

WELLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council held at the Community Centre
at 7.30pm on Thursday 6th August 2015

Item	Minutes	Action										
	<p>Present Parish Cllrs: Mrs J Gowan (Chair), Mr S Crane Mrs L Langford, Mr B Prince, Mr D Wood</p> <p>Also in attendance: Ward Cllr Pauline Crockett, Mrs Chris Bucknell (Parish Clerk) and 51 members of the public.</p> <p>1.0 To Accept Apologies for Absence – Cllr D Miller</p> <p>2.0 To Receive Declarations of Interest Cllr Langford declared a non-pecuniary interest in Planning application 152222.</p> <p>2.1 To Consider Requests for Dispensations – None</p> <p>3.0 To Adopt the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Parish Council held on Thursday 2nd July 2015 Resolved: The Minutes were confirmed and signed by the Chair</p> <p>4.0 To Consider Application to amend Planning Condition to allow Extended Shop Opening Hours on Bank Holidays and Public Holidays</p> <p>A request by Rob to allow opening on bank holidays and public holidays from 7am to 7pm had been considered at the July meeting of the Parish Council with a resolution made to consult with the Chapel and Neighbouring properties. This had been done and all were supportive of the proposal. At the July meeting Cllrs were divided as to whether to restrict the opening within set hours or whether to approve the request for 7am-7pm with Rob to select his hours within that frame and the Chair asked Cllrs for their feelings on this before a decision was made. Any application would be at Rob's expense and Cllr Wood was asked to confirm this with Rob.</p> <p>Resolved: To submit an application to change the planning condition to allow opening between the hours of 7.00 am and 7.00 pm on Bank Holidays and Public Holidays, times to be at the discretion of the shopkeeper.</p> <p>5.0 To Consider Planning Matters</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="193 1503 1401 1675"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reference Number</th> <th>Application</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>151913</td> <td>6 Derside Close, Wellington – proposed works to Conifer tree</td> </tr> <tr> <td>152007</td> <td>Claremont, Wellington – fell one tree</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above two applications had been considered by Jenny Guille, Tree Warden, who had no objections to the proposals and comments to that effect had been submitted.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="193 1675 1401 1899"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reference Number</th> <th>Application</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>152222</td> <td>The Plock, Wellington – remove Conifer and Leylandii Tree</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above application had been received forwarded to Jenny Guille for her comments.</p> <p>Resolved: To submit the Parish Council's comments in line with Jenny Guille's recommendations.</p>	Reference Number	Application	151913	6 Derside Close, Wellington – proposed works to Conifer tree	152007	Claremont, Wellington – fell one tree	Reference Number	Application	152222	The Plock, Wellington – remove Conifer and Leylandii Tree	
Reference Number	Application											
151913	6 Derside Close, Wellington – proposed works to Conifer tree											
152007	Claremont, Wellington – fell one tree											
Reference Number	Application											
152222	The Plock, Wellington – remove Conifer and Leylandii Tree											

Reference Number	Application
151954	Land Adjacent to Ravensholt, Wellington – proposed development of three bedroom dwelling

The Chair outlined the application telling Cllrs that it replaced an earlier application which the Parish Council approved with comments on landscaping, proximity to the boundary of the neighbouring property and discharge of waste into the overloaded public system. She stressed that it was necessary to judge this application on its own merits without reference to the earlier one which was refused on the grounds of its impact on the Grade II listed property. Neighbouring properties had all been advised of the new application. The plans had been annotated as a four bedroom property (with one labelled as a study) with the application form stating that this was to be a 3-bed property. The Chair had spoken to the Planning Officer for clarification and his advice was to assess it as a 3 bed property as stated on the application. The Chair noted that the original application was for a house with one bedroom on the ground floor and two on the upper floor but that this new application could be construed as a four bed house. The plans were projected and discussed by the Councillors. The public were given the opportunity to comment. The agent and applicant were not present.

The following comments were made

Sewage - there needed to be a private system installed in order not to further overload the public sewer system

Bedrooms – the number of bedrooms needed clarification. It was noted that the Parish Council is on record as stating that Wellington has over-supply of 4 bedroom homes and wishes to see homes with less bedrooms which are thus cheaper on the open market to encourage new, young families to settle in the Parish.

Access Drive - The construction of a new entrance drive from the main village street required land which was currently owned by the residents of neighbouring Khotla. The Parish Council would like confirmation that a binding legal agreement exists between the two property owners so that problems of access and ownership do not arise in the future.

Resolved: The Chair to draft a response based on the above comments and circulate to all Cllrs for comment before submission.

Reference Number	Application
152129	Bridge Farm, Wellington – proposed erection of a new timber framed three bay carport

Resolved: There were no objections

Reference Number	Application
151855	Land adjacent to Mill Lane, Wellington. Proposed development of site to provide 45 houses.

The Chair introduced the Applicant (Mr Thomas Jay) and the Agent (Mr J E Smith) and gave a short slide presentation to give background to the application and to put it in context (précis below).

The SHLAA assessment carried out in 2012 was outlined showing the two areas which were classified as being land with low or minor constraints and suitable for development (part of the land

JG

Clerk

at Mill Lane and land west of the cemetery). The land at Mill Lane which was assessed in the SHLAA was only part of the total site and recommended as having capacity for 15 houses. The Chair stressed that although aware of it being done and of its findings the Parish Council played no part in this SHLAA assessment which was county wide.

As part of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) exercise the Parish Council undertook a formal call for sites from landowners. The onus was on landowners to come forward if they wanted land to be considered, they were not approached directly. It was noted that Mr Jay submitted the whole of his land holding for consideration. Nine sites were independently assessed and scored against a proven scoring model so that the NDP steering group and Parish Council could make an informed judgement on which land to recommend. This work was commissioned independently in order to ensure no bias towards any particular site or landowner.

It was noted that Herefordshire Council's Local Plan gave Parishes no choice as to whether they take new development between now and 2031. It was added that as Wellington had recently seen two developments the number of new dwellings still to be achieved was relatively low. It was also noted that if no NDP existed there was significant potential for over development, the land currently being considered having a capacity for 65 houses.

The Wellington Neighbourhood Plan, currently at formal consultation stage, recommended the Mill Lane site as one of three going forward for recommendation. The recommendation being for 15 houses on part of this site, along with 12 by the cemetery and 4 in Auberrow Lane.

This Mill Lane application was for 45 houses made up of 2, 3 and 4 bed. The application for 45 houses had been made after the NDP recommendations were made public and the applicants had not taken into account the content of the draft plan, or had chosen to ignore them. The Parish Council had been advised that Herefordshire Council may apply a prematurity test against any applications coming through at this stage in the development of the NDP but the details of this are uncertain.

The Chair invited the Applicant and Agent to speak. The Applicant, Mr Thomas Jay, spoke about the development, stressing that this would be made up mainly of self-build units

The Chair then invited members of the public to make their comments, stressing that the Parish Council could only comment on material planning grounds and the content of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Following representations from members of the public the Parish Councillors were asked to make their comments.

The material planning comments made by members of the public and Councillors are summarised below

Scale of Development - A development of this size would have an unacceptable impact on the village as a whole and particularly on far west end of the village and its rural aspect, something that the NDP set out to preserve by recommending small, strategically placed developments to allow the village to grow organically.

Self Build – This was not made clear in the application and the Parish Council had serious concerns about how this would work on such a large site.

Neighbourhood Development Plan - This proposed development was not in compliance with the draft NDP. The applicant was well aware of the recommendation for 15 properties on that site having attended the March informal consultation – no attempt was made to revise the intended application to conform. This application was considered to be opportunistic to take advantage of the unadopted status of the NDP and the publication of the Local Plan.

Flooding – Considerable concern was raised about the impact the development would have on flooding and the Parish Council felt that the accompanying report by BWB did not address specific local issues. The Agent was unable to provide answers to questions regarding management of

water/sewage and any SUDs system raised by a member of the public at the meeting.

Sewage - The proposals for this site appeared to include storage of effluent for overnight discharge to the public system along with a proposal to discharge part-treated effluent into Wellington Brook, a watercourse which has been recognised as having excellent water quality and supporting a variety of wildlife. It was noted that no information had been provided regarding water run-off from the hillside beyond the site to the north which impacted on Mill Lane.

Access – Several concerns were raised about the safety of road users and pedestrians. It was noted that Mill Lane was a narrow steep sided lane without passing places. It was part of the 492 bus-route Leominster-Hereford (which has to reverse in a restricted space) and heavily used by agricultural vehicles. It was felt additional vehicle movements from 45 houses could make the locality extremely hazardous.

Impact on Flora and Fauna – Concern was raised about the site and the fact it was home to a large variety of wildlife, insects, plants etc. It was noted a report had already been prepared but it was felt a new detailed report should be prepared at a time when wildlife of all types was active.

Section 106 – it was noted that there was no intention to include a section 106 contribution, although mention was made by the applicant of a play facilities being included.

Resolved: The Chair to draft a response based on the above comments and circulate to all Cllrs for comment before submission.

JG

6.0 To Note Date and Time of the next Regular Meeting of the Parish Council

Thursday 3rd September 2015 at 7.30 pm.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

Signed Date 3rd September 2015
Chairman of Wellington Parish Council