 2021, 7.00 pm

Laxey Football Club Function Room

Minutes of the Meeting

Present: Ms M. Christian, Mr S. Clague, Ms A. Creer, Mrs M. Fargher, Mr T. Kenyon, Mr P. Kinnish, Mrs J. Pinson, Mr S. Ryzak, Mr J. Smith,

In Attendance: Mr P. Burgess, Clerk, Mr M. Royle, Deputy Clerk/RFO

Apologies: All present

At 7.00pm From Manx Utilities: Mr. A. Dobbins (Executive Director MU), Mr T. Woakes (Head of Sewerage MU), Mr I. George (Arcadis, Project Director for delivering works at Peel & Laxey).

7.00pm Private Session *(released by mutual agreement)*

To open the meeting and request that Members consider this agenda and declare any interest that they may, or may be perceived to have, in its business.

MF advised that she received posts on social media from the B4 Laxey Group. AC advised that she also received posts from the Group. MC advised that she had attended a B4L meeting recently to gather information. MR advised that the officers recommended that these matters were not of a significance that the Members should withdraw from discussion or the room. Mr Dobbins advised that MU were aware of the B4L Group and had invited them in to contribute to the current investigative process. This was noted by Members.

JS arrived from a previous meeting at 19.04pm.

MF welcomed the representatives from MU to the meeting. Mr Dobbins, Mr Woakes, and Mr George introduced themselves and briefly indicated their roles. PK clarified that Arcadis were employed by MU. Mr Dobbins stated that he felt that everyone wanted the same outcome that was to finally solve the situation in which raw sewage was being discharged into the Bay.

Mr George gave a presentation on progress into the investigations into the options for Laxey Bay; how options and sites were being selected, etc. He explained details of the Bathing Water Directive. He advised that the 'Good' standard had been set as the minimum standard that should be achieved in Laxey Bay. This meant that there should be no more than three significant storm 'over-spills' per bathing season, each of above 50 cubic metres of dilute sewage into the waters. He also added clarification that currently there's in excess of three spills per bathing season through the current outfall; he confirmed that currently there were about 30 'over-spills' per season. He stated that this level of 'over-spill' would continue if the previously proposed sewage plant had been implemented and Mr Dobbins clarified that the same degree of storm 'spills' would occur even if a pump away option was chosen. This was because of the nature of the Victorian piping system that underpinned the whole village and due to the heavily incised topography of the settlement. Mr Woakes stated that the storm 'over-spills' would occur at times of heavy rains as storm water also used the whole system in Laxey.

Mr George added that, even though the number of spills could not be reduced due to these factors, an additional Ultra Violet system would be installed on the outflow which would offset the effect of the number of storm 'over-spills' whichever option was eventually selected. Mr Woakes outlined the nature of the permissions from DEFA in regard to these 'over-spills' so that it did not impact on the quality of the bathing water. SC stated that "our experts had stated that UV treatment did not work". Mr Woakes advised that MU's experts and practical evidence from elsewhere indicated that this was an effective method of treating sewage in these situations. Mr Dobbins stated that MU would be more than happy to see the documentation from the experts if it were supplied. JP stated that she assumed SC didn't mean the Commissioners' expert. SC said "no". Mr George stated that a large storage tank and associated plant would be required at the Cairns site in Laxey whichever option was chosen; this would be to control the outfall, particularly during storms. He advised that at Baldrine modelling had shown that the UV

treatment would not be required to maintain the Good standard. MC asked for clarification of this; Mr Woakes advised that the flow was diffuse and there was much less surface water in this area than in Laxey where the system was combined with surface water. AC asked where this fitted in with the UNESCO Biosphere status. Mr Dobbins advised that they were regulated by DEFA and if it did not meet the standard set, they would not be licensed to discharge.

Mr George commented on the potential options that were being assessed following refusal of the first proposal at the planning stage. Broadly these were, Laxey with its own treatment site, Baldrine with its own treatment site, a combined solution for the two areas in which some pumping would take place, and a full pump-away option to Meary Veg. He referred to the 'call for sites' process that had been undertaken earlier in the year and advised that other sites had also been considered. Criteria were being applied to all these to assess the options. PK questioned this 'criteria' method, adding that people with a 'genuine knowledge of the needs' should be consulted. Mr George stated that this method was now a standard recognised way of assessing construction and engineering projects.

AC asked whether the Cairns site was still being considered. Mr Dobbins advised that it was the location where all the Valley's sewers come together in one place and whatever the chosen option some infrastructure would be needed at the site. Mr Dobbins confirmed that the Cairns was still an option site.

TK asked about the route of the pipe for the pump away option. Mr George advised that it would potentially be up Old Laxey Hill and along the road to Onchan and in fields beside; a cross bay pipe option had also been considered but that had been dismissed on practical and cost grounds due to the nature of the sea bed. JP asked if the problem was not being shifted to Old Laxey Hill and other areas where pumping stations would be needed. She asked if the cross-bay option could be more closely considered. Mr George gave detail of the practical difficulties of this option which would mean huge costs. JP asked how this cost compared with the cost of building the pumping stations, digging up the roads, and getting planning permission at each pumping location. She asked would there be vibration, noise, and smell at the pumping stations some of which may be in residential areas. Mr George advised that the cross-bay option would be reported on in the final report. Mr Dobbins added that there would also be significant cost involved to pump the cross-bay pipe from sea-level up cliffs to ground level.

PK questioned the accuracy of the costings that would be produced; would they tally-up? Mr George advised that he had strong confidence in this aspect. JS asked how the projected lifespan of each option would be factored into the costings. Mr George stated that the costs would be assessed on a 50 year period for each of the options; this would compare each option correctly. The lifespan of IRBCs was discussed. Mr Woakes advised that some of the internal components had a lifespan of 25 years, but the built infrastructure would have a lifespan of up to 100 years. SC stated that the original IRIS scheme showed only two pumping stations adding that B4L were supportive of this option and would accept it.

Mr Woakes confirmed that pump away was one of the options but the original IRIS proposals were being re-assessed largely because they were only ever undertaken for a feasibility study; any subsequent design would need properly assessing and costing.

Mr Dobbins stated that MU were currently tasked with investigating and costing each option and then presenting all of them in detail to the public for their consideration and comment; it would be a transparent process, neither MU or Arcadis had any pre-conceived judgements on any of the options; the lack of such criteria based analysis had been a criticism of the previously refused planning application.

Mr George briefed Members on the consistent assessment scoring criteria and the process by which some sites had been discounted. He could not share details at this stage as there were sensitivities involving landowners, etc. He said the final detailed assessments would be published as part of any planning application, adding that they were aiming to select five sites for final, more detailed investigation. PK stated that he felt that MU needed to put a scheme before the Laxey public that they were happy with, even if this costed more. Mr Dobbins added that MU have an obligation to cost the options, put them to the community, and if the community were

in favour of a more costly option then it would be a matter for Tynwald; that would not be MU's decision. He added that he got the impression from Members in the room that the pump away option was preferable. He asked if it would be acceptable to pump away from Laxey to a site combined with the current Garwick system and then release the treated effluent into the sea close to that point. SC Stated that this would not be acceptable because the effluent would still contain human solids. Mr Dobbins stated that that was not the case as it would be treated. SC stated that the only acceptable option was to pump to Meary Veg.

JP stated that until you give me all the arguments for and against each option I will not make my mind up until I know all the facts.

AC asked about other locations where IRBCs were used and the effluent was pumped locally into the sea. Mr Woakes stated that this was done in Ramsey and at 11 other locations around the Island including at the other IRBC sites. He stated that these were at Glen Maye, Patrick, Dalby, Balladoole, Glen Mona, Corony, Port Lewaigue, Booilushag, Ballagarey and Ballaugh and at one other. Mr Woakes confirmed that Port Erin and other southern areas were linked to Meary Veg but stated that storm 'over-spill' was still discharged from the pumps and their overflow tanks that served these locations. SR asked for clarification as to whether MU would be happy to do a scheme that was more expensive if it was approved by Treasury. Mr Dobbins stated that this would be a matter for Tynwald and Treasury to consider but they would if that were the chosen option and funding was available.

There followed discussion of the Ramsey site at which odour problems had been experienced. Mr Woakes explained that no odour filtration system had been fitted at that facility, but because of the flat topography and slow speed of flow there was a problem because it was turning more septic than anticipated. This was being addressed by the installation of filtration equipment; septicity was unlikely to be an issue in Laxey he suggested as there would be a greater flow speed at Laxey due to the incised topography and the storm water flow. A Member stated that he had been told that the cost of the Ramsey filtration system was to be a million pounds. Mr Woakes stated that the actual cost of the filtration installation at Ramsey would be £250,000.

Mr George explained that in regards to the investigations into the pump-away option pumping/storage tank sites were being considered at The Cairns Site, towards the top of Old Laxey Hill, a lifting pump station would be needed in the region of Baldrine, and one in the region of Groudle Glen.

There followed discussion of some land owned by the Commissioners beside Old Laxey Hill. This would be investigated to see if it were a possible site for a pumping station. AC stated that this was near a residential area. Mr Woakes stated that in general pumping stations elsewhere were often near residential areas. He added that there were very few complaints about odour, noise, or vibration from either the current Island pump sites or the 12 Island IRBC sites.

Mr George re-stated that from October 2021 the next stage was to select five short-listed options that would undergo detailed examination in terms of Environmental Impact Assessment, design, flooding implications, and costing, etc. A preferred solution would then be recommended. Public consultation would take place in advance of any planning application.

Mr Dobbins confirmed that the possibility of a 'tidal valve' on the current outfall was being investigated. It was known that one had been fitted circa 1912 but this had been removed by the early 1950s as seen in a phot from that era. The consensus was that this would be a positive move for the short term before a full solution was found and implemented.

Mr Dobbins asked if the Commissioners would mind being referenced in a press release as having met MU to be briefed on progress. Members agreed that this was acceptable as long as it was made clear that the Commissioners had made no commitments at the meeting. There followed discussion of whether this meeting should have been in public. Mr Dobbins stated that MU felt it was a matter of courtesy that they speak to the Commissioners initially in their capacity as representatives of the community. MF asked the Board Members if there would be any objection to the information provided tonight being published in the Commissioners public minutes. There was no objection from the MU representatives.

	<i>Mr Dobbins agreed that a 4.00pm start for the consultative group meetings would be considered in order that Members with daytime employment could attend.</i>
7.45pm	<p>Presentation from representatives of The Shed Company Limited to present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. plans for refurbishment of the Changing Cubicle units on Laxey Promenade 2. proposals for 'The Shed Lounges' on the public Green adjacent to the current business. <p><i>This matter was deferred to a subsequent meeting. No discussion took place.</i></p>
8.00 pm	Public Session
116/21	Planning Matters
	Planning Applications
a)	<p>21/00992/B Ashwood Ballamenagh Road Baldrine, Erection of four detached dwellings with garages and associated access road.</p> <p><i>This application was discussed in detail. SC advised that he had sought advice from the clerks as he had a property that was around half a mile from the site. The advice received was that he should declare this, but that as the distance was so great any interest that SC had in this respect was too insignificant to withdraw from the discussion. The application was discussed. It was noted that the site was currently used as garden but was zoned in the Area Plan for development. Concerns were raised about over-intensive use of the site, the narrowness of the highway and access, visual impact, and design which was felt to be too suburban for the location. MR added that the transition from built environment to rural was a matter that the planning system sought to control through various policy. It was agreed unanimously to submit objection to the application.</i></p>
b)	<p>21/01016/B Andania Glen Road Laxey, Installation of a replacement front door.</p> <p><i>This matter was discussed. There were no objections to this application.</i></p>
c)	<p>21/01035/B Thie-Ny-Claghan Glen Road Laxey, Installation of replacement doors to front and rear elevations.</p> <p><i>This matter was discussed. There were no objections to this application.</i></p>
d)	<p>21/01059/B Strenaby Farm Lonan Church Road Laxey, Alterations and erection of stables.</p> <p><i>This matter was discussed. The report from the Authority's Officers was noted. There were no objections to this application.</i></p>
	Approval Notices (DEFA Planning Committee) <i>The following matters were noted. No further instruction.</i>
e)	21/00807/B Installation of replacement windows to front elevation, 4 Bay View Terrace Laxey – Approved 06.09.21
f)	21/00841/B Installation of a new door and replacement of existing window with 2 new windows, Maycroft Minorca Hill Laxey – Approved 02.09.21
g)	21/00336/B Alterations and erection of a two storey extension to existing public house to provide restaurant, hotel accommodation and staff manager accommodation with associated alterations to existing car park, Shore Hotel Old Laxey Hill Laxey – Approved 08.09.21
h)	21/00351/CON Registered Building consent for demolition elements to PA 21/00336/B Shore Hotel Old Laxey Hill Laxey – Approved 08.09.21
i)	21/00492/B Installation of replacement roof tiles, Barroose Cottage Barroose Lane Baldrine – Approved 08.09.21
j)	21/00770/B Alterations and erection of first floor extension to front elevation, Bramalea Highfield Drive Baldrine – Approved 09.09.21
	Refusal Notices (DEFA Planning Committee) -ntr
	Appeal Notices (DEFA Planning Committee)
	<p>20/01316/B Conversion of rear extension from residential use (class 3.3) to tourist accommodation (class 3.6) Elgin Jacks Lane Port E Vullen</p> <p><i>Original refusal decision reversed by the Minister. Application now approved. The Commissioners had submitted comment to the Appeal process in support of the applicant's case. This matter was noted.</i></p>

	Planning Enforcement (DEFA Planning and Building Control) - ntr
117/21	Approval of Minutes
	Approval of minutes of meeting of 1 st September 2021. <i>These were agreed to be a correct record. Proposed SC, Seconded AC. Resolved.</i>
118/21	Matters Arising & Other Business
	<i>There were no matters raised.</i>
119/21	General correspondence – ntr
8.15pm	Information & Training Session for Commissioners Content notes to be circulated 10.09.21.
	A training/information session for Members took place. This covered information about Local Authorities in general, Garff Sheading particularly, the Local Government Act and associated policy as contained in the Principles of Corporate Governance and Code of Conduct Document. Particular emphasis at this session was on the process of decision making, identifying when a conflict of interest was present, and the legal requirement to withdraw from the room when a conflict of interest had been declared or established unless by a vote taken by the Board for the Member to remain in the room in some capacity for all or part of that discussion. A full copy of the information provided is available on powerpoint slides for any party or member of the public by contacting the Commissioners' Office. This particular session was led by the clerks, but other supplementary sessions would be led by the Authority's Housing Manager, by the Commissioners retained Health & Safety contractor; by Jennifer Chance, Director of Planning and Building Control; by a HR professional; and a specialist professional on Equality legislation.
Private Matter	A matter in regard to residents at Coil Roi was discussed.
	The meeting closed at 9.52pm Date of next meeting: Wednesday 6 th October