



## MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the **REPRESENTATIONAL COMMITTEE** held at the Guildhall, Mill Street, Ludlow on **WEDNESDAY 1<sup>st</sup> JUNE 2016** at **7pm**.

### R/01 PRESENT

Chair: Councillor Ginger

Councillors: Councillors Clarke, Draper, Gill, M Jones, Kemp and Sheward

Officers: Gina Wilding Town Clerk  
Stephanie Williams Administration Assistant

Also attending Councillor Boddington, Ludlow North  
Ben Wiliscroft, Shropshire Council Conservation Officer

### R/02 HEALTH & SAFETY

The Chairman informed Councillors of the fire exits, fire assembly point and asked that everyone sign the attendance log.

### R/03 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor R Jones and Councillor Lyle.

### R/04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

#### Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

None

#### Conflicts of interest

<u>Cllr</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
Sheward	16/01902/FUL	Attends Quaker meetings and agrees with objections submitted to Shropshire Council from the Quaker Group
Kemp	16/02046/FUL	Employee of Ludlow Infant School linked to Ludlow Junior School

#### Personal Interest

None

**R/05 PUBLIC OPEN SESSION (15 minutes)**

There were six members of the public present.

Rosemary Wood Chair of the newly formed Friends of Ludlow Flood Action and Environmental Group for the Corve and Teme. Rosemary expressed her interest in attending the committee new planning applications in Ludlow and the impact these could have on flooding. She would like to work with local partnerships to avoid future damage to the area. The Chair informed Mrs Wood that all planning applications can be viewed on Shropshire Councils planning portal.

Denise Thompson, Ludlow 21 and The Green Festival spoke in support of the application for a grant for the children's activities at the Green Festival 2016. She stated that the festival is self financing with limited funds which also finances the Swifts Group, Slow Food, Easy Riders and Vision 21 Group and explained that the Green Festival is well attended and a chance for Ludlow to show its green side and she hoped that Ludlow Town Council would support the event again.

Martin Paddy Brennan of The Bluestone Centre Bleathwood Ludlow, would like to work with Ludlow Town Council and the Ludlow Boxing Club to help disengaged youngsters in the area in rehabilitation. The Chair advised Mr Brennan to make contact with the Town Clerk.

**R/06 LUDLOW'S UNITARY COUNCILLORS QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

There was one Unitary Councillor present, Councillor Boddington, Ludlow North.

**Land adjacent to Castle Meadow Linney Ludlow 15/00459/FUL**

Councillor Boddington updated members on the appeal for the proposed dwelling that the planning inspectorate had thrown out the appeal for the following reasons:

- The effect the proposed dwelling would have on the character and appearance of the area.
- Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy 2011, policy CS3, CS5 and CS6 and the Planning National Policy state that heritage should be protected.
- The dwelling would be within the conservation area and in the setting of the castle.

He stated that this is good news for Ludlow this refusal will strengthen cases against proposed developments at the bottom of Linney and Burway Lane.

Councillor Ginger asked why this is good news for Ludlow/ Councillor Boddington said that this proves the current policies work the core strategies and SAMDev and heritage policies do work.

**Harvest House Ludlow 16/00761/FUL**

Councillor Boddington informed members that new information that was not available previously for consideration had emerged and asked if members would be able to consider it.

**RESOLVED (5:0:2)**  
**GG/PD**

That the new information relating to 16/00761/FUL be considered at the Representational Committee meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2016.

**R/07** **MINUTES****RESOLVED (unanimous)**  
**GG/PD**

That the minutes of the Representational Committee meeting held on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> May 2016 subject to the amendment at minute R/325 to state that Councillor R Jones had sent her apologies and was not in attendance and Councillor M Jones was in attendance, the minutes be approved and be signed by the Chair.

**R/08** **PRE APPLICATION PRESENTATION FROM TREVOR HEWETT- ARCHITECTS ONE STOP TOWER STREET GALEFORD LUDLOW**

Mr Hewett presented the pre planning application presentation to members for 9 Tower Street which is currently a One Stop and the Post Office. The proposal by Macham Investments is to demolish One Stop and the development potential for the site into a retail/restaurant unit with ten 2 bedroomed apartments and one town house apartment above. There are areas that are still to be addressed within the development which will be discussed with the planning officers these are:

- A sustainable traffic management report as there will be no parking provided on site
- Refuse collection and access to this
- Noise levels
- Archaeological reports on the site

The plans have been presented to the LCAAC and have been on display in Ludlow Library.

The Conservation Officer stated that this was a key area to be enhanced on the edge of the conservation area. The design needs to be in appropriate scale with existing building lines in Tower Street. Subject to some further amendments he would support this enhancement.

Members raised a few points that would need addressing:

- Refuse Collection access
- Parking provision

- The high density of the development

Members agreed that the area was in need of enhancement and would comment on the application once submitted to Shropshire council. The chair requested that the status of the old jail is confirmed as to whether it is a listed building.

#### **R/09 ITEMS TO ACTION**

The Chairman thanked staff for completing the items to action.

**RESOLVED (unanimous)**

**GG/PD**

To note the items to action

#### **R/10 Ludlow Conservation Area Advisory Committee (LCAAC)**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)**

**GG/CS**

To note the minutes of the meeting Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 and the agenda of 4<sup>th</sup> May 2016.

#### **R/11 NOTICES OF PLANNING DECISIONS FROM SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)**

**GG/PK**

That the decisions be noted

12/04328/OUT	PENDING
13/02286/FUL	REGISTERED
14/02846/OUT	PENDING
15/04599/LBC	PENDING
15/04586/FUL	PENDING
15/05049/FUL	REGISTERED
15/05125/DEM	UNKNOWN
15/05374/LBC	REGISTERED
15/05373/FUL	REGISTERED
15/05013/FUL	REGISTERED
16/00117/OUT	PENDING
15/05542/FUL	PENDING
16/00221/FUL	PENDING
15/05373/FUL	PENDING
16/00506/LBC	REGISTERED
16/00426/FUL	REGISTERED
16/00436/FUL	REGISTERED
16/00840/TCA	REGISTERED
16/00708/OUT	REGISTERED
16/01156/FUL	PENDING
16/01267/TCA	PENDING
16/01200/TCA	PENDING

16/01172/ADV	PENDING
16/01055/FUL	PENDING
16/01067/FUL	PENDING
16/01182/FUL	PENDING
16/00978/FUL	PENDING
16/00761/FUL	PENDING
16/01015/FUL	PENDING
16/00788/REM	PENDING
16/01387/LBC	PENDING
16/01386/FUL	PENDING
16/01751/LBC	PENDING
16/01750/FUL	PENDING
16/01412/FUL	PENDING
16/01767/DIS	PENDING

## R/12 SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL DECISIONS

### RESOLVED (unanimous) GG/CS

That the decisions be noted

15/05509/FUL	Stone House Corve Street Ludlow SY8 1DG	WITHDRAWN	45
16/00404/FUL	Hillcroft Gravel Hill Ludlow SY8 1QU	GRANTED	46
16/01182/FUL	132 Corve Street Ludlow SY8 2PG	GRANTED	48
16/01219/AMP	MW Knight & Son Ltd WorkShop Buildings Bromfield Road Ludow SY8 1DW	GRANTED	50

16/01035/FUL	1 Courtyard 19 Lower Galeford Ludlow SY8 1RN	GRANTED	52
15/00096/FUL	River Cross Gables Temeside Ludlow	REFUSED	54
16/01365/FUL	Daycroft Henley Road Ludlow	WITHDRAWN	
16/01574/TCA	2 Boyne House Broad Street Ludlow SY8 1NL	NO OBJECTION	56
16/01615/TCA	2 Trinity Cottages Julian Road Ludlow	NO OBJECTION	58

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### R/13 16/02014/FUL Lorelei Gravel Hill Ludlow SY8 1QL

#### RESOLVED (unanimous) GG/PD

No objection

**R/14      16/02094/TCA Millenium Green Café Dinham Ludlow SY8 1EG**

Members were interested to establish who owned the land

**RESOLVED (unanimous)  
GG/TG**

No objection

Subject to permission from the Environment Agency.

**R/15      16/01829/FUL 5 The Cliff Park Halton Lane Ludlow SY8 2JF**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)  
GG/MC**

To Object

- i) Members requested confirmation that it is a lawful development to build a permanent extension on a temporary structure.
- ii) Members requested that adequately detailed plans are provided before any decision is made.

Councillor Sheward left the room at 7.56pm

**R/16      16/01902/FUL Proposed dwelling North of 81A Corve Street Ludlow**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)  
GG/TG**

Object

Members stated that some improvements had been made but their previously minuted concerns had not been addressed.

Members objected to the previous application on 15/04/2015 and made the following comments.

- *Uncharacteristic and unsympathetic to the existing street scene.*
- *Difficult access off the narrow highway into the garages*
- *The proposed dwelling would dominate the sky line in the Conservation Area.*
- *Over development of the land.*

Councillor Sheward returned to the meeting at 8.01pm

**R/17      16/01962/FUL 26 Bringewood Ludlow SY8 2NA**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)  
GG/PD**

No objection

**R/18      16/02046/FUL Ludlow Junior School Clee View Ludlow**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)  
GG/PD**

No objection

**R/19      16/02033/FUL Stone House Corve Street Ludlow SY8 1DG**

The Conservation Officer made the following observations:

- The L shape had been retained (foot print of existing building)
- The removal of the planned dwellings along the wall onto Station Drive had been noted, which was an objection from nearby residents
- The development was less dense
- More parking has been included
- The existing Stable Block had been retained

**RESOLVED (unanimous)  
GG/MC**

To Object

Members agreed that whilst the new scheme is an improvement they still felt that the overall architectural approach is not fitting with the current street scene. The development is still too dense, parking and access is still an issue therefore Ludlow Town Council is unable to support the scheme in its current design.

**R/20      14/05573/OUT Dun Cow Farm Rocks Green Ludlow SY8 2DS (Ludford Parish)**

**RESOLVED (5:0:2)  
GG/TG**

Object

Members objected to the amended plans because their previous objections listed below had not been resolved and the new position of the fuel tanks effectively reduces the staff parking spaces from 27 to 11 when parking spaces on the site are already relatively low.

Members reiterated their previous objections made in January 2015:

*Ludlow Town Council's Representational Committee resolved to object to application **14/05573/OUT** at their meeting on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015.*

*Members acknowledge that the application is in Ludford parish, and the statutory consultee response is the responsibility of Ludford Parish Council, however the detrimental impact of the proposed out of town supermarket on Ludlow would be devastating and therefore Ludlow Town Council's role as community representatives in planning matters is important.*

### **Community Representations**

*At the time of writing this letter there were fifty-eight public comments of which fifty-two are in opposition to the proposal. These figures give a clear indication of the high level of local concern and opposition to the proposal.*

*Ludlow Town Centre Residents Association and local organisation Love Ludlow have both made representations to the Committee to voice their members' opposition to the proposal. Please find minutes from the meeting which record the representations from these organisations enclosed.*

### **Detrimental to Existing Street Scene & Residents' & Visitor Amenity**

*Ludlow currently has an enviable range of local independent shops including three butchers, two delis, three bakers and many unique retailers selling clothes, giftware, domestic goods, confectionary, flowers, snacks, meals & drinks. These shops trade, surrounded by the beautiful architecture and ambience of the town centre, alongside small chain store outlets, however, there is parity because they are all ~~are~~ subject to the same restriction imposed by the medieval street layout.*

*The status quo of Ludlow, as it currently exists, is a workable balance that will enable the town to develop and make plans to ensure Ludlow continues to thrive, however, an out of town supermarket would distort the status quo and devastate the town centre.*

### **Local Knowledge**

*Members noted that the developer identified the existing Aldi store as 'out of town', but, in reality, Aldi is on the opposite side of the same street (Station Drive) as Tesco and a pedestrian crossing permits shoppers to safely walk from one store to the other, so both supermarkets are effectively in the town centre. In planning terms, the defined area of the town centre may be correctly represented; however, the information is misleading without local knowledge.*

### **Outside SAMDev Boundary**

*The proposed supermarket, petrol station and parking is an 'out of town' development and outside the SAMDev boundary. There is concern that this would set a precedent for unplanned and unwanted retail development on the outskirts of Ludlow. Members resolved to object to the proposal for all the reasons stated in this letter, but one of the primary concerns is the devastating effect that similar out of town developments have had on nearby towns such as Leominster and Kidderminster. Shropshire's SAMDev submission is currently being assessed by central government, and has passed some significant stages, which now means it carries some weight within the local planning framework.*

### **Infrastructure in the wrong place**

*An 'out of town' supermarket and petrol station offering a similar number of parking spaces as the town centre car parks will have a detrimental impact on the town centre. The location of the self contained facilities of the proposed 'out of*



*town' supermarket would not facilitate linked shopping trips to the town centre because it is on the wrong side of a busy roundabout on the A49 bypass with no pedestrian crossing on the road leading to the supermarket. The proposed supermarket is not on the local bus route.*

***Linked Trips***

*One the other hand, the proximity of existing supermarkets Tesco, Aldi & Budgen (previously the Co-op) to the town centre enables linked shopping trips into the town centre shops and cafes. Linked shopping is important to the town centre shops & businesses because they rely on impulse buying, which requires footfall in the town centre.*

***Sufficient Provision Already Exists***

*There is no need for an out of town supermarket in Ludford. Current provision of supermarkets is more than sufficient clearly evidenced by the fact that one of the existing supermarkets is under trading and up for sale.*

**R/21      16/02239/FUL 51 Mill Street Ludlow SY8 1BB**

Members stated that the existing windows were part of the architectural history and journey of the building and images should be retained.

**RESOLVED**

**GG/MJ (4:1:2)**

- i) No objection to the replacement of the six windows to create uniformity
- ii) However, it was not clear that roof would be able to support two dormer windows and member felt that the solution should be symmetrical. Either two dormer windows installed or two roof light retained to prevent disruption to the roof line.

**R/22      GRANT APPLICATION Ludlow Amateur Boxing Club**

**RESOLVED**

**MC/CS (unanimous)**

To refuse the grant application.

**R/23      GRANT APPLICATION Ludlow Green Festival / Ludlow21**

**RESOLVED**

**MC/CS (unanimous)**

To award the grant application of £300.00.

**R/24      16 MILL STREET LUDLOW**

**RESOLVED**

**GG/PD (unanimous)**

To defer the item until Shropshire Council Highways provide an accurate map.

**R/25**      **LUDFORD BRIDGE**

Members requested that the Town Clerk send Philip Dunne MP a copy of the letter of 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016 to Shropshire Council Highways regarding Ludford Bridge HGV restrictions and signage.

**R/26**      **PAVEMENT PERMITS**

**RESOLVED**  
**GG/PK (6:0:1)**

- i) Members requested clarification from Shropshire Council on the policy on pavement permits and if the kerb is part of the pavement or part of the highway.
- ii) That they had no objection to the applications for Castle Lodge Buttery and CWA Cycles and Pet subject to confirmation that the kerb is included in the pavement area. If the kerbs is not included the criteria for minimum distance is not met.
- iii) That there was no objection to applications for Gallery Castle Square and 55 Mill Street
- iv) To object to the application for The Olive Branch because the overall pavement area is too small to allow the minimum distance for pedestrians.

**R/27**      **MARKET SQUARE WAR MEMORIAL BENCH**

Members thanked Councillor Ginger for his work on this project

**RECOMMENDATION**  
**GG/PD (unanimous)**

To replace the existing two benches on the Market Square Memorial with one bespoke large bench with the seating capacity equal to two benches and to be positioned to enable civic events to continue in their traditional way.

The Conservation Officer left the meeting at 8.45pm

**R/28**      **CAMP LANE, LUDFORD BRIDGE AND LINGEN ROAD**

**RESOLVED**  
**GG/PD (unanimous)**

Members noted the letter from Shropshire Council

**R/29**      **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER Ref SC/00263/16**

The Chair thanked the Tree Officer for his valuable comments, which were supported by members.

Clearly the planning considerations on this site are far wider than the issues arising from treatment of the present extensive tree-cover. Regardless of their public amenity value, if the site is to be developed at all, many trees will have to be cleared.

There is some scope for confusion between the two reports submitted to support this application. The report of Mr. Habershon dated May 2012 covers 67 trees or groups of trees of which only three are proposed for retention. The later report by Terry Merchant (28/10/12) details all the trees on the site but with a different numbering system from the earlier report but appears not to include a site plan with a "blue boundary line". Within this line the report recommends clearing 149 trees of which 22 are in Category A "with particular visual importance". Of the 93 trees proposed for retention 8 are in category A. The supporting photos refer to "Wood A" and "Wood B" but there appears to be no site plan or commentary explaining the significance of these two areas.

The arborist's report on the existing tree-cover and proposals for retaining individual trees and groups for screening is exceedingly detailed and professionally informed. To develop an independent view on the precise proposals for tree-work would require similarly detailed work.

Retention of 93 trees on the site will clearly maintain the wooded character of the area although this will no doubt be affected in future as the trees are incorporated into new gardens (probably producing a rash of additional applications). In the absence of a site plan of the retained trees it is impossible to comment on the effectiveness of the screening which will be achieved although the report as whole is very thorough and competent and encourages confidence in the recommendations.

**RESOLVED**  
**GG/TG (unanimous)**

To put a Tree Preservation Order on all retained trees as a group to protect against future clearance.

**R/355     ROAD CLOSURE - MAYOR'S SUNDAY**

**RESOLVED**  
**GG/PD (unanimous)**

To note the road closure

Meeting closed at 8.48pm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman  
NB: No Closed Session minutes will be issued

Date