

## Member Site Visit Meeting

24<sup>th</sup> January 2019

**Weather:** Cold, overcast but clear

### Planning Committee Member Attendance:

| Councillors:                     |    |                       |    |
|----------------------------------|----|-----------------------|----|
| AWFORD, Cllr Philip (Chair)      | P  | PARSONS, Cllr Shaun   | Ab |
| BIRD, Cllr Robert                | P  | PREEST Cllr Alan      | Ap |
| BROWN, Cllr David                | Ap | RIPPINGTON Cllr Keith | Ap |
| CORDWELL, Cllr John (Vice Chair) | P  | ROBINSON Cllr Steve   | P  |
| FISHER, Cllr Bernard             | P  | TRACEY, Cllr Pamela   | P  |
| HALE, Cllr Terry                 | P  | VINES, Cllr Robert    | P  |
| Hirst Cllr Stephen               | P  | WHEELER, Cllr Simon   | Ab |
| MORGAN, Cllr Graham              | P  |                       |    |

**Key: P= Present, Ab= Absent, Ap= Apologies**

### Officers in attendance:

Kevin Phillips (KP) Team Manager, Sarah Pearse, (SP) Principal Planning Officer, Denis Canney, Senior Planning Officer (Case Officer), and Andy Birchley Senior Planning Officer (Enforcement).

### Application Site visited:

Planning Application 18/0032/TWMAJW by William Gilder Ltd., for a Biosolids Cake Liming Treatment for a 5 year temporary period on land at To West of Wingmoor Farm, Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve.

**Case Officer:** Denis Canney (CO)

Members were joined on site by Mrs S Hughes (Planning Agent), Mr M Fowles (William Gilders Ltd.) and Mr P Richmond representing Bishops Cleeve Parish Council.

The CO described the site and location, pointing out in the landscape the extent of the red line site boundary. He described the process and where the material will be placed on site. He explained the proposed drainage system including the location of a (18m x 5m x 1.5m) submerged hardcore covered waste water storage tank and a 30m x 8.9m swale. He reported that the majority of the material (up to 15, 000T) will come from the Applicants waste water treatment plant at Toddington and will produce compost suitable for agriculture. It is proposed to treat up to 20,000 tonnes per annum which could include biosolids from other waste water treatment plants in the county. The alternative method of disposal is to landfill if for agricultural reasons it cannot untreated be directly used on agricultural land. He pointed out that this is a green belt location and the application is for a temporary period of 5 years.

The CO reported that there is an objection from Tewkesbury Borough Council and the surrounding Parish Councils including Stoke Orchard, Uckington, Elmstone Hardwicke,

and Bishops Cleeve. In addition the County Landscape Advisor has also expressed concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposal.

The CO referred to laminated plans of the site which were circulated to the Councillors as part of his presentation.

### **Members Questions.**

Cllr Tracey noted the very narrow access to the site and that it was adjacent to a rifle range and was concerned about the site access. The Case Officer confirmed that the lorries or tractor and trailer deliveries would drive straight onto the site and go out the same way they came in.

Cllr Tracey felt that this needed to be controlled and asked about the type of waste that would be brought to the site.

The CO explained that the biosolids are what is left over after treatment at Toddington and is mainly sludge and water. It is treated with lime as part of the composting process.

Cllr Tracey asked about the pond that could be seen on the circulated plan. KP explained that the ponds that Cllr Tracey were referring to on the plans were on the Wingmoor Farm east landfill site that was located at some distance on the other side of the railway line and would not be affected.

Cllr Tracey did not feel that visual impact would concern the businesses located across the fields at some distance to the west.

Cllr Hirst asked about the extent of the proposed windrows.

The CO used the plan to point out the extent of the proposed concrete pad.

Cllr Hirst questioned whether this area would be sufficient.

The CO explained that this was an issue that was brought up by the Consultees and assured Members that the area of the concrete pad had been designed to accommodate the suggested throughput and operational requirements of the proposal.

Cllr Hirst asked whether the Applicant would stop operations when the site became full?

The CO explained that the operations would be fluid, material would be brought onto the site, lime added, material matured and then removed for use as compost. More material would then be brought in on a rolling basis.

Cllr Hale noted that the site was in flood zone 1, but wanted to know whether the concrete pad had been designed to take climate change into consideration.

The CO replied that the tank was designed to take the runoff from the concrete pad and surface water directed to the swale to the satisfaction of the Flood Authority.

Cllr Hale asked what was the distance to the waste water treatment plant?

The CO replied that the Toddington site was 7 miles or 12 km away.

Cllr Hale asked about lorry movements.

The CO explained that the proposal was to take 400 tonnes per week over 5.5 days. There would be an average of 4 deliveries per day. If the site was operated on a campaign basis then this daily/weekly average would differ.

Cllr Fisher Asked what form the lime would take, powder or liquid? In powder form, surrounding areas could look like a fall of snow. It would be harmful to the environment and also to the operatives.

The CO responded that there is no detail in the application other than mixed with lime using lime mixer plant or shovel.

Cllr Bird pointed out that the site is in the Parish of Stoke Orchard. The main argument is about the location in the Green Belt. He questioned what would be visible. It was confirmed by the CO that it was a concrete pad with compost windrows and a hard standing. The waste water storage tank would be underground and the surface covered with hardcore. The hedges would remain undisturbed.

Cllr Tracey asked about the tank depth. The CO explained that the tank would be below ground level at a depth of 1.5 metres.

The CO explained that in addition to the concrete pad there would be on site plant, equipment and welfare facilities (although no details were outlined in the application submissions), together with vehicles manoeuvring on site.

Cllr Robinson asked about the maximum throughput of the site, could it be extended to 30 or 40 thousand tonnes?

The CO explained that the application was for 20,000 tonnes equating to an average of 400 tonnes per week. The material may not come in every day.

Cllr Robinson suggested that they would need another planning application to increase the throughput of the site.

Cllr Fisher asked about the 10 tonne weight limit restriction over the culvert near the site entrance.

The CO confirmed that the transport figures were based upon a 20 tonne lorry or tractor and trailer. The CO will investigate this issue with the Applicant.

### **District/ Parish Representative.**

There were no representatives from either Tewkesbury Borough or Stoke Orchard Parish Councils.

## **Local County Councillor.**

Cllr Brid is the local councillor for the area. He had nothing to add and was attending the MSV in his capacity as a Member of the Planning committee.

## **Other People.**

The Agent Sue Hughes asked if Mr Fowles could explain the process to Members and also clarified that there were no welfare facilities proposed at the site.

Mr Fowles explained that the biocake is the residual material remaining from treated human waste arising from septic tanks. A polymer system is used to draw out the solids. The material is "limed" to kill bacteria. There are two methods of adding lime, one is folding in dry lime and the second is a mechanical process. Mr Fowles explained that the work would be done on a campaign basis, there are more likely to be periods of use rather than continuous use.

Cllr Hirst asked whether this was an industry recognised process for treating this waste. Mr Fowles confirmed that it was.

## **Members walked to the site entrance.**

Cllr Fisher pointed out the signs denoting the 10 tonne weight limit.

The CO explained that the initial highway objection related to visibility at the site entrance. The entrance opens onto the busy road serving the household waste recycling and landfill site, which is used by large lorries and public vehicles. He pointed to a tree and vegetation that had been cut back to improve visibility to the right out of the access. However to achieve the required visibility splays of 28 and 24 metres, the splays would be on land outside of the applicants control.

Cllr Fisher asked whether it was a private road. The CO confirmed that it was not an adopted highway but the principles of a safe access applied.

Cllr Fisher pointed out that the drivers of wagons are higher up and have a better view of oncoming vehicles. The CO explained that given the location so close to the adjoining access to the serving the household waste recycling and landfill site that users of this access need to be aware of the potential of vehicles coming out of the proposed access to the site. At present the existing site access at this point has restricted visibility for such public users.

Members pointed out that two vehicles cannot use the access track adjacent to the rifle range at the same time and agreed that a Highways representative should be requested to attend the Planning Committee on the 31<sup>st</sup> January.

The meeting was closed at 11.05 am.

## **Members left the site at 11.05am to return to Shire Hall.**

Sarah Pearse 25/1/2019