

Public Document Pack

Legal and Democratic Services



To: All Members of the Strategy and Resources Committee

Dear Councillor

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - THURSDAY, 1 FEBRUARY 2018

Please find attached the following report for the meeting of the Strategy and Resources Committee to be held on Thursday, 1 February 2018. This item was not included in the original Agenda pack published previously but requires consideration as a matter of urgency for the reasons set out in the report.

8. ROSEBERY PARK POND - SILT REMOVAL (Pages 3 - 8)

The report highlights issues with the renovation of Rosebery Park Pond and requests authority to use additional funds to remove accumulated silt.

For further information, please contact Fiona Cotter, 01372 732124 or fcotter@epsom-ewell.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Beldan".

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Rosebery Park Pond - Silt Removal

Report of the:	Head of Property & Regeneration
Contact:	Tony Foxwell
Urgent Decision?(yes/no)	Yes
If yes, reason urgent decision required:	The main contract is underway on site and a decision is required urgently.
Annexes/Appendices (attached):	None
Other available papers (not attached):	N/A

Report summary

The report highlights issues with the renovation of Rosebery Park Pond and requests authority to use additional funds to remove accumulated silt.

Recommendation (s)

That the Committee:

- (1) Notes the urgent decision taken under delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman, to allocate additional funds to the project for the perimeter detail of the pond;
- (2) Agrees either: Option 1: to proceed with silt removal at an extra cost of £82,000 or Option 2: to delay works until the following year and seek their inclusion in the Capital Programme;
- (3) Should the Committee agree to proceed with Option 1 (silt removal), to approve the use of S106 funds from the agreements listed in paragraph 5.3 of the report to fund the works.

1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy

- 1.1 Supporting our community and improving the quality of life for all residents.

2 Extra works to Perimeter detail of Pond

- 2.1 The restoration of the pond in Rosebery Park is underway, after safely removing the fish and relocating them to the Stew ponds. The pond is now empty.

- 2.2 The works involve reconstructing the defective perimeter detail that had collapsed due to water damage. After commencement of works, inspection revealed the structure to be in worse condition than originally thought.
- 2.3 Prior to preparing specification documentation, when the scope of the works were being looked into, trial holes were made to investigate the perimeter construction. Unfortunately, due to the amount of fish in the pond it was not possible at that stage to drain the pond completely to inspect the entire structure. Design drawings and a specification were compiled from this exercise.
- 2.4 The proposed design was based on a fillet concrete detail with liner dressed down into the pond. As the structure has been completely undermined with water it is no longer bonded to the ground and water is flowing under the lower edge of concrete. The defective concrete and perimeter edge detail has to be removed, a new detail has been designed and agreed by the Structural Engineer and costs submitted by the main contractor.
- 2.5 This element of the works required urgent approval to avoid incurring costs through delay and lack of materials as the main contractor is already on site. It would result in disruption to the works and additional plant, materials and site set up costs of £2,800 per week as the contract is well underway. Officers therefore consulted the Chairman about the decision to allow the works to continue.
- 2.6 The additional costs for alteration to the perimeter detail of the pond are £33,000.

3 Silt Removal

- 3.1 A survey carried out in 31 October 2014 that took measurements and levels of silt within the pond area. The proposed removal of the silt was put into a 10-year maintenance plan to be addressed at some future date.
- 3.2 With the pond empty, the extent of the silt at the base of the pond is of concern and while carrying out the main construction work, the opportunity presents itself to undertake these works as well. This would also have the benefit of minimising the disruption to the local wildlife, particularly as the pond is currently empty of fish.
- 3.3 There are three methods of removing silt from ponds:
 - 3.3.1 **Mechanical Dredging** is the term generally used for the removal of silt from a water course involving the mobilisation of excavation plant and equipment. This system of removal is usually completed by either removing the water from the watercourse in order to create a terrestrial environment or by using specialised aquatic dredging machinery with modified tracks or floating pontoons.

Mechanical dredging can be carried out using excavators with standard arms and long reach arms, barges and dragline excavators. The most popular tend to be excavators. Using excavators for dredging means you have to find a way of removing the material.

3.3.2 Pumping: The benefit of silt pumping is that the majority of the work can be completed on water. No bulk moving needs to take place, as is the case with mechanical dredging, and this reduces damage to the ground. Silt pumping can be carried out with the use of excavators to lift the pump in and out of the area, with the use of floating craft such as floating diggers, pontoons or boats, or it can be carried out on the bank of the lake, river or pond. There are two pumping systems that can be used to remove silt from a lake or river, these are hydraulic pumps and vacuum pumps. The best ways to remove material when pumping are listed below:-

- Pumping silt into de-watering bags
- Pumping into a bund away from the waterbody
- Pumping into bunds on the banks so after the silt has dried they can be used for planting
- Pumping into tankers and removing from site to land fill

3.3.3 Chemical application - which is spread over the pond and degrades the silt over years.

- 3.4 Having investigated and discussed the options with the main contractor, local specialists and Officers, the preferred method in this instance is pumping and removing the silt from the site completely.
- 3.5 Costs have been compiled from various sub-contractors via the main contractor and Kier. Three quotations have been obtained: all are in a similar range around £82,000 - £84,000. This includes all contractors fees, plant, fencing and track pads.
- 3.6 To remove the silt, large tankers will have to drive across the park, pump out the silt and remove it from site. This operation will require additional track pads to protect the parks grounds. These will need to be hired and put in place for the duration of the works.
- 3.7 Management of the process, protection of the park & public, preparation of all Health & safety information, method of works, and risk assessments can be carried out by the Main contractor on site.
- 3.8 It is anticipated the works will take approximately 2 weeks and this can be carried out with the existing 16 week programme.

- 3.9 The costs of removal have been calculated on removal of a specific volume of approximately 400 cubic meters. The actual volume could be less or more once on site. Officers recommend a limit of 400 cubic meters as that would cover removal the majority of silt.
- 3.10 In advance of removal, a sample of the silt will be analysed to check contamination levels. If the silt reveals any contamination, the disposal cost could increase.
- 3.11 In the event of contamination, it is recommended that no more than £82,000 should be spent in the removal of the silt and this would result in a reduction in the volume removed.
- 3.12 The alternative option is to not carry out any removal of the silt and plan to remove it at a later date. This would incur further costs for site set up and management of removal, but the works could be considered as part of the capital programme. Of course, there are no fish currently in the pond and if the silt removal is considered at a later date, they would have to be removed safely prior to carrying out the works which would also be a cost consideration.

4 Financial and Manpower Implications

- 4.1 The additional costs of the silt removal could, if members wished to proceed, be funded from S106 monies. The Council holds a balance of uncommitted S106 funds for 'Environmental Improvements' of £131,000.
- 4.2 The use of the majority of these funds are not restricted to a specific location or time-limited although the use of £4,000 is restricted by the agreement for use in a specific area and therefore could not be allocated to fund these works.
- 4.3 When considering S106 contributions that could be used to fund these works, only agreements completed in respect of developments within 3 kilometres of the pond have been considered.
- 4.4 One agreement considered requires that the S106 contribution be spent on a project within 2 miles of the development in question and the location of the pond meets this criteria. Another of the agreements considered is time-limited and must be used by September 2024, a condition that would be satisfied by this project should the expenditure for these works be incurred in 2018.
- 4.5 The agreements proposed to fund the works are as follows:

S106 Ref	Address	Conditions	Balance £	Agreement time-limited?
304	West Park Hospital Phase 2	Within 2 miles	64,193	By 10/09/ 2024
146	R/O 1/3 Gibraltar Crescent	None	1,775	No
155	97 The Crescent	None	330	No
163	Plot 7, Worlds End, Woodcote End	None	839	No
166	3 Market Parade Ewell	None	607	No
179	15-17 Manor Green Road	None	1,310	No
204	Horton Park Children's Farm, Horton	None	1,856	No
250	1A Corner House Parade Ewell	None	719	No
251	Pickard House Upper High St Epsom	None	1,821	No
270	31 High Street Epsom	None	1,438	No
271	31 High Street Epsom	None	966	No
275	The Lane House, 33 Epsom Rd, Ewell	None	478	No
298	Highridge Court, Highridge Close, Epsom	None	4,286	No
285	Public Convenience High St Ewell	None	1,438	No
	Total		82,055	

4.6 **Chief Finance Officer's comments:** *The S106 funds identified in the above table are available for use for this purpose. However, this will deplete the S106 resources available for other environmental improvement priorities within the Borough. The use of available S106 funds is next due to be reviewed by the Capital Members' Group in June 2018.*

5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)

5.1 The restrictions on the use of S106 funds have been outlined in the financial implications set out in paragraph 4 above.

5.2 **Monitoring Officer's comments:** *Before any money is finally committed, Officers will ensure that the terms of the individual agreements have been complied with.*

6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications

- 6.1 The proposed works will enhance the environment of the park and pond, helping local wildlife and reducing the contaminants in the pond.

7 Partnerships

- 7.1 There are no implications for the purposes of this report.

8 Risk Assessment

- 8.1 The Risks of not carrying out the silt removal are:-
- 8.1.1 Degrading wildlife to and around the pond
 - 8.1.2 Poor quality of water remaining in the pond
 - 8.1.3 Public frustration that the works are not carried out properly
 - 8.1.4 Increased future costs of not removing the silt while the pond is currently empty

9 Conclusion and Recommendations

- 9.1 The report advises members of the urgent decision taken under delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman, to spend additional funds on the perimeter detail of the pond. The cost of these unforeseen but necessary works have increased the cost of the project by £33,000.
- 9.2 Draining the pond has also revealed the extent of the silt build and the Committee is asked to consider whether proceed with its removal at a further additional cost of £82,000 or whether to delay the works for possible inclusion in a future capital programme.

Ward(s) affected: Town Ward;