

Humber, Ford & Stoke Prior Group Parish Council

DRAFT – subject to
confirmation

Minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 21 October 2014 at 7.00pm in Stoke Prior Village Hall

Present: Cllr Mike Hubbard (Chairman)
Cllr Mrs Stephanie Wilson

Cllr Peter Lefroy-Owen
Cllr Mrs Jenny Ellerton

With: Mr Philip Brown (Clerk), Mr James Hinton (applicant for 142749) and 3 members of the public.

The Chairman welcomed the applicant and other members of the public to the meeting, reminding them that the Council did not have the power to make a decision about applications; this committee was meeting to determine the Council's views to be submitted to the Planning Authority (Herefordshire Council).

PC45/14 Apologies for absence

Received: apologies for absence from Cllr Rodney Thompson.

PC46/14 Declaration of interests and dispensations

- (a) There were no declarations of interest in agenda items from members.
- (b) There were no applications for dispensations from the rules on participation by members with a disclosable pecuniary interest.

PC47/14 Minutes of 6 October 2014

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 6 October 2014 subject to deletion of the sentence "No notification of this had been sent to the Parish Council" from minute PC43/14(a).

PC48/14 Matters for report arising from the minutes

None.

PC49/14 Application 142479/F: "Land to south of Rectory Gate" [Land to SW of The Old Rectory] – Proposed new dwelling [re-submitted application]

- (a) *Received:* the application (circulated on 3 October 2014). The Chairman noted that the application was almost the same as the previous application (140116) which the Committee had supported and which had received planning consent in June 2014, but with changes to exact siting, layout and dimensions. He also noted that some of the same errors were repeated, including the incorrect description of the location, and out-of-date references and drawings of the existing site. The Chairman reported that the owners of the adjacent property, The Old Rectory, while not opposing the development in principle, continued to have serious concerns that the development might affect their foul drainage and their bore-hole water supply and had received no reassurances about this.
- (b) *Received:*
 - (i) A letter from Mr & Mrs Stovold from The Old Rectory, concerning: firstly, the spreader-pipes from their septic tank which partially run onto the development site and for which they had been advised they had a lawful easement; secondly, that any new sewage Package Treatment Plant either on the development site or replacing their own septic tank would have to comply with new Environmental Agency rules in relation to siting away from their water-supply bore-hole.
 - (ii) A letter from Janette Rowlatt of The Bury asking for a moratorium on new development applications until the drainage problems in the village had been resolved. It was noted that this was not in the power of the Parish Council (which could only submit comments on applications) and the assessment of environmental impacts of new development was a matter for the local planning authority.
- (c) *Noted:* the applicant's comments in a statement and responses to initial questions from the committee: changes were being proposed to achieve a more practical layout to the house, including a small change to the location on the site and a growth in its size. The style and design and other details remained the same as application 140116. No trees or hedges on the site would

be adversely affected by the development. The issue and details of foul-drainage would be addressed under building regulations.

- (d) *Noted:* comments from Mr & Mrs Stovold: they stressed that they had no objection to the development, but simply wished to resolve the issue of how it might affect their septic-tank drainage and water bore-hole. This was of continuing concern because of correspondence received from the applicant asking for the existing spreaders on the development site to be removed as they could be damaged during groundworks for the new house. Also, Mrs Stovold said that new Environment Agency regulations meant that the outlet of any new sewage treatment plant (either for the development or replacing their own septic tank if this were necessary) had to be at least 50m from a bore-hole, and this was not addressed in the application, although this had now been brought to the attention of the applicant's agent and the local planning authority.
- (e) *Noted:* the applicant's responses to the concerns about foul-drainage: he had no intention of disrupting the existing spreaders from the neighbouring property and would supervise the builders in this. He expressed his confidence that a sensible solution could be found to the problem, for which Mr and Mrs Stovold thanked him. The location of the Package Treatment Plant discharge had not yet been decided, and this would be done according to Building Regulations and Environment Agency rules relating to the nearby bore-hole.
- (f) *Noted in discussion:*
- The issues around the drainage on the site might be mostly private matters to be resolved between the residents concerned, but the avoidance of any possible environmental contamination was also a planning consideration.
- The Committee had supported the previous application as providing additional housing towards the target for the village in the county's draft Core Strategy, and this argument also applied to the current application.
- The incorrect location in the site description should be corrected, as this had led to misunderstanding by some residents and would cause possible future confusion.
- (g) **Resolved:** to submit the following comments: *The Council recommends approval of the application for the same reasons as it supported the earlier application (140116), subject to: (i) the application and development complying with Environment Agency regulations (including if necessary an EA Permit) concerning the nearby bore-hole on the Old Rectory land; (ii) the development respecting the rights of the adjacent property's (The Old Rectory) septic-tank spreaders in every detail, to avoid any environmental contamination.*

PC50/14 Planning Applications: matters for report

None.

The meeting closed at 8.05pm.

Signed(Chairman) Date