

Friday 7th July 2023 EGM Mileham Village Hall

8 members of the public, plus 1 joined later. Total 9

2 from Bee Dev

1 x Councillor Mitchell Thurbon

4 x PC (AT Chair, NC Vice Chair plus WF & CH)

AT - opened the meeting at 6.30 with agenda

Apologies for absence LT received

Changed the order of the planning applications to be discussed.

AT - asked if anyone has any questions and to allow 10 mins per person to speak and only once.

AT - explained that Bee Dev attended the last PC meeting and offered to share the ecology and drainage report with LT to load to PC website which was done.

AT - offered Bee Dev to speak.

Bee Dev:

- Explained that the reports (ecology and drainage) concluded that there was no risk to site.
- Proactively looked at the style of the houses and introduced a semi-detached for 2 of the 6 properties.
- Are interested in talking to the PC to see if this helps.

AT - responded to members of the public that this was discussed at the last meeting with Bee Dev. Bee Dev had explained that no housing association was willing to take on the 2 "affordable" houses so this would perhaps be an opportunity to introduce a non-executive style property.

AT - then proceeded to ask JP's questions

Q. What is the difference between an ecology and WF assessment?

A. Bee Dev - nothing

Q. Who is going to go through both reports?

A. Bee Dev - the planning department

JP comments were read out by AT – please see AT for details.

Q. Who will put mitigation in place?

A. Bee Dev - planning dept will review and we will have to follow strict guidelines.

Bee Dev will appoint people to review stages at certain points of the development build.

Bee Dev offered to meet JP to discuss the ecology reports and queries.

NC - responded he was sure that JP would appreciate this. Suggested that JP's concern was the first report was more detailed than the current report. Would Bee Dev agree to implement the recommendations on pages 32-7 of the earlier report? Bee Dev resounded that they would raise all of them with their Ecology people and revert.

It was pointed out that all the docs were all the BDC website for all to read for themselves.

Bee Dev invited all and any questions to be forward to them.

Drainage.

AT read out comments submitted and showed pictures to everyone.

Q. How is the drainage flowing under number 35, it's unclear?

A. Bee Dev - this is on 3rd party land.

Bee Dev - Ditch runs to number 35's back garden and ditch. Pipe not on development site so don't know how to answer this question. Development not intending to utilise this ditch, going to put in independent soakaways not intending to use existing.

WF - ditch at front nothing to do with this discussion.

Bee Dev confirmed not intending to use the front ditch but install a comprehensive system.

NC - will this be better than the current system?

AT - expressed a concern about the drainage impact on the village, mentioning current issues including Manor Terrace and Tittleshall Road.

MBS – previous PC tried to raise a letter about 4 blocked gullies opposite the development which drain in the ditch in front of the development. Strong possibility the blocked gully will conflict with the proposed entrance to the development. MBS has tried to locate this and offered to help with a mini digger to locate this before planning permission is submitted. MBS also wrote to the vendor and auctioneer to advise them of the problem and believes the letters should be on the website.

IS - would like Alison's letter to be noted as its comprehensive and informative and should not be ignored. Also noted that the time the report was taken (April) and the weather conditions at the time were drier than in mid-winter.

Bee Dev – used independent companies and used specialists for different areas of reporting. They have professional indemnity insurance and are confident the reports are robust, and these would need to be shared with the NHBC for certificates.

Bee Dev – drainage solution will be fixed on the development site with the use of modern materials to reduce flooding on the land. Previous flooding could be due to the type of agricultural land it was. Bee Dev will dig out to a depth and introduce new permeable materials to ensure drainage would be better than current.

Consultee would be NCC to agree drainage application and there would be a consultation at County Hall.

Q. The challenge is if the plan goes ahead what guarantee does the village have and who will be responsible for sorting out any problems once the development is completed?

Bee Dev go back to the drainage report. They cannot deal with any other areas in the village.

AT - could we share Alison's letter/report with developers and were pointed to the planning website where it is.

IS - asked perhaps Alison would like to meet with the developers and will follow this up.

MBS - look at planning and 5 years requirement run of storage on BDC submission and water retaining in clay. Previous developer had issues with clay. Suggested a run a water storage to be put in.

Muriel – the last ditch on the west side of the last property floods and comes out on to the road.

Bee Dev - this is not on the development land so would not touch this.

WF - do you mean ditch at 35?

WF - ditch at 35 not part of development.

Bee Dev - If they can improve then they can maybe help with a solution and introduce something and include in their development.

Q. Foul water?

Bee Dev Anglian water haven't said there isn't capacity but also haven't made an acceptance. If Anglian water does not accept, then Bee Dev would have to find an alternative solution privately.

AT explained this was discussed at the last meeting.

IS - said more fundamentally that the village has no resources, no school etc. Which is why it was rejected 5 years ago. What has changed?

Bee Dev feel it is a sustainable location and it had planning permission in the past. NCC policies apply and are enforced.

Bee Dev are putting a case together with all the planning permissions.

*****Interruption as another member of the public turned up.

AT - there was 15 minutes left for this discussion

WF - asked about the gradient of the field drop to the entrance of the development site.

Bee Dev NCC gave tolerances for the gradient and now changed the 2 access points as a construction solution.

AT - asked any other comments and thanked Bee Dev for their time.

Bee Dev offered again to meet with Alison and AT said LT would be in touch with Alison to see if this could be organised. Bee Dev also asked again if they could be sent JP's comments and questions.

Bee Dev asked if they could get feedback on the semi-detached offer.

AT - response said we cannot comment but said the last 4 will be executive homes and that there was nothing smaller on offer.

19.07 AT thanked Bee Dev once again and Bee Dev left the meeting being chased by MBS to offer his service and his phone number.

We then had to wait for the hall to settle as the noise level had risen.

No representative from Pye Development

AT - asked does anyone have any queries on this development keeping in mind we as a PC cannot ask specifics on the development without the developer for this.

WF - looking at the planning website stated they are looking to get release from clause 6 and archeology report has been submitted.

AT - also noted that the access to the site had been moved slightly.

WF - confirmed from planning website that the access and the direction of one of the houses facing has changed. Keeping clause 7 & 8

WF - no comments.

AT - asked generally how can they put footings in without planning permission.

Then there was a general discussion amongst several people about whether these were footings or archaeology trenches, I couldn't catch it all as there were many people speaking at once.

WF - confirmed that the Archaeology report was uploaded to the planning website on 6th July 2023. Developer has now asked for clause to be released.

Everyone broke into a discussion about the trenches/footings when they were dug who dug them and what they were. Report is in but the dig is not complete was one comment.

AT - asked generally were these footings and a member of the public was sure these were not.

Archaeology report submitted on 6th June discharge on 5th July AT to ask LT what can we do to comment?

MBS is seeking to amend the roadside plan as he has concerns about the brick wall being built and the road noise this will reflect, and he is against this.

WF & NC checked plans for brick wall, and it appears to be there.

MBS - this would mean a brick wall from the VH to the development. He concerned about the road noise through the village.

The brick wall height was confirmed to be 1.2m high.

Member of the public. Issue with the sewage. Anglian water couldn't handle this and there will now be septic tanks installed.

AT - if Anglian water refused the 3 houses, will Anglian water refuse the 6 and then Bee Dev will end up putting in septic tanks also but Bee Dev haven't got this stage yet so we don't know. We don't know why one of the village developments would get permission if the other would not.

MBS response was its due to pumping stations at Stanfield and Litcham and the capacity of these. Maybe it can't drain either way.

Member of the Public does the 3 give a time frame for build.

WF - nothing on BDC website. Another planning app has reserved matters; submitted in March, amended in June. House front moved from side to the front.

AT - has a decision been made?

WF - no we have until 12th Jan 2024

General conversations on drainage; multiple conversations happening simultaneously, not possible to record them fully.

Drainage to site - must there be more digging?

3 houses will have septic's

When was that agreed?

Anglian water refused mains drainage

Where did you hear that?

Bee Dev - not at drainage stage yet.

MBS they will have to put in an application for private sewage. Pye is living on site where there is a static caravan and a septic already.

MT - assume this is for sewage as Anglian water would have requested a pump.

Then was a conversation about electricity. It was about placing the transformer for electricity. An objection was raised to where it was to be placed, then Pye objected to a new pole and then perhaps it may now be located in a hedge?

19.33 AT are we all done? Thank you all for attending. Next meeting is 15th August 2023.

Member asked about allotments and was directed to MBS as this is not a PC matter.

Anything for next meeting? No response from public.

Meeting closed 19.35.