



MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the **REPRESENTATIONAL COMMITTEE** held at the Guildhall, Mill Street, Ludlow on **WEDNESDAY 19th July 2017** at **7pm**.

R/61 **PRESENT**

Chair: Councillor Ginger

Vice Chair: Councillor Sheward
Councillors: Councillors Clarke, Garner Gill and Pote

Officers: Gina Wilding, Town Clerk
Stephanie Williams, Admin Assistant

Also attending: Unitary Councillor Andy Boddington Ludlow North
Nick Scott Managing Director of Pickstock Homes
Katherine Else Managing Director Claremont Planning Consultancy

R/62 **HEALTH & SAFETY**

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

R/63 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Jones, Lyle, Mahalski and Paton

R/64 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

None

Conflicts of interest

Cllr	Item	Reason
Garner	15	Chair of The Green Festival
Ginger	17/03016/LBC 17/03015/FUL	Near neighbour

Personal Interest

Cllr	Item	Reason
Garner	15	Participant in Green Festival
Pote	15	Participant in Green Festival

R/65 PUBLIC OPEN SESSION (15 minutes)

There were no members of the public present.

R/66 LUDLOW'S UNITARY COUNCILLORS QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

There was one Unitary Councillors present.

Councillor Boddington, Unitary Councillor Ludlow North

**R/67 MINUTES
RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/CS**

That the minutes of the Representational Committee meeting held on Wednesday 28th June 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

R/68 ITEMS TO ACTION

The Chairman thanked staff for completing the items to action.

RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/CS

To note the items to action

R/69 LUDLOW CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LCAAC)

RESOLVED (unanimous)
CG/GG

To note the agenda of the meeting held on 19th July and the minutes of Wednesday 28th June 2017.

R/70 PRESENTATION - CLAREMONT PLANNING CONSULTANCY – LAND AT ROCKS GREEN - LUDLOW

Nick Scott Managing Director of Pickstock Homes (Developer) and Katherine Else Managing Director of Claremont Planning Consultancy presented members with the proposal for a hybrid planning application of two hundred homes including the outline of the first phase of the housing development on Rocks Green. The developer indicated that the plan was to build the two hundred homes over a period of between 6-10 years in total. The developer stated that the site would be liable for statutory affordable housing provision, but did not specify the details of the S106 agreement for the site.

Members raised the following point to be considered prior to the application being submitted to Shropshire Council;

- Adequate parking provision should be planned into the development to prevent the designed in spacious aspect of the development being swamped by cars
- Drainage issues are resolved in line with SUDS best practice and Environment Agency guidelines
- The green open space provision is centralised within the development to safeguard children
- Traffic management scheme is adequately considered regarding access and egress onto the main access road including the increase in traffic due to the development on the supermarket and petrol station at Rocks Green.
- To adequately consider the ability of the existing infrastructure of Ludlow to cope with this development
- That the provision of much needed small family homes, 2 and 3 bedroom properties is planned into the development at each phase of the development
- The inclusion of swift bricks as an integral feature of the houses.

The Chair thanked Pickstock Homes and Claremont Planning Consultancy for the presentation and for consulting Ludlow Town Council in the early stages of the planning.

R/71 SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL DECISIONS
RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/EG

That the decisions be noted

R/72 17/01387/FUL Housing Development Site Sidney Road Ludlow

RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/CS

To Object

Members felt that the revised plans had not address their previous comments submitted to Shropshire Council on 4th July 2017 and 3rd May 2017.

To strongly object on the following grounds:

- i) The amenity value of the land is significant to the existing residents, who have enjoyed the use of the land for over twenty years*
- ii) The proposed development is overdevelopment of the area*
- ii) The proposed development would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area*
- iii) The access to proposed parking area off Sidney Road is obscured and potentially dangerous because it leads onto a very busy road, which is a bus route and reduced to single width due to parked cars. The bus stop is at the end of Sidney Road where the proposed entrance for parking has been planned.*
- iv) The existing footpath and the bridleway are on the definitive map;*
- v) There are Tree Protection Orders on all three trees on the site*

There is precedent in case law established by the Sunningwell case in Oxfordshire, and others, where the development was refused on the grounds that the space had been used as an amenity area for over 20 years.

R/73 17/02991/FUL 25 Steventon New Road Ludlow

**RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/TG**

No objection to the proposed works

However, members felt that the way the application was presented was misleading and flawed because the velux window, dormer window and the staircase were omitted from the description of the planning application.

**R/74 17/03016/LBC 18 Bullring Ludlow
17/03015/FUL 18 Bullring Ludlow**

**RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/RJ**

To Object

For the following reasons:

- The proposed development would be overdevelopment of a very small site
- The development is in very close a proximity to Ludlow Town Walls, which is designated by Historic England as an Ancient Scheduled Monument.
- Structural engineering methods include pile driving, which would have a destabilising effect the town walls. There is no access to the site for the pile driving equipment.
- The development would have a detrimental impact to the surrounding area because of the lack of amenity area for the proposed dwellings
- Access to the dwellings, is severely restricted. There is only pedestrian access.
- There is no provision for parking

R/75 17/03027/LBC Smithfield House Lower Galeford Ludlow SY8 1RT

The Committee praised the applicants for working co-operatively with the Conservation Officer.

**RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/MC**

No object

R/76 **17/03026/LBC 1-2 King Street Ludlow**

RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/EG

No objection

R/77 **17/03455/TCA The Croft 12 Dinham Ludlow**

RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/TG

No objection

R/78 **17/03337/LBC The Wheatsheaf Lower Broad Street Ludlow**

RESOLVED (5:0:1)
GG/MC

Members felt that the proposed signage and lighting were excessive in a residential and out of keeping with the street scene of the conservation area.

However, subject to the following amendments, there was no objection to the proposal:

- Removal of the signage and light on the east wall (4 & 5), by the Broad Gate Arch because it is in an area of restricted visibility, so unnecessary, and it would be a distraction to motorists passing through the narrow archway.
- Removal of third down lighter at the west end of the building.

For clarity:

Signage to be retained:

- The hanging sign because it is a traditional indication of a public house (2 & 3).
- Two downlighters (1)
- The main large sign and lighting (4&5)
- The lantern and the two non illuminated information boards (6,7 & 8).

R/79 **ROAD CLOSURE-JULIAN ROAD – 25/09/2017 – 29/09/2017**

RESOLVED (unanimous)
GG/MC

To note the road closure

R/80 **GRANT APPLICATION - GREEN FESTIVAL****RESOLVED (unanimous)**
GG/TG

Members requested that two aspects of the accounts are fully explained. Namely, that the 'at cost value' of the intangible asset is defined and where the 'at cost value' sits within the accounts is adequately explained. The information should be made available for consideration at Representational Committee Agenda 23rd August 2017.

R/81 **CORVE STREET BUS STOP****RESOLVED (unanimous)**
GG/CS

To note the letter from Shropshire Council stating that Corve Street is not wide enough to accommodate the proposed street widening.

R/82 **TREES – CORONATION AVENUE****RESOLVED (unanimous)**
GG/TG

- i) To support Peter Norman, Tree Officer's detailed report and suggestions of an oak avenue along Bromfield Road/Coronation Avenue to replace the existing trees without liability for cost of the project or involvement in the discussion with land owner. .

The "avenue" of trees consists of four separate blocks of planting with substantial gaps between them dictated, in part, by the causeway over the flood release channel. The four distinct groups number as follows:

On the East side starting from the South (Lower Corve Street end).

Block 1 - 1 young oak; 5 mature birch; 2 mature cypress; 1 mature hawthorn; total 8 trees.

Block 2 - 1 dead cypress; 2 mature birch; total 3 trees.

On the West side starting from the South.

Block 1 - 7 young oak; 3 mature cypress (2 dead); 3 dead birch; 1 mature ash; total 14 trees.

Block 2 - 11 mature crab apples (3 dead); 5 mature birch (one dead); 4 mature cypress (one dead); total 20 trees.

The total planting in the Avenue therefore comprises 45 trees most of which appear to have been planted at the same time (1953?) but 8 of which (the young oaks) much more recently. However the comments by Siobhan Reedy relate to only the last block listed above. This may be because this is the only block in which the trees are planted outside the metal fences of the adjacent fields and are therefore the responsibility of the Highways Authority and not that of the owners of the fields (but who planted them all in the first place?)

Because of this limitation, the action proposed is not a comprehensive solution to the problem of what is indeed "a very tired and motley group of trees". Indeed, the replacement of this block of 20 trees with fastigiate oaks will make the avenue as a whole even more "motley".

One aesthetic consideration in planning replanting is the nature of the immediate environment - in this case grazed fields. In such a situation a planting of striking exotics is not appropriate and the introduction of native trees matching a rural context should be preferred.

In my opinion any action on this particular section of the Avenue should be related to a longer term plan to deal with the entire length of the avenue. Unless the Highways Authority have some jurisdiction over areas within the fence lines of the fields (which may be the case because of the embankment construction of the causeway) this will inevitably involve the collaboration of the landowner(s). The presence of 8 young pedunculate oaks within the fences (all well staked and protected from stock) indicates that this may not be a problem. (N.B. These oaks may have been planted when the bridge was rebuilt after the floods to make good the loss of trees during construction).

The phased approach I would suggest is to replace all the existing trees with standard pedunculate oak to match the existing young trees. As a first step all dead trees and the crab apples and cypresses should be removed and the gaps planted up. Retention of the birch would retain the screening of the road for the residents of Lower Corve Street. In a second phase the birch (many of which have serious rot pockets from previous branch removal and are not long lived anyway) could be taken out and the oak avenue completed. Cooperation with the adjacent landowners may enable some of the gaps to be filled on both sides of the road. Although in the short term serial planting will mean trees of different sizes, in the long term Coronation Avenue could become an avenue of mature oaks which continues the motif along the Bromfield road past the Leisure Centre.

- ii) To write to Peter Norman to thank him for the detailed report and suggestions.

Meeting closed at 8.22pm

Chairman

NB: No Closed Session minutes will be issued

Date