



ITEM		ACTION
	<p><u>Herefordshire Council Water Steering Report</u> – HP brought up some amendments she felt were required to Appendix 1, Para 5.7</p> <p><b>ACTION – HP TO EMAIL COMMENTS ACROSS TO PD &amp; KS.</b></p>	<p><b>HP</b></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>RE-CAP ON WATER SUPPLY</b></p> <p>Herefordshire Councils Water steering Report is progressing, although there is an issue about whether it will be published prior to the Water Strategy.</p> <p>HC have opted for option 2 as set out in the water report. They have received confirmation from RA that DCWW are able to supply water. Sustainable homes, 2<sup>nd</sup> point, option 2, agree that no impact on habitat regulations, once agreed water supply can be ticked, and can then focus on water treatment.</p> <p>DB thinks that is Hereford not impacted. HP commented that in the TOR it says that Hereford is to produce a report on each of the intentions. PD confirmed yes, water supply is not a problem.</p> <p>DB advised that he is attending a meeting next week and will seek to clarify. PD will produce a report following receipt of an update from DB and will send it over to HP, etc. DB commented that if the review is signed off, it may not be DCWW plans to fulfil. DCWW current plan does not affect the River Wye in Herefordshire.</p> <p>RB stressed that water supply and water resource are two different things. DCWW advise that the water resource message to all LA's is the abundance of water at high level, and that they will do whatever is necessary to ensure that they have an abundance in the future. They will off-set a series of mitigations on their side to guarantee that development can go ahead. DB felt that the issue with Hereford is that a large area is reliant on one water source (river Wye in Hereford). With the only abstraction being from Hereford, they are not as open to flexibility as other areas that have several water sources.</p> <p>IB sought clarification – Hereford in the main has only the one water source at the River Wye in Hereford. Need to be clear that water supply is available otherwise it could lead to an issue with supply in future. Need to feel comfortable that they are happy to build X number of houses on a site without effect on supply / resource.</p> <p>IB commented that assumptions were only being made on housing growth, and queried if we include effects from industries that may be interested in moving to the area. PD advised that RA had advised him that any industry interest would have to be dealt with on application basis. If they have a plan that is promoting a water intensive industry, and a plan for large building site, need to ensure that the supply is able to cover all.</p> <p>RB advised that the legislation regarding factories and employment areas, their only requirement is to provide the domestic supply i.e. wash basins / toilets, etc. If industry then requires heavy water use (i.e. apple washing) then they need to approach DCWW to discuss, and if needs be they may have to pay for a water supply to be brought in.</p> <p>HP felt there is a need to clarify how much water is spare after the development sites are completed. HE felt that RA would be able to clarify.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>PD advised that future meeting are site specific, and we will be able to look in more detail at that time.</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>UPDATE ON JOINT WORKING BETWEEN ENVIRONMENT AGENCY AND NATURAL ENGLAND</b></p> <p>DB advised that there is difference of opinion around phosphate targets for the river Wye and river Lugg between the Environment Agency and Natural England. They have agreed to disagree in the past.</p> <p>The problem with phosphate targets is that there has never been a single target agreed. A long term approach is to get uk tag together to review phosphate targets and get them agreed nationwide.</p> <p>In the short term they have agreed to adopt conservation targets that NE promotes for favourable condition for SSI. The two organisations have agreed to adopt that approach. DB distributed a copy of a paper on the proposed approach to Phosphate Conservation Targets to all present. The paper provides a summary of that approach. JT has done all the research contained within the paper and DB has added further information and they are hoping that IB will agree that this document shows all that has been agreed to date. IB felt that it did.</p> <p>IB felt that they need to add that the tighter targets are what are added to new developments. Arguments about best use of technology may not allow a development to go ahead. It is difficult for even small scale sites to be brought forward where they are already failing their habitat targets.</p> <p>DB advised that this would not apply to replacement developments, i.e. if someone is redeveloping an area. Most redevelopments have a phosphate improvement, as they install better toilets, etc. IB added that extensions are not a problem either. RB commented that this was reassuring to know.</p> <p>IB advised that surface water is no longer going into the supply either. RC commented that this is something that they encourage. DB commented that Herefordshire and Leominster have combined water systems.</p> <p>BAT regarded as 1mg of P per litre. If a development is close to or exceeding its conservation targets, will need to look at improvements.</p> <p>DB advised that the River Lugg downstream of Leominster is failing, so essentially if there is to be any increase of volume there will need to be an increase in the load.</p> <p>There are other options regarding efficiency. For example Coors brewery recently cut their water use by 1/3. There is no reason we can't link retro fitting SUDS to a development. RC commented that there could be issues with controlling that through planning, there is nothing included to make them take surface water out, and trying to implement that level of control is very difficult.</p> <p>DB queried if it could be enforced through a S106 agreement? It is difficult to use a S106 on sites as it is reliant on all parties agreeing,</p> <p>RB advised that DCWW offer a rebate to customer bills if it is shown that no surface water goes into the public sewers.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>RB queried what everyone else will be doing towards hitting these targets if any improvements are required to meet the standards. PD advised that this is covered later in the agenda. DB reassured DCWW that they are not only looking to them to rectify the issues, will be looking at what other parties can do also.</p> <p>KS advised that one of the proposed sites in Leominster has an issue with surface water. A consultant that looked at the site produced a guide for prospective developers.</p> <p>IB felt that the challenges are going to be P accounting. If a site is already failing, it may be able to go ahead if it is able to show that a plan is in place to reduce P in the future. PD agreed they might need to accept that in the short term we have a problem but that long term improvements on the site could lead to compliance. Once P is in the system it stays for a long time, so it is going to take some time to reduce. It was hoped that through the phasing of a development, it will give a clue about which areas can be developed with no problem, and the other areas that are going to have a huge problem.</p> <p>OFWAT &amp; DEFRA feel that BAT isn't good enough on some sites / developments. They are challenging the government to look at and potentially set BAT at a different level for particular nature conservation sites. They would not set BAT as a different level nationally though. A lot of money is being invested that may not show a lot of return, but if no investment is done no return will be received ever.</p> <p>HP queried the likely timescale of the review. DB advised that uk tag are meeting in October, the consultation will go out in Spring 2012, so could possible know by the end of 2012 if agreement can be reached. This might allow DCWW to add into PR14. All those involved are included within DEFRA at present, meaning they only have to go to the one minister which should enable agreement to be reached easier.</p> <p>DB commented that OFWAT may have an issue in that they have already paid for this, so it's not going to be easy. It is important that the core strategy is sympathetic to that issue. Development constraint here that cannot be released, important to flag up the constraint to developers.</p>	
5.	<p><b>UPDATE ON HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL'S CORE STRATEGY PROGRESS AND PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR LEOMINSTER AND BROMYARD</b></p> <p>KS advised that at the last meeting they advised that the Core strategy was going to cabinet in June, however this did not happen. They will know later if they will be reporting by the end of July on the preferred revised strategy.</p> <p>They are suggesting a revised housing target that is a bit lower than in the previous strategy. They are looking at reducing numbers within Hereford and Leominster and increasing them in the rural parts of the county. If it goes to cabinet at the end of July and if it is agreed, they will be looking at going out to public consultation in September and October. They are also likely to pole the people of Herefordshire about a road around Hereford at the same time. Submission date is hoped to be around about spring 2012.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>KS advised that a short eight to ten page leaflet will go out to the public for consultation. As part of the growth of Herefordshire they would you like to see a road to west. If the public answer to a road to the west is no, there will be no road as no alternative has been offered within the consultation. If this happens they will need to go back to the strategy as they won't have the infrastructure in place to bring forward the proposed development sites.</p> <p>The local MP's want the road to go to the east, as they receive less complaints from people living there, while HC want it to go to the west. The East route is more difficult as it goes across a conservation area, and there are not only ecological consequences but financial ones also. KS advised that they have stepped back from campaigning as it is a political argument at present.</p> <p>DB queried if they have thought about doing something on the website where people can click on a video where someone explains the issues to them clearly, as people are more likely to pay attention to that than read a leaflet.</p> <p>KS advised that they are hoping for more clarity in the next few days. If it does not go to cabinet at end of July it will put the whole process back as cabinet do not sit during august, so it would not go until end of September.</p>	
6.	<p><b>LEOMINSTER SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND IMPACT UPON THE RIVER LUGG SAC</b></p> <p>PD DB &amp; IB paper – special area of conservation. The river is currently failing its target, so this implies we cannot build anything that feeds into that system.</p> <p>PD advised that the proposed growth for Leominster (up to 2031) is for 1,700 houses, but this could be reduced following feedback from cabinet.</p> <p>There is a need to get developers to start showing a phosphate impact. Although more than 50% is coming from agriculture.</p> <p>NE runs a voluntary stewardship scheme. HP advised that the whole of the river Lugg is within the area, and the officer covering that area is working hard to get the farmers to sign up to it. There is an issue there with potato farming and poly tunnels. The ultimate objective is to get it to hit its targets rather than fail. The diffused runoff is not all from farming. Sediment fingerprinting gives you an exact idea of where the sediment is from.</p> <p>DB felt that there was an opportunity for LA's to intervene with the planning of sites, and need to ensure that they are able to secure maximum benefits from each application. Rain water collection, etc, have a good effect.</p> <p>HP commented that polytunnels have only recently required planning permission, and people doing reports are saying it is green field runoff. DB felt that we could say that we want zero runoff. We could suggest that they store it and use it to water crops during summer.</p> <p>AMP5 (2010 -15) also referred to as PR14. RB advised that the final submission will be around April 2014. It is a long process. PD queried if it only focused on agreed developments. RB advised that the regulator will look at what has been firmed up as will not allow them to look at proposals. KS asked if they get to submission before 2014, will they look at the agreed sites.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>RB advised that there are various drivers that will run the plan, such as targets on leakage, etc, so by 2013 they will have firmed up what they want to do. The next 6 month will be early planning, and then the long process of developing schemes and getting them costed. They then go into a pot with lots of other schemes and they have to wait to see which gets awarded the funding</p> <p>HA advised that the Leominster sewerage works have a 3,000 headroom equivalent. If they enter dry weather flow, there could be an issue with headroom then. He queried the timescales, as the present target works out at approx 100 per year, which is triple of development figures in the past. This could then mean that they are hitting their dry weather flow target, and if it goes over the limit they will need to apply for a new dry weather flow consent. This would then mean looking at getting new treatment works, etc. The primary level tank allowed some extra headroom. KS advised that nothing significant is expected to start in Leominster until approx 2014, going though to 2020 to completion.</p> <p>The sewerage level tanks have headroom in them but the river is already failing its phosphate levels. Even though you have a consent and you could legally use that headroom, need to have a plan in place to show that you will be able to mitigate that increase. They cannot be seen to be approving a site that will then further affect the phosphate level target.</p> <p>DB advised that there are other alternatives available, such as at the new cattle market site. The designers say the site will not discharge sewerage as they have an evaporation and transportation system in place. If the developer is able to demonstrate that they are putting things in place, then may be able to bend the policy to fit. If there is a real need to release some development within Leominster then may be able to go down this route, although it will obviously require a larger land area to accommodate the private sewerage plant / reed beds / etc.</p> <p>IB advised that in some areas there are Inset companies that act as a sewerage company, and are regulated by OFWAT. They are a sudo water company, and OFWAT are responsible for ensuring that if it fails it gets taken over, most likely by the local water company. The Inset company have a minimum level for sewerage that they are responsible for. They can take water or sewerage, or both. DB advised that there is the sub inset option also. This is very common in rural areas. The developer creates an inset company and then transfers the consent to the home owners following sale of the properties and they set up their own company.</p> <p>HA advised that the Leominster sewerage treatment works has a capacity of 1,800 before it hits the dry weather limit.</p>	
7.	<p><b>BROMYARD SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND IMPACTS UPON RIVER FROME AND RIVER LUGG SAC</b></p> <p>PD advised that DCWW have recently completed some refurbishment and upgrade work at the Petty Bridge water treatment plant.</p> <p>The river Frome is failing its WFD, and the Frome joins the river Lugg. DB advised that is included with the SAC, and has already been through the review of consents. Bromyard is in the same position as Leominster, and any developments at Bromyard will have to overcome the same issues as Leominster.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>IB advised that headroom is relevant if it can be shown that the development doesn't affect the phosphate levels.</p> <p>DB advised that he has had various discussions with DCWW about what can and cannot be done with regard to a contribution from a developer towards works at treatment works and has received some conflicting advice to date.</p> <p>RB advised that if it is identified that a scheme is coming forward in X year and the developers are not willing to wait, DCWW can work with them to bring forward the works if they can feed in financially. Ultimately DCWW should be funding the end of line assets, but if developers are unwilling to wait they have funded the improvements to allow them to bring the development forward earlier.</p> <p>However, there is an issue in that the water company cannot reserve capacity for a developer. The developer may give them the money to improve the asset, but there is no guarantee they will receive the catchment. There is also an option for LA's to pay for the asset upgrade and get the costs back from the developers.</p> <p>DB commented that P is dealt with by chemical dosing, and any developer contribution does not cover the treatment costs. RB advised that they look at the revenue it will create to see if it is worthwhile.</p> <p>IB highlighted that some of the 1,800 capacity could have been reserved for sites that already have outline planning.</p> <p>HA advised that the scheme that just completed in AMP4, the figures received on capacity show that the headline is 300 – 500 population range. DB queried any restrictions on the pumping as Bromyard is heavily pumped. HA advised that previously the flow could not be discharged when the river was at high level so it backed up into the village and caused flooding issues, this has now been resolved. Petty Bridge pumping station now has dry weather flow capacity.</p> <p>KS advised that the proposed site at Bromyard is quite large, and has constraints that cannot be overcome in the early part of the plan. Proposal for 500 over a 30 year period.</p> <p><b>ACTION - PD WILL FIRM UP NUMBERS TO DCWW</b></p> <p>HP suggested providing the developers with the population requirements for sites. KS advised that the housing market assessments identify where the shortages are, and the household numbers required. Need to look at maximum numbers that could be achieved on a site.</p> <p>DB commented that any small villages within the same water body are in the same situation as Leominster and Bromyard as they are on the same water treatment works. Some of the works have different treatment levels, 2phosphate, 6 phosphate, etc.</p>	<p><b>PD</b></p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>DISCUSSION ON THE MEETINGS ACHIEVEMENT TOWARDS COMPLIANCE WITH THE HABITATS DIRECTIVE</b>          Mostly covered above</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
9.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b> None raised.</p>	
10.	<p><b>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Week commencing 19 September / 26<sup>th</sup> September 2011</li> <li>• Week commencing 14 November 2011</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that these two meeting will be hosted and chaired by Herefordshire Council.</p> <p>PD advised that future meetings will cover the following areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September – Hereford &amp; Ross-on-Wye</li> <li>• November – Rural settlements</li> </ul> <p>PD advised that he will now amend the water report following information received at this meeting. He will be contacting everyone before the September meeting for input, further information, etc.</p> <p><b>ACTION – ALL TO FORWARD AVAILABLE DATES / BEST TIMES FOR WEEKS COMMENCING 19<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER AND 26<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER TO PD.</b></p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>