



## **Horsforth Town Council**

Mechanics Institute  
Town Street  
Horsforth  
Leeds  
LS18 5BL

**[admin@horsforthtowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:admin@horsforthtowncouncil.gov.uk) – [www.horsforthtowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.horsforthtowncouncil.gov.uk) – **0113 258 0988****

### **Community and Environment Committee**

**Thursday 16 June 2022**

#### **AGENDA PACK**

**Contents page overleaf**

*Distribution: Cllrs E Bromley, C Calvert, SL Dowling, SM Dowling, J Garvani,  
R Hardcastle, E Hyndes, R Jacques, P Mallott, C Sellers, T Stones*

# Table of Contents

Item 4 - minutes of the previous meeting .....	3
Item 8 - Christmas lights 2022 quote .....	7
Item 12 - Newlay Weir - request for assistance .....	9



## Horsforth Town Council

### Community and Environment Committee Minutes

3 March 2022 at 7pm

Mechanics Institute, Town Street, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5BL

**Present:**

**In the Chair:** Cllr J Garvani

Cllrs C Calvert, SL Dowling, SM Dowling, R Hardcastle, E Hyndes, T Stones

In attendance: J Sou - Clerk.

**CE/21.68-21.70** These minute numbers have been left blank intentionally.

**CE/21.71** To accept apologies and the reason for absence.

**RESOLVED:** To accept the apologies and reasons for absence from Cllrs P Mallott, R Jacques and C Sellers.

**CE/21.72** Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and other Interests.

The following non-pecuniary interests were declared

Cllr C Calvert, SM Dowling, J Garvani and R Hardcastle - Item 6.1 – know the representative speaking on behalf of Horsforth Churches Together

Cllr J Garvani – Item 6.1 – knows the representatives speaking on behalf of Horsforth Woodside Bowling Club and recommended to the club that they apply for a grant from Horsforth Town Council

**CE/21.73** To consider questions and comments from members of the public at the Chairman's discretion.

No members of the public present.

**CE/21.74** Minutes of the previous meetings

**RESOLVED:** Subject to amending to show that Cllrs R Hardcastle, R Jacques, R Jones and C Sellers were not in attendance, the minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2021 are a true record.

**CE/21.75** Grant/Sponsorship feedback

None from grant recipients but a member of the public praised the first Perfectly Pitched concert.

**CE/21.76** Grant and sponsorship Applications

Representatives from each organisation attended to present the applications.

**21.76.1. RESOLVED:** To award sponsorship of £500 to Horsforth Churches Together towards the Good Friday Walk of Witness road closure costs

Signed ..... Dated .....

## DRAFT

- 21.76.2. RESOLVED: To award a grant of £500 to Horsforth Woodside Bowling Club for security measures, improvements and replacements to fixtures and for a new sign**

**ACTION: Clerk to advise applicants of decisions.**

**CE/21.77 Good Citizen and Young Achiever Awards Scheme**

- 21.77.1. RESOLVED: Under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 to exclude members of the press and public from the meeting during this item by reason that the item will disclose the identity of individuals and information relating to them.**

- 21.77.2. RESOLVED: To award a Good Citizen award.**

**CE/21.78 Christmas Lights 2021**

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. To accept the offer from Leeds Lights of a £460 discount from 2022 Christmas lights as compensation for the outages during Christmas 2021 but Committee is disappointed that the compensation is not more given the number and frequency of motifs and lights that were not lit**
- 2. To pay the invoice of £13,282+VAT for Christmas lights 2021**

**CE/21.79 Events**

**21.79.1. The Queen's Platinum Jubilee 2022**

Members **noted** the following:

- Cllr K Firth had been appointed as the lead for the event
- Next meeting of the Events Sub-Committee is on 15 March 2022

**21.79.2. Horsforth Gala**

The Clerk has requested prices for stalls and a booking form.

**21.79.3. Any other action required**

Christmas lights and switch-on event 2022 – Events Sub-Committee to consider applying for a grant from Leeds City Council.

**CE/21.80 Band concerts**

**Noted the dates and bands booked:**

**Sunday 5 June – Otley Brass Band**

**Sunday 3 July – Guiseley Brass Band**

**Sunday 7 August – West Yorkshire Band**

**CE/21.81 Horsforth Matters**

Progress had been delayed due to illness and work commitments of the lead councillor. Further delay was now likely due to the forthcoming elections.

**CE/21.82 Jubilee Garden**

No updates reported.

Signed ..... Dated .....

**CE/21.83 Floral displays**

Two quotes relating to floral displays were considered.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. To waive the requirement for three quotes**
- 2. To accept the quote from Leeds City Council for supply, installation and watering of the Council's floral displays and for watering of community floral displays.**

**CE/21.84 Hall Park**

Friends of Hall Park had been invited to contribute to the meeting but the email had bounced back.

Councillors to provide the Clerk with the correct email address.

**CE/21.85 Litter**

It was **noted** that Rawdon Parish Council had "no littering" signs.

**ACTION: Clerk to make enquiries with the clerk at Rawdon Parish Council regarding their "no littering" signs and any permissions required.**

**CE/21.86 Items for future agenda**

Tree removal on the ring road – consultation.

**ACTION: Cllr J Garvani to let the Clerk have further details for the Clerk to raise with Leeds City Council to ensure Horsforth Town Council is consulted.**

**CE/21.87 Date of the next Meeting**

To be confirmed

Last date for agenda items: To be confirmed.

The meeting closed at 7:58pm.

*Distribution: Cllrs E Bromley, C Calvert, SL Dowling, SM Dowling, J Garvani,  
R Hardcastle, E Hyndes, R Jacques, P Mallott, C Sellers, T Stones*

Signed ..... Dated .....

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Quote from Leeds City Council for 2022 Christmas Lights**

	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>
<b>Budget for Christmas motifs, lights and trees</b>	14,300.00	14,700.00
<b>Budget for Christmas switch-on</b>	2,150.00	2,200.00

**Item****Christmas Lights as per 2021**

Installation, recovery and storage of HTC bespoke motif	150.00	157.00
Hire of x52 motifs @£230 per motif	11,388.00	11,960.00
x3 sets white flashing lights for natural trees at The Green	480.00	504.00
30m lights for 15ft cut tree The Green	480.00	466.00
30m lights for 15ft cut tree New Road Side	480.00	466.00
x2 stars at Horsforth Museum @£105 per star	219.00	210.00
x2 15ft cut trees	950.00	not yet available
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,147.00</b>	<b>13,763.00 plus VAT</b>
2021 discount		-460.00
<b>Total with discount</b>		<b>13,303.00 plus VAT</b>
<b>Christmas Switch On</b>		
Electrician	85.00	90.00

**This page is intentionally left blank**



**From:** Martin Hughes  
**Sent:** 14 April 2022 16:04  
**Subject:** RE: Newlay Weir and fish pass - next steps

I am seeking for HTC to at least form the corporate opinion that the [ ] fish pass should be removed – if nothing else happens.

---

**From:** Martin Hughes  
**Sent:** 06 April 2022 11:12  
**Subject:** Newlay Weir and fish pass - next steps

This is a formal request from me, in my role as Chair of both Newlay Conservation Society and Horsforth Civic Society, in seeking help from the Town Council to move forward in respect of matters pertaining to Newlay Weir and the now-redundant fish pass.

The Environment Agency have published the Arup report on the reasons for the collapse of the weir and in short the blame for the weir's collapse is laid at the enabling works cofferdam, which was not built to conform to the Flood Permit issued for the works. Suttles, the contractor, is responsible for the design and build of the fish pass, and this includes any enabling works, and so includes the cofferdam. Companies like Suttles should carry indemnity insurance for circumstances where the work they do causes problems during that work. This appears to be the case here. I have tried to set out some of the explanations given by Arup with extracts below.

We now need to press the Environment Agency, and others, to move ahead with the next phase of any remediations.

With the weir no longer functioning, there being no industrial need for it, and the huge cost likely required to repair it, residents' views are that the weir should be either be left to get washed away in time by the river (no cost to anyone) or that it should be consolidated in its ruined form to produce a conserved structure for historical interest (significant cost to whoever pays).

Concerning the fish pass; without the weir, the fish pass has no purpose. It is a concrete eyesore in the Newlay landscape. Residents' views are that it should be removed.

I should mention that my mailbag also has emails in it where residents want to see the weir restored fully and the fish pass made to work. However, there is a

realisation that this may be impracticable due to cost. I'd say that opinion has shifted away from this majority view, when Newlay Conservation Society did its public consultation on possible outcomes last year.

One final issue arises and that is that should the Environment Agency pay for a fish pass structure that is unfit for purpose?

It is my intention to write to all stakeholders in this matter, the others being the Environment Agency, Leeds City Council (via our local city councillors) and the two riparian owners.

I'd like the Town Council to consider this in one of their planning meetings and to bring any recommendations to full council so that the Town Council can form its view on what it thinks should happen.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Martin

---

**From:** Martin Hughes

**Sent:** 05 April 2022 17:36

**Subject:** Newlay Weir update RFI/250153 - some explained conclusions

Dear All

I have now read the Arup report (interesting that it is labelled version 2 – I wonder what version 1 said?) and felt some in-depth explanation would be worth while as to why Arup blame the cofferdam for the collapse. Also, I am now thinking about the ramifications of the report's conclusions. I am not a specialist and all I am doing is extracting bits (in smaller type face) of the report to highlight the areas detailed by Arup in the summary (which is the minimum bit of the report you should read).

Arup say that the cofferdam was not installed to the design requirements set out in the Flood Permit: -

1). Sheet piles installed too high. (We thought some were too low, and that it was daft to build a cofferdam that would fill up with water from time to time. EA's statement to me that the cofferdam "was designed to flood" was correct).

As described in Section 4.3, the piles were not installed to the level specified by the Flood Permit and as such, did not follow the proposed methodology. The permit stated that the piles should be installed 0.6m below the top of bank. In fact, some piles were installed to a level around 1m above the top of bank.

As can be seen in Figure 26 and Figure 27, most sheet piles were installed to a height greater than the stipulated 600mm below the top of the adjacent bank. It is acknowledged, however, that defining what constitutes as being the “top of bank” is problematic.

The sheet piles were in place for a period of 5 months prior to the collapse of the weir.

Images

of the construction site during ‘normal’ flow conditions show that most of the disruption to flow dynamics occurs on the interface between the sheet pile and the downstream face of weir.

## 2). Cofferdam built wider than it should have been

The (flood) permit also required that the cofferdam should not reduce the width of the channel by more than 10m. The channel width was actually reduced by 13.6 m.

As described in Section 4.2.4, the net effect of the sheet piles was to reduce the effective width of the weir crest from 55.7m to 42.1m, a reduction of 25%. This is less than the 30% stipulated by the Permit, but it protruded 13.6m into the channel, compared to the permitted 10m.

..... during higher flow events, the flow dynamic appears to change with the upstream corner of the sheet piling influencing the flow more as shown in Figure 42, forcing the main flow of the water towards the centre of the weir.

## 3). The combined effect of 1 and 2 above

The increased height and extent will have resulted in an increased impact during periods of high water levels on the weir.

With the raking angle of the sheet piles directing the main flow across the face of the weir, as shown in Figure 43, and the reduction in channel functional width by 25%, resulting in an increase in velocity over the front face of the weir of 10% (as detailed in Section 4.2.5) during

a 1 in 5 year event; it is possible that these changes have caused erosion at the toe of the front face of the weir resulting in the collapse of weir.

At high flows, the video and photographic evidence (see Figure 44) shows that flow was deflected across the front of the weir, was very turbulent and rolling waves were present. The rolling waves would not have been present without the raking piles. This circulating action, in conjunction with the force of the redirected jet of water, at a velocity 10% higher than it would have been without the piles, would have caused changes in flow patterns and focused flow in areas that it would not usually be focused. This could therefore have resulted in

erosive forces, causing toe scour that may have contributed to the collapse of the weir.

Residents felt that vibration during sheet pile insertion was likely to have weakened the structure.

It cannot be categorically stated whether vibration caused, or contributed to, the weir collapse as there is no way of accurately knowing the vulnerability of the structure, or the underlying ground, to vibration. Pre-construction photographs show degradation of the weir in the location of the fish pass before the works started although there is no evidence of degradation within the area of the breach.

The contractor, Suttles, (Suttle Projects Ltd was the appointed contractor commissioned to deliver the design and construction of the Newlay Weir Fish Pass) is notably responsible for the design and construction of the fish pass and will therefore be responsible for any enabling works, such as design and construction of the cofferdam.

I expect that the cofferdam design did conform to the Flood Permit, but Arup say that the as-built cofferdam construction did not. There is therefore a failure of the contractor to build the cofferdam to the Flood Permit specification (and probably therefore the design) and not building to the cofferdam design has caused the weir collapse.

What do we want to happen next?

I am reaching the conclusion that repairing Newlay Weir is untenable on the grounds of cost. Many have also pointed out that the function of the weir is no longer required.

The fish pass remains an eyesore and without the weir in place cannot function as intended. Many have expressed an opinion that it should be removed. My view is that it should be removed and that Suttles should make a claim on their works insurance to facilitate that.

Should the Environment Agency pay for a fish pass that is not acting as a fish pass? My view on this is no, any money paid to Suttles for the fish pass should be repaid, as the fish pass turns out to be unfit for purpose.

Who drives this forward?

The riparian owners? (those who actually own the left and right riverbank sections of the weir)

Leeds City Council?

The Environment Agency?

A combination of one or more of the above?

My next action will be to write to each of the above to gauge their views on the outcome of the report.

I'd like to have the views of those within Horsforth Civic Society and Newlay Conservation to make sure I am doing everything I should and that I continue to express any concerns or requirements you have.

I hope you find this summary of summaries useful.

Martin