



ITEM		ACTION
	<p>GR Hearn looked at various scenarios, looking at the impact of demographics of housing on certain areas. There will be a large number of people looking to move into retirement during that period, plus a larger number of single requirements due to the increase in life expectancy.</p> <p>In order to maintain the working age population in the county, we are likely to need 14,400 new homes during that period. This is just to maintain, it does not allow any increase in numbers. To support and also allow planning growth we would need to look at higher end, of around 16,500 new homes to support an employment growth of 3.5% over that period.</p> <p>It is planned that the Hereford target will be reduced to 6,500, the rural areas will be increased to 5,300, and there will be a reduction in totals in the market towns. The strategic site at Whitecross will be deleted, and there will be a reduction in the numbers built at the Holmer site and at the Rotherwas site. The Whitecross site was for 1,500. The Rotherwas site was for 1,000 but will now be reduced to 500. A background paper is available on the website. <a href="http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/housing/planning/55855.asp">http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/housing/planning/55855.asp</a></p> <p>RP advised that the Rotherwas Enterprise Zone should be in place before end-March 2012. The core strategy does not have to be in place before it can continue. PD commented it is an industrial development, and that any phosphate levels on an industrial use have to be dealt with by the developer. DCWW have a duty to provide domestic use only.</p> <p>HP commented that there could be broad categories of industries going into the zone some who could have high water usage, i.e. drinks production. RP advised that there is B1, B2 &amp; B8 blanket permission on the site. The LDO process involves consultation with stake holders. HP felt it would be useful to be working together prior to that, so that they are aware of the issues. The Government targets for LDO are 2015. There is pressure to bring forward the development within that timeframe. They are seeking to achieve as much economic development in that time within each of the enterprise zones. Most will be five years, but others have been ten years elsewhere.</p>	
4.	<p><b>HEREFORD CITY SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS</b></p> <p>PD advised that this covers both sewage treatment works within Hereford City.</p> <p>Hereford city has an 80% NE phosphate target on the headroom capacity of the sewage treatment works. Once this headroom target is reached we will be failing NE targets. This will be in approximately 11 years time based on current targets.</p> <p>HP advised that NE had objected on the Rugby site application based on phosphate levels. She advised that it was a holding objection while asking for further information.</p> <p>DB advised that he should be able to produce a figure that will be helpful to HC in terms of when the threshold will be breached. Any development that takes place we will need to look at getting the developer to contribute to reduction in phosphate levels. Need to look at how we can progress reducing phosphate whilst allowing us to continue with development. It was suggested we could look at opportunities for using section 106's to get developer contributions. It could be an opportunity for a developer to look at storm water flow not going into the sewers.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>PD advised that in relation to de-coupled sewerage works they are unable to force developers to undertake work on land that is not owned by them, however, if it's on HC land it can be looked into. RB advised that as from the 1<sup>st</sup> October ownership of the sewer went to DCWW.</p> <p>IB raised the issue of all water going through the sewerage treatment works, including rain run-off, etc, some comes out dirtier than when it went in. DB said that there is issue with dry weather flow and peak weather flow, and queried if it is possible to work out a volume that is being separated out. HA felt that it would be good to know what the improvements are, would they still need to do.</p> <p>PD advised that Birmingham is doing some de-coupling at the moment. RB advised that they are offering a discount to any developments that reduce the amount of surface water going into the sewerage system. HA advised that they are looking at ways to reduce the amount of surface water run off getting into the system. HA commented that there are examples around but it is tricky, and it's hard to get developers to look at other ways of dealing with surface water, as it's easier and quicker for them to put it in storage tanks etc.</p> <p>RB advised that there are a new set of standards for sewers which were due to be published in April 2012 but now looking likely to come out in October 2012 as they are being slowed down by the Government.</p> <p>DB suggested that at sewerage works where DCWW have severe infiltration issues, developers could contribute to relining it to prevent the infiltration from entering the tanks, etc. it was felt that there was a need for a technical group to get together to discuss some of the issues and suggest possible solutions. IB felt that BAT was the main issue, and that there is a strong case for moving forward with that. HA felt that customer impact would be higher cost. PD felt that the issue is the time it will take. IB disagreed and felt that it should be looked at now.</p> <p>Package treatment plants – DCWW advised they are not keen. North Leicester are allowing as long as sites have a package treatment. IB advised that private treatment plants are discharging at the target phosphate levels with 0.06 at Ashby.</p> <p>DB non proliferation policy that they will step outside if there is a good argument for it. IB stated that there is an expectation that if there is a blockage in the system, once the improvements are made to the treatment works they will then discharge through them.</p> <p>HP advised that the conservation objective for Hereford is 0.03 milligrams a litre. Package treatment works to be seen as an improvement and need to be meeting this target. DB felt that the types of sewerage arrangements need to be looked at also. HA advised that Carmarthen bay has phosphate limits on 4 sewerage treatment works, and are looking at various methods including non-chemical.</p> <p>PD asked if with the use of chemical treatment, we could we get contributions from developers to go to DCWW towards the chemicals used. He queried how often the chemicals are added? HA advised that they are continually added, and it has to meet the consent. There are lots of options, so need to identify which is the best for the sites.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>IB felt we need to come up with a solution with DCWW that they are happy to run and is not going to breach their consent. DB felt it was no different to giving the money to them to separate the drainage systems. It is preferable to keep clean water clean, than to add chemicals.</p> <p>PD felt that we need to look at cost implications of these options. He queried where he would go to try and get figures for each of the options to try and ascertain which is the better option. IB suggested North East Leicestershire as they are going down similar lines at present.</p> <p>Growth funding is harder to argue. Policy funding is easier to get as the EA set targets, etc, which have to be met. DB commented that a revue of consents has already been established. NE targets are attributed to the SSSI requirements. At present the river in Hereford is passing both.</p> <p>HA queried what the financial calculations are based on. DCWW have spent millions of pounds on Hereford on work just completed in the last year with capacity for 10-15 yrs. To now be told that this is incorrect and that further headroom is required is difficult to take back. PD felt that they would need to ensure that any housing development is phased to ensure that it did not exceed the headroom within that time, and advised that it is all based on unknowns. DB commented this is not an ideal situation for anyone.</p> <p>IB advised that UK TAG are due to report in January 2012, there is a consultation period during February to April. There are some disagreements around certain types of river, and he is unsure if Wye or Lugg fall into those. It will be finalised in approximately September / October 2012. January will give an indication of the technical targets, and we should have a good idea by about April 2012. PD queried who will be involved with the consultation. IB advised that he unsure at this stage and he will let PD know once he is aware of who is involved, and the various dates.</p> <p><b>ACTION: IB TO FORWARD DETAILS TO PD CONCERNING PARTIES INVOLVED WITH THE CONSULTATION AS SOON AS MORE INFORMATION IS KNOWN</b></p> <p>PD queried the nutrient management plan. IB advised that this has been produced for NW Leicestershire, chaired by the EA, and includes water, other two districts, etc. There is an option for pumping some sewerage out of the catchment area. It is starting to get people to think about other options that are available, and encouraging people to look at developers that have a good record in this area.</p> <p>IB advised that non agriculture resources that contribute to the phosphate pollution are not including within the report. This can contribute to a large percentage of the disused contribution. DB advised that there are sizeable villages in the county where all properties have sewerage tanks, could look into connecting these to the main sewerage. RB advised that there is no legislation in place to force an individual to move from one system to another. IB advised that you can pick up these people from their water bills, the ones that pay for sewerage are linked to the system, those that only pay for water usually have a sewerage tank.</p> <p>HA advised that they are able to provide a map showing the boundaries for each of the sewerage works.</p>	<p>IB</p>

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>HP felt that winter storage and polytunnels also need to be included within the report. KS queried if all are happy to go forward with DB's idea of a technical group to discuss possible solutions. DCWW advised that they are happy to be involved.</p> <p><b>ACTION – NOMINATION REQUIRED FROM EACH ORGANISATION TO BRING THIS IDEA FORWARD.</b></p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL'S WATER REPORTS</b></p> <p><u>Water Resources</u> Fine, little chance of habitat issues, water supply will be established on a site by site basis.</p> <p><u>Water Quality</u> Small scale development, anything less than 10, deemed unlikely to have an impact, if agreed by DCWW. PD queried the availability of headroom capacity, and asked if there was a need to consult with DCWW on every application.</p> <p>PD felt that it implied that there is a habitats regulation in place for any development on the Lugg and it will require consultation. HP felt that this was the same for the Wye as it is meeting its target at present and we don't want it to begin to fail. Need to understand where the threshold is. HP felt that everything needs to be tallied up, and we need developers to advise how much P they are putting in.</p> <p>DB advised that he has primed Damon Llewellyn from Solihull that he may need to be involved.</p> <p>HA queried if Herefordshire have figures on the decline in occupation rates. IB felt the water going to the treatment works was the issue not the population figures. HA advised that they look at population levels, there could be additional properties built but no difference in the population levels. IB advised that they are only interested in the amount of water going down the DCWW pipes. All developments have different population equivalents.</p> <p>DB raised the issue of Bulmers moving a large part of their processing plant to Ledbury. Surely this means that less water is now being discharged from the previous site in Hereford. If there is a sizeable reduction from Bulmers the headroom capacity may already have been increased. They were not sure if this was taken into account in terms of the river, if not then may now be less than 80%. HA advised that if the report was done 12 months ago it will not have taken account of the phosphate improvements that they have recently been undertaken either. DB felt that there was a significant volume from Bulmers that will not be going to the sewerage now. PD queried if DCWW have population equivalents for Herefordshire, and if so can they forward it. The 80% figure included Bulmers, population figures, etc.</p> <p><b>ACTION – DCWW TO FORWARD POPULATION EQUIVALENTS TO PD</b></p> <p>IB added that the good news is that when people extend properties they tend to add bathrooms and update all existing bathrooms and new bathroom fittings are far more efficient.</p> <p>Planning applications that are more than 1km away from the river do not require any feedback. HP would like to have an understanding that an HRA needs to be done before it goes to Natural England.</p>	<p><b>DCWW</b></p>

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>DB stated that the Lugg looks very gloomy, but if we consider that there are a number of works within this catchment that do not nutrient strip at present, then as long as a development does not make matters worse the planning authority would be able to assess the HRA as equivalent.</p> <p>PD felt that as well as a need to set up technical group there is a need to set up a group to look at the nutrient management plan, or could the tech group look at that also.</p> <p>IB stated that need to decide on how to make decisions on planning applications based on nutrient management plans. NE just gives advice on what areas should be looked at. It is up to the Local Authority to write NMP, with input from NE. Need to decide timeframe and objectives of the plan, and give enough of a position to allow small scale development through while the plan is being pulled together. He suggested speaking to NW Leicestershire as they have taken legal advice on what can / cannot be done during the interim position. DB advised that the EA's place is that they may not object on applications, as there understanding is that they will not be consulted. HP felt that a paper needs to be in place setting out why EA are not commenting. IB highlighted that each organisation has a different role within the planning process. HP felt that another issue that could be in the paper is an understanding of what information is needed and where the developers need to go to get that information. PD asked if HP would be able to pull that together before the next meeting. SIMCAT stuff may mean that some parts of the paper aren't necessary anymore. HP will try and get a paper about what should be done in the interim period.</p> <p><b>ACTION – HP TO PULL TOGETHER SOME INFORMATION AND PRODUCE A PAPER WHICH ADVISES DEVELOPERS OF WHAT INFORMATION IS REQUIRED FROM THEM, AND WHERE THEY CAN GO TO FIND OUT THIS INFORMATION.</b></p> <p>HA queried if the Phosphate monitoring is continuing at present. DB advised that yes, they monitor certain areas, and then every 3 years they monitor everywhere. HA queried if this could pick up improvements from Bulmers moving. DB commented that in the present economic climate it is possible that other businesses may have gone out of business that previously had large discharge. This could also then increase the headroom. PD commented that it is something that he is looking into at present.</p> <p>Appendix 3 – HA advised that Canon Pyon &amp; Kingsland have just commissioned feasibility studies to look into growth. In the report it shows no growth available, so he queried if it is necessary for them to undertake these studies, or to look into updating the works. IB felt it was necessary if upgrade could improve the phosphate figures. If UK TAG change the phosphate standards that could be an issue. If DCWW decided to upgrade works to reduce phosphate levels, this could then allow additional headroom and mean that HC could then allow development in that area. IB advised that it is already failing P levels in the area at present.</p> <p>Discussion about how much of the 2,500 will be released.</p> <p>DB felt that many of DCWW sites have large sites attached to their treatment works so there could be the possibility of installing a reed bed or similar to reduce phosphate levels.</p>	<p>HP</p>

ITEM		ACTION
6.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p><b>ACTION - IB TO SEND COMMENTS THROUGH TO PD.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION - MODELLING MEETING – DB TO LOOK INTO AND PULL TOGETHER A MEETING BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING OF THIS GROUP.</b></p>	<p><b>IB</b></p> <p><b>DB</b></p>
7.	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2011 at Herefordshire Council's offices.</li> </ul>	