## SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

Date: 13th September 2016

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	16/02033/FUL Stone House, Ludlow	Neighbour

We are withdrawing our objection to this development as the developers have repositioned the main building and have agreed verbally to allow a deed of variation to the rear access for the buildings on Corve Street. We retain concerns about materials that are to be used in the buildings and most notably the positioning of the dormer windows in the extension of the Stable Block. These dormers directly overlook the garden of Old Stone House and could be placed on the other south-facing roof of the extension thereby removing the intrusion into our privacy at the same time as making the extension a lighter and more pleasant residence. We are assured by Purcell/Churchill that discussions will be entered into with Wrekin and with the planning officers to see if this can be done. The gardens on Station Drive are on the south side and would therefore not be affected.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	16/02033/FUL Stone House, Ludlow	Neighbour

Having spoken to the various parties involved and agreed various changes I am happy to withdraw my previous objection.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
	16/02033/FUL	Neighbour
7		OFFICER COMMENTS:
	# Bottom of Page 3 (page 49), point 1.8,last line	
	The existing right of way enjoyed by 110 Corve Street will also be retained. This should read "The existing right of way enjoyed by 110, <i>111 and 113</i> Corve Street will also be retained. NB the existing right of way for 111 Corve Street is jointly shared with 112 Corve Street (under the same ownership) although does not appear on the title deeds.	This point is noted. The right of way does extend from the access to the rear of No. 110 Corve Street, including Nos. 111 and 112.
	# Page 5 (page 51), Point 2.3	
	Buildings along Corve Street, west side of site. No mention is made of No 110, No 111 or No 112 Corve Street. These are all Grade 2 listed. No 112, The Great House, is far older than No 113, dating back to 1270, and is one of the historic houses of Ludlow.	The buildings along the western side of the site only include Nos. 110 – 113 inclusive. There are no other properties affected.
	# Page 6 (page 52), Point 4.1.2 - SC Drainage Conditions	

Drainage details for the access road have not vet been provided. We are keen to see these as we know from CCTV studies performed by ourselves that we know we have the drains from the current Stone House site plus the water supply to the current Stone House site running through our land between 111 and 112 Corve Street. While this was acceptable for an office building it is not acceptable for residential development. We also have a drain run collecting water from the rear roof of 111 Corve Street, running immediately behind the rear walls of 111 and 112 Corve Street. This drains into the current drainage system between 111 and 112 Corve Street. We would like this particular drain run to be conserved. We understand that the drainage from the new residential development will be through a new drainage system which will exit through the main entrance from the site (currently gated) onto Corve Street. It would be good to have this new drainage system confirmed in writing.

We know that the houses of 110,111 and 113 Corve Street have cellars which have been damp. The cellar to 112 was filled in at some time before the date we purchased it. We have had extensive and expensive work carried out on the cellar of 111 Corve Street to ensure the cellar is dry and is a usable, safe space. We are very keen to ensure that this current situation continues and that the cellar of 111 Corve Street will not be adversely affected by the development, either caused by the drainage runs, planned soakaways or construction works. We are also aware that the whole site from the Aldi supermarket to Corve Street slopes downwards towards Corve Street and are particularly wary about the use of soakaways for the new development.

## # Page 15 (page 61), Point 4.1.9 Historic England Advice

Careful attention is given to matters of layout, scale and massing and particularly the potential impact upon views into the site from the side of Stone House. This should also include and from the rear of 111 and 112 Corve Street, other historic houses, bordering this site. .... the success of any scheme will depend considerably on the use of quality and appropriate design, materials and finishes.

This is a comment provided by the Council's drainage engineer as part of his technical consultation response. As recommended, construction development will not be able to take place on the site until the precise drainage scheme has been submitted and approved by the local planning authority. The applicant is aware of the concerns raised by neighbouring residents and has no intention of interfering with any private drains.

This refers to a consultee response. The impact of the proposed development has been assessed in relation to neighbouring properties in the report. The point made at 4.1.9 relates solely to public views rather than private ones.

## # Page 16 (page 62), Point 4.1.10 SC Conservation - Comments on the original scheme

Constraints: Mention is made of the rear burgage plots of the Grade Il listed buildings along Corve Street, however in the list of designated assets considered within the constraints analysis there is possibly a typographical error. Mention is made of the Grade Il listed 114 Corve Street. This is not next to the site. It is currently run as a Nail Bar.

No mention is made of Grade II listed 112 Corve Street, The Great House, one of Ludlow's historic houses, or Grade II listed 111 Corve Street, The Maltsters House. Both of these houses are adjacent to the planned development site

**Design Context:** To minimise the negative impact on the Grade Il listed buildings it is suggested that the roof line should be amended to include chimneys as ventilation stacks. The effect of the double gabled end wall could be mitigated by specifying the natural materials and rather than just specifying them for the Stables building the materials should be traditional and also be specified for a minimum of the 2 storey double gabled buildings on the west side of the development, eg lime mortar or painted light pastel colour, use of wooden timber for windows and joinery and use of slate for roofs for the 2 storey houses on the west side of the development adjacent to the Corve Street buildings, and possibly also for the double gabled end on the south side of the development.

## # Page 28 (page 74), Point 6.2.10

Should specify that the double gabled end adjacent to 111 and 112 Corve Street on the west aspect of the site should have traditional materials e.g. coloured lime mortar or pastel painted brickwork, slate roof and wooden windows and joinery.

### # Page 29 (page 75), Point 6.2.12

Where is the evidence for the sustainable drainage scheme mentioned in line 2?

This also refers to a consultee response. The impact of the proposed development on all affected heritage assets is addressed in the report. It is accepted that the reference to 114 Corve Street is an error and should have included 111 and 112 Corve Street. Matters relating to materials and method of construction are covered by the recommended planning conditions.

All matters relating to materials will be considered in detail post-decision and prior to construction. The most appropriate form of materials will be secured for use, within reason.

The application is accompanied by a full Drainage Statement. The Statements explains that it has been prepared to "provide a sustainable drainage and maintenance strategy for the site." The Council's Drainage

Engineer agrees with the principles set out in the Statement and has suggested a number of conditions requiring additional information. These are set out in the Committee Report.

The SuDS proposals for the development are as follows:

- 1. Surface water from the roof area will be collected in attenuation tanks, with outfalls connected to the surface water sewerage system. The attenuation tanks will collect and settle first flush water off the roofs they serve;
- 2. The car parking bays will be surfaced in permeable paving. The sand layer and voided sub-base under the paving beneficially removes superficial pollution from parked vehicles;
- 3. Both the attenuation tanks and permeable paving will reduce the quantity of rainfall run off reaching public sewer;
- 4. Access roads which do not drain via permeable paving will be drained via deep trapped gullies. These gullies will remove sediment and floating matter from the run

off from the roads;

5. The water retention time in the void sub-base will be high, and therefore is likely to lead to the settlement of suspended solids from the stored water prior to discharge public storm.

## # Page 36 (page 82), Point 6.6.9

Concerns have been made by local residents about routing services beneath the properties on Corve Street. However, the applicant has confirmed that all services will utilise the existing routes that run beneath the existing access from Corve Street and there will be no impact on these properties arising from the proposals.

This statement is incorrect. Please see our above comments on current drainage and water supply which runs in the land between 111 and 112 Corve Street. We are only aware that fibre-optic cabling has been laid throughout the main entrance to Corve Street. Electrics probably run by the main entrance as there is an electric substation nearby.

The developer clearly has a duty of care to ensure that the development is carried out without causing harm to private infrastructure. The possibility of damage being caused to other parties' infrastructure remains a civil matter.

The Drainage Statement explains that there are existing combined and surface water public sewers in Corve Street to the west of the site, these are shown on the Severn Trent Water (STW) records. There are existing connections into these public sewers from the existing office building on the site and it is proposed to utilise these existing connections as part of any drainage strategy going forward.

A copy of the STW sewer records is included with the Statement and the proposed drainage plan clearly shows the foul and surface water drains connecting into the main sewers on Corve Street via the site entrance.

#### Page 38 (page 84), Point 6.7.10

The first line is wrong. No 112 is not attached to the Old Stone House which is immediately to the south (not north). There is a passageway, narrow at the front widening out to the rear of the properties and where The Great House ends (this wall is 1270), we have built a stone wall which currently separates our garden from the current garden of Old Stone House. From Corve Street it looks as if the 2 houses are joined but this is just a front (not aware when this was built).

Dr O'Callaghan is correct.
The report contains a typographical error in that the Stone House is located to the immediate south (not north) of No. 112 Corve Street. They are attached to each other by a section of historic wall at the front.

## Page 39 (page 85), Point 6.7.14 & Page 52 (page 98), point 24

Future lighting. We would like to be kept informed of future lighting plans to ensure it does not have an adverse effect on us.

The discharge of planning conditions is subject to a formal application process: but this, unlike a normal planning application, is not subject to public consultation. There is no statutory requirement for the local planning authority to engage with local residents. The discharging of conditions relates to a development already agreed in principle. It should be a speedy process, being regarded as a technical exercise.

# Page 47 (page 93), Point 6 and Page 48 (page 94), Point 10

Would like to see drainage plans.

The same comments apply to this point. However, it may be prudent to suggest by way of an informative that the developer engages with the local residents prior to submitting details against these particular conditions.

### Page 48 (page 94), Point 11

The developers have told us that they would remove the current ugly air conditioning and extraction equipment. Is this going to be replaced somewhere else?

The recommended conditions include submission of plant including air conditioning. The siting and appearance of such plant will be controlled in the interests of visual amenity and the interests of safeguarding local residential amenity as far as is reasonably practicable.

## Page 52 (page 98), Point 25

Siting of single communal TV aerial and satellite reception system. We would not want this to be within our line of vision from the rear of 111 and 112.

The point of this condition is to avoid the building becoming swathed in aerials and satellite dishes. One communal array for both will enable the authority to site the antennae in the most appropriate location.

Item No. 7	Application No. 16/02033/FUL	Originator: Ludlow Conservation Advisory Committee
	Ludlow Conservation Area Advisory Committee: no objection to the amendments. Reservations about over-development of the site are maintained.	These updated comments are noted. No further comment is considered to be necessary.