

MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the **REPRESENTATIONAL COMMITTEE** held in the Stable Block Meeting Room, Stone House, Corve Street, Ludlow on **TUESDAY 11th JANUARY 2011** at **7.00pm**

R/65 PRESENT

Chairman: Councillor Wilcox

Councillors: Aitken; Hunt; McCormack and Smithers

Officers: Communications & Cemetery Officer, Gina Wilding

Also attending: Dyanne Humphreys, Principle Planning Officer, Shropshire Council

R/66 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Davies.

R/67 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the terms of the Local Authorities (Model Code of Conduct) (England) Order 2007 issued under Section 51 of the Local Government Act 2000 Members declared interests as follows: -

There were no personal or prejudicial interests declared

R/68 PUBLIC OPEN SESSION (15 minutes)

There were two members of the public present.

Mr Nash, Ludlow Civic Society

Mr Nash asked for confirmation that the Shropshire Council Planning Committee meeting on Wed 26 January is still going ahead – this was confirmed.

Mr Nash also asked that if a meeting between Shropshire Council, English Heritage and the developer takes place then would LTC be taking part – this was confirmed.

Mr Nash also asked members to consider the impact on Ludlow, if the development by the Reader's House were to go ahead, in light of the considerable disruption simultaneous road closures in King Street and Ludford Bridge

Cllr Mrs Rosanna Taylor-Smith, Shropshire Councillor

Confirmed information on the forthcoming road closures, signage and the Type and Affordability of Housing Consultation.

R/69 MINUTES

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the minutes of the meeting of the **REPRESENTATIONAL COMMITTEE** held on **7th December 2010** were approved and signed as a correct record.

JW/JS

R/70 PLANNING DECISIONS FROM SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL

RESOLVED (unanimous)

JW/JS

The decisions listed below were **NOTED**:

10/05030/TCA	No Objection	10/04766/LBC	Grant
10/05049/TCA	No Objection	10/04938/TCA	Objection
10/01815/LBC	Refused	10/05231/TCA	No Objection
10/01830/ADV	Grant	10/04362/FUL	Grant
10/04765/FUL	Grant		

R/71 PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS

RESOLVED

10/05134/VAR Granville Garage Bromfield Road Ludlow **No objection**
JS/SMC 3:0:1

Members asked Shropshire Council Principle Planning Officer to update them on the progress of the flood mitigation scheme which was a condition of the original planning permission

10/05326/TCA 112 Corve Street Ludlow **No objection**
SMc/JA (unanimous)

10/05358/ADV New Brewery, Kingsley Garage 105 Corve Street **No objection**
JA/SMc (unanimous)

10/05479/LBC Emporos, 27 Bull Ring, Ludlow **No objection**
JA/JS 2:1:1

10/05483/VAR The Bungalow, Bromfield Road, Ludlow **No objection**
JA/JS 2:1:1

10/0555/FUL The Barn, Halton Lane, Ludlow
SMc/JS 3:1:0

Objection

LTC comments: The proposed extension is oversized and out of sympathy with the original barn.

R/72 GRANTS, PLANNING, TRANSPORT, PARKING & PATHS

- (a) **Consultation – Draft supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Type and Affordability of Housing**

RESOLVED JW/JA (unanimous)

Consultation – Draft supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Type and Affordability of Housing

That comments made below at the meeting should be noted and a presentation / question and answer session arranged for the next meeting.

On first consideration of the document members found that they were in agreement with many points made, and specifically those indicated below:

1.2 Members were in agreement with:

Shropshire Core Strategic Objective 5:

“Provide for a mix of good quality, sustainable housing development of the right size, type, tenure and affordability to meet the housing needs and aspirations of all sections of the community, including provision for specialist needs and the elderly.”

Members also thought that the housing should be of a uniform style to avoid an stigmatisation.

2. Type, Mix and design of housing

Members were in agreement with:

2.3 With this objective in mind, in the case of larger housing developments (10 plus houses in Shrewsbury, the market towns and other key centres and 5 plus houses in rural areas), the Council will generally seek to achieve a suitable mix of types and sizes of dwellings in the development. In particular it is normally important to include an adequate proportion of smaller dwellings as part of a development, particularly in rural areas where market forces tend to lead to the provision of larger dwellings at the expense of smaller dwellings. If this trend is unchecked it leads to the exclusion of less well-off people from rural villages and the countryside.

Members were also in general agreement with the content of the following sub-sections and main headings:

Mix, type and layout of the affordable housing requirement

Section 106 agreement Head of Terms

5. Affordable Homes for local people: exception sites especially:

Scale and design

5.21 Exception site developments must have regard to housing need and are relatively small sites. The scale of any individual scheme must reflect the character and scale of the settlement.

Tenure – general

Prioritising local people

Definition of "local area"

Standard conditions regarding design requirements especially:

5.61 Permitted development rights of the affordable dwellings will normally be removed in order to retain control over future extensions. Applications for extensions and adaptations will be considered on their merits, including the personal circumstances of the applicant such as the needs of an occupant with disabilities or to accommodate appropriate extensions for family growth.

Rural Occupation Restrictions

However, as members seek to indicate from the following examples, the document was very technical to the extent that some of the statistics were indecipherable to those without specialist knowledge.

Members found the **Dynamic Viability Index** on pages 58 and 59 very confusing:

One section in raised considerable concern:

4.30 Where a development can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Housing Enabling officer that it is not viable at the level of contribution required, negotiations will determine what would be a viable contribution. An open book accounting approach will be used to assess the financial aspects of the development. This is an arrangement involving the structured management and sharing of costing information between client, contractor, associated suppliers and the Council. The template used by the Council is available at Appendix C.

4.30 Seems to weaken the Council's resolve to ensure that developments meet the needs of the local population in terms of elements that might not be attractive to developer.

Members acknowledge that economic considerations are important to enable the developers to undertake a project, but **4.30** seems to allow many of the social and economic considerations that are paramount to the community within which the

development will be built to be swept aside in favour of the considerations of the developer.

There were also concerns about the review process and period for the document, members have requested an officer from Shropshire Council to attend the next Representational meeting to help make the document more accessible.

- (b) **Tree Preservation Order**
RESOLVED SMc/JS (unanimous)
To support the TPO
- (c) **Road Adoption**
RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)
To note the adoption of the development at the former football Ground, Dahn Drive off Riddings Road
- (d) **Changes to Waiting Restrictions in Ludlow**
RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)
To note the traffic regulation order that came into operation on 10 December 2010
- (e) **Road Closure**
RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)
To note the road closure in King Street, Ludlow. Members considered the new route and concluded that it seemed the best solution in difficult circumstances.
- (f) **Road Closure**
RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)
To note the diversion route to be used during the closure of Ludford bridge to vehicular traffic until the end of April 2011. Members raised concerns that the temporary diversion signs were not securely fixed and some had fallen over causing unnecessary confusion. Members also noted that there was not yet sufficient diversion signage on the A49
- (g) **Grant Feedback**
RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)
To note with thanks the feedback from Ludlow Girlguiding Centenary Celebrations
- (h) **Ludlow Swift Conservation Group**
RESOLVED JS/SMc (unanimous)
To recommend that Ludlow Town Council's Direct Labour Force help Ludlow Swift Conservation Group to put up nesting boxes to Full Council because the request was time sensitive and there was not enough time to wait for the next Services meeting.
- (i) **Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decisions**
RESOLVED JW/JS (unanimous)
To note the decision regarding Dinham Lodge, Dinham, Ludlow

The meeting closed at **20:35pm**

Chairman

Date

NB: No confidential minutes will be issued