

Appendix 1 - Questions taken at the meeting

Is there going to be a covenant to prevent the land being built on?

The land is well outside of the building line and so planning would not be approved. The topography would be prohibitive and there are no plans to build on it.

Could it be designated as a conservation area for use by the village once completed?

The site is Common Land and environmental planting would be possible.

If there is a large pond it would require fencing and life buoys

The details are unknown as yet as the project is still at a very early stage. It is felt that for the majority of the year the area would be a marshy area.

Will there be a second vote on the plans?

The land would remain Common Land and any proposals would have to go through planning so the general public would have the right to comment on it at that time. Should the plans not go through the land would revert to the Freeholders. The point is to help stop flooding and create a nature area.

Some flood alleviation work has already started on Metcalfe Farms and this area would be a further line of defence for water from the other side of the catchment.

Will there be blasting?

It is not thought that blasting would be necessary. Some test holes have been dug so it is known that the area can be deepened but it is unknown by how much.

Which expert has come forward to suggest Quarry Heads would be a suitable site for a flood alleviation area?

No expert has suggested this it has come out of site meetings with the NYCC team following a meeting to walk the catchment area on the MOD land. The plan would be to have leaky dams on the catchment on the MOD land reducing the water reaching Quarry Heads. The overspill would enter the pond with the overall aim of holding the majority of the surge back.

An environmental area with plantings would be an attractive area and concerned that a large attenuation pond in the middle of the field has risks.

The plan is not to build a big hole in the middle of the field but it would have to lie within the natural topography of the bowl. There will not be a large dam on the site.

Why can this not be looked at in greater detail before the land is transferred?

Because there is no money to do that. Consultants will need to be employed.

You have no consultants, you just have the MOD and Yorkshire Water

Yorkshire Water are not involved. NYCC are the ultimate authority that will make the decision.

You have one stream identified on the map when there are more underground streams and water coming off the land that rushes down the fields on the other side of the road. You will be taking the money from the Freeholders. Metcalfe Farms are building attenuation ponds at the top road and there is no evidence that this will stop the water flowing down the fields on the other side of the road

That is not the point of this meeting which is about Quarry Heads. This will not stop all the flooding but is the contribution from the village towards the wider flood alleviation work.

The Freeholders will retain all the money only the land will be transferred.

Anything that can be done should be done.

When will the Feasibility study be available?

NYCC are experiencing problems with Covid and are also working through the Unitary Authority process so are stretched. At this time all that is known is that it will be soon.

Why can the vote not be held once the study is published as being asked to vote without any information?

The vote is about passing the land over to the Parish Council for the benefit of the village so it is ready when the feasibility study is presented. If the land cannot be used for flood attenuation it will revert back to the freeholders.

Will there be something in the transfer to state that it will revert?

It will be written into the transfer as already stated.

Is there a proposal that if it cannot be used for flood alleviation to use it as an environmental area?

The parish council can work with the Freeholders to make it an environmental space with their permission but it does not belong to the parish council.

That is a debate for another day, the important thing is to stop people from suffering flood water in their houses. This is about obtaining permission to transfer the land so the parish council can apply for grants and get the project moving.

If the project does not go ahead the land will revert back to the Freeholders and approaches can then be made to the Freeholders with other ideas but the best idea is to use it to help stop the flooding.

Bellerby is one of the first villages to have a feasibility study. This was on the back of a meeting of the parish council with NYCC and Metcalfe Farms due to the progress already made at the time with the attenuation ponds at Metcalfe Farms and the proposal for an attenuation pond at Quarry Heads. The NYCC representative said immediately that the feasibility study would go ahead first based on this progress. As a result Bellerby is ahead of the other areas affected.

It is not lack of appreciation but lack of communication, people need more time

How much more communication can the parish council put out? Everything has been transparent, there has already been one vote, there have been newsletters with this information but it is up to the individual whether they read it.

Every parish council meeting is open to the public but the public does not attend. All agendas and minutes are published and the parish council try to keep people informed. If you want the information attend the meetings.

How many votes were received in the previous vote?

Paper votes: 85

Online: 162

Census population of 364 which means an alleged response of 67.8%.

Exclusion of all the online votes left 52% for & 48% against which it was felt was too close to call.

It was therefore it was decided to void the vote due to the multiple votes by some individuals.

Can the ballot be put online?

The ballot is not being put on line due to the failure of the previous vote.

The information from this meeting will be made available as soon as possible.

Any other comments?

Thank you to the parish council for all the work you do. I appreciate that you receive a lot of flak whilst people stand on the edge and criticise so thank you.

This is a race against time as another flood can happen at any time.

It is important to remember that all the parish councillors are volunteers who do their best for their village in very difficult circumstances.

Any water held back from this village during a flood crisis is very welcome. Thanks go to Metcalfe Farms for all the work they have done. This will allow extra time for people to prepare their homes with sandbags.

Metcalfe Farms have spent about £5000 on experts before approval was received for the attenuation ponds. The Quarry Heads project will have to go through this process. Nothing will happen with Quarry Heads before it is signed off by the experts.

The amount of money spent on this type of project is large and I want to know that this is not a red herring and the village does not end up in debt. So present the information as professionally as possible. It is about having the confidence that the parish council are the right people to put this forward.

We are not talking about money at this point. It is about giving the parish council the authority to look into it and get other people to produce feasibility studies etc. The parish council are not the correct people it is NYCC and the MOD. NYCC are the experts and they employ contractors that are experts as will come out of the feasibility study. All the parish council are doing is pre-emptive measures so we are ready when the report is published.

MOD are looking at flood attenuation and it is not all about ponds. Unless Metcalfe Farms have done their bit and the village has done its bit then the MOD will not do its part. It is about all doing a part to reduce the risk – team effort.

It is demonstrating to the other landowners that the village is taking the issue seriously.