
Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 27 October 2015

Site visit made on 28 October 2015

by B J Sims BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 November 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/15/3001117

Land off A49 and Bromfield Road, Ludlow, Shropshire SY8 1DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Beardsell, Tesni Properties Limited, against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 13/03862/OUT, dated 23 September 2013, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2014.
 - The proposal is for residential development comprising of up to 215 dwellings; public open space; the construction of new highway junctions, access roads and pedestrian footbridges; a commercial building (Class B1(a) or (b) – business) and/or neighbourhood store (Class A1 – retail); and associated engineering and accommodation works.
 - The Inquiry sat for two days 27-28 October 2015.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development comprising of up to 215 dwellings; public open space; the construction of new highway junctions, access roads and pedestrian footbridges; a commercial building (Class B1(a) or (b) – business) and/or neighbourhood store (Class A1 – retail); and associated engineering and accommodation works, on land off A49 and Bromfield Road, Ludlow, Shropshire SY8 1DY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13/03862/OUT, dated 23 September 2013 and revised on 12 June 2014, subject to the conditions set out the Schedule appended to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. Application Ref 13/03862/OUT was revised on 12 June 2014 to provide additional information and to change the name of the applicant company from WCE Properties Limited to Tesni Properties Limited, as confirmed by a Certificate of Incorporation on Change of Name. The Council subsequently refused the application in the name of Tesni Properties Limited with reference to the additional information. This appeal is determined on the same basis.
3. The application and appeal are in outline with only the means of access for detailed consideration.

4. For the avoidance of doubt, a subsequent application Ref 14/04455/OUT for similar development on the same site, also refused by the Council, is not for consideration in connection with this appeal.
5. The Council gave notice in advance of the Inquiry that, whilst its reason for refusal would stand, it would adduce no evidence in support of its refusal. Accordingly, the appeal proposal is considered on a fresh assessment based essentially upon the evidence of the Appellant, a designated Rule 6 party named Friends of Fishmore View (FFV) and the Ludlow Town Council (LTC), which was represented the Inquiry, together with written representations by other interested persons. In practice, the Council maintained procedural involvement in the Inquiry and provided information on the progress towards adoption of its Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev), as well as evidence on its five year housing land supply (5YHLS).
6. The Appellants have provided a planning obligation by way of an agreement under section 106 of the Act to contribute a proportion of the proposed dwellings as affordable homes in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document on the Type and Affordability of Housing adopted by the Council in September 2012, or any subsequent modification. The provisions of this agreement are necessary, relevant and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, in terms of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) and accordingly are taken into account as a consideration material to this decision.
7. For further avoidance of doubt a putative alternative pedestrian access linking the southernmost corner of the appeal site to Bromfield Road at the River Corve Bridge does not form part of the appeal proposal, was not pursued by the Appellants at the Inquiry and is not considered in this decision.
8. Subsequent to the Inquiry, the Council received the report of the Inspector following examination of the SAMDev Plan. This recommends that, among a range of Main Modifications (MMs), the Plan be clarified to explain that housing guidelines are not to be regarded as maximum figures and that Policy MD3 be subject to certain amendments to set out a clear approach to windfall development in relation to the housing guidelines, which are not to be regarded as a ceiling. The Inquiry was conducted with reference to these proposed MMs at the consultation stage and, in the absence of any considered variation by the Inspector, there is no injustice in their being taken into account in the recently delivered report, subject to consideration of the weight yet to be accorded the emerging SAMDev discussed in connection with the first issue below.

Main Issue

9. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - 9.1 the principle of development of the appeal site by way of the appeal proposal with respect to the current planning policy status of the appeal site,
 - 9.2 the degree to which the proposed scheme is to be regarded as sustainable development,
 - 9.3 the suitability of the proposed bridge to Fishmore View as a means of pedestrian and cycle access, having particular regard to the amenity of Fishmore View, and

- 9.4 on balance, whether any policy conflict or environmental harm due to the proposed development is outweighed by material considerations or benefits, including any shortfall in five year housing land supply and having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Reasons

Principle of Development

10. The statutory development plan comprises the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy of March 2011 (CS) and saved policies of the South Shropshire Local Plan 2004-11 (SSLP). CS policies CS1 and CS3 together set a County requirement of around 27,500 new dwellings during the 20 years to 2026, including between 3,575 and 4,125 units in South Shropshire. Of these, an indicative 500 to 1,000 dwellings should be provided in the market town of Ludlow, as a principal focus for development, either on allocated sites or within the development boundaries. Policy CS5 strictly controls development in the countryside outside development boundaries. Policy CS6 sets out sustainable design and development principles. Policy CS10 seeks to manage the phased release of housing land in order to maintain a five year housing land supply (5YHLS) as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
11. According to the SSLP, the appeal site lies outside the settlement boundary of Ludlow and is not allocated for development. However, the SSLP provided for development within the County up to 2011. It is the emerging SAMDev Plan which is set to replace the SSLP in providing site specific allocations and development criteria up to 2026, in parallel with the adopted CS. SAMDev Policy 10, consistent with the CS, sets a guideline for housing growth in Ludlow, between 2006 and 2026, of 875 dwellings, of which some 280 are predicted to come from Rocks Green and The Sheet, two allocated sites outside the current development boundary.
12. SAMDev Policy M1 commits to making sufficient land available to meet the CS housing requirements, specifically in the market towns, including Ludlow. SAMDev Policy MD3, incorporating MMs now formally recommended by the examination Inspector, states that, in addition to the sites allocated in the Plan for housing, planning permission will also be granted for other sustainable housing development, having particular regard to other Policies including CS2-5 and MD1.
13. Paragraph 4.16 of the supporting text to Policy MD3, also subject to recommended MM, admits that, whereas housing allocations are a key component of supply, windfall development on other sites is also important, both within settlements and in the countryside, including greenfield sites. This is again subject to other relevant policies. The same paragraph also makes reference to the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development.
14. Having regard to paragraph 216 of the NPPF, the policies of the SAMDev Plan relevant to this appeal may now be accorded significant weight in recognition of the advanced stage of preparation of the Plan and because they are essentially consistent with the NPPF.
15. By way of the submitted Statement of Common Ground, the Council and the Appellants are agreed that the proposed development is in conformity with the

CS, whereby, under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development should be permitted unless material circumstances indicate otherwise. However, that conclusion is at odds with Policy CS5 of the current CS, which strictly controls development outside the defined boundary of Ludlow, where the appeal site is situated. On that basis, the acceptability of the development depends upon other material considerations.

16. Among such material considerations are the SAMDev policies outlined above, as well as the NPPF with its presumption in favour of sustainable development, in its triple socio-economic and environmental roles, and its fundamental aim to boost the supply of housing.
17. There is no dispute in this case that only some 9,500 new dwellings of the 27,500 CS requirement have been delivered in the first nine years of the CS plan period, leaving 18,000 to be found across the County in the next 11 years. It follows that there is a current need to boost the supply of housing in Shropshire, including by way of greenfield windfall sites, as contemplated by SAMDev Policy MD3, where these are sustainable in planning terms.
18. To that extent, notwithstanding some degree of conflict with Policy CS5, the development now proposed on the appeal site is in principle potentially compliant with the adopted CS as a whole and its housing strategy, especially when taken with the material provisions of the emerging SAMDev.

Sustainability

19. Whilst the case for FFV focusses principally on their objection to the Fishmore View Footbridge, discussed below, it is apparent that they share other local concerns, as voiced at the Inquiry by Ludlow Town Council (LTC) and broadly related to the sustainability of the proposed development. LTC, and others who made written representations, continue to object to the proposal in terms of the original reason for refusal, which remains in place. These concerns are taken into account in the following assessment.
20. Even though the appeal site is located outside the defined development boundary of Ludlow, it is nonetheless contained by the embankment of the main A49 and is physically and visually associated with urban Ludlow, more so than either of the sites allocated by the SAMDev.
21. There is nothing to refute a Landscape Visual Assessment by the Appellants, which concludes that the site is generally of low landscape sensitivity. The area of most sensitivity is on the eastern side towards the River Corve, where there is potential for the retention of 3 hectares of land as open space, in excess of Council requirements for a development of this size, as illustrated on the submitted plans. This could give rise to ecological and landscape enhancements, including the retention of certain protected trees.
22. Equally there is nothing to question the common ground between the Appellants and the Council that the development would not cause harm to biodiversity, archaeological or heritage interests.
23. There remains local concern that the River Corve is known to flood over part of the site. However an unchallenged Flood Risk Assessment, submitted by the Appellants, indicates that, whereas the easternmost part of the site lies within Flood Zones 2 or 3 of medium or high risk, the area to be occupied by the built part of the proposed development is in Zone 1 of low risk. Flood risk to

- residential property could accordingly be minimised by technical solutions incorporated into any future proposal for full planning permission.
24. In answer to concerns over noise and vibration levels close to the A49 and mainline railway, an Environmental Noise Assessment submitted by the Appellants and also unchallenged, shows that noise impacts could be mitigated in a detailed submission by suitable insulation, screening and orientation of dwellings.
 25. As for air pollution from the nearby A49, there is no evidence that this is likely to give rise to public health concerns.
 26. There also remains local concern that the site is inaccessible due to the presence of the A49 to the north and the main railway line cutting through the site towards its boundary with Bromfield Road, noting that the frequency of trains using the line is set to increase. It was these problems of accessibility that evidently caused the site to be omitted from the SAMDev allocations. Be that as it may, the appeal proposal resolves these matters with details, approved by the respective highway authorities, of a new roundabout access serving the bulk of the site from the A49 and a further entrance off Bromfield Road to the south. Importantly, there would also be a pedestrian bridge over the railway in place of the present level crossing. The site would thus be made safely accessible and the proposed dwellings would be within walking distance of a number of regular bus routes and several community facilities along Bromfield Road, including the Recreation Centre and a primary school.
 27. In the absence of any restrictive landscape or conservation designations covering the site, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed development would not give rise to any significant harm to the countryside beyond the Ludlow development boundary. Nor would the development cause any adverse environmental impact that could not be controlled by planning conditions or mitigated in the design of a fully detailed proposal. It would amount to a logical extension to the town and is to be regarded as sustainable development with reference to national and local planning policy, in particular CS Policy CS6.
 28. Although controversial, as discussed below, the pedestrian and cycle accessibility of the appeal development would be further enhanced by the proposed Fishmore View bridge, on the eastern side of the site, over the River Corve. This would provide an additional two-way link between the proposed residential development and north western Ludlow, whilst also enabling public open space within the appeal site on the west of the River to be reached via Fishmore View.
 29. It is to be borne in mind that the Appellants and the Council are agreed that the sustainability credentials of the appeal site would not be unacceptably reduced if the pedestrian and cycle link via the proposed Fishmore View bridge were deleted from the proposals, and that its deletion could be achieved by a suitable planning condition imposed upon any outline permission granted. The Appellants and the Council would be content to accept such arrangement and there is nothing in the evidence to contradict this shared view of the Appellants and Council or preclude that approach.

Fishmore View Bridge

30. It is necessary to consider the suitability of the Fishmore View bridge in terms of its advantages to the proposed development as against any adverse effects it would have, in terms of the evidence of FFV.
31. The Bridge would clearly enhance the sustainability of the proposed development by providing a shorter, two-way, pedestrian and cycle link, direct from the east of the site to the facilities of Ludlow. This would serve as an alternative to the more indirect route via the proposed railway bridge, which would lie toward the south west corner of the site, further from the town centre. That longer route would also involve walking or cycling along Bromfield Road, in close proximity to motor traffic. The Fishmore View bridge would thus provide greater encouragement to residents of the proposed development, as well as visitors, to use sustainable travel modes, other than the private car, including local bus services. For example, the circular Ludlow town service would be more accessible at Fishmore Road for some residents of the appeal site than via the bus stop on Bromfield Road.
32. FFV contend that the presence of the bridge could generate unsafe pedestrian and cycle movements along a narrow section of Fishmore Road by schoolchildren and others destined for the Stanton area to the east. On the other hand, FFV consider that many of the children attending school on Bromfield Road would continue to use Bromfield Road to reach home in areas of the town such as Bringewood, more directly to the south, reducing the sustainability benefit due to the bridge. FFV also question the practical availability and accessibility of bus services and whether they would effectively encourage use of the bridge as an alternative to the private car.
33. It is the chief concern of FFV that, as a result of these considerations, the proposed Fishmore View bridge would, in practice, serve merely as a leisure route. As such, FFV contend that it would mainly attract people to use the open space west of the River Corve in conjunction with the existing green space and play area between Fishmore View and east bank. This is currently used by visitors, typically dog walkers, including those who arrive by car and park along Fishmore View.
34. There is no quantified estimate of pedestrian or cyclist catchments or flows likely to use the bridge. Therefore the majority of residents of the relatively quiet cul de sac of Fishmore View, together with occupiers of Corve View, nearest to the appeal site and proposed bridge, fear increased use of the area by non-residents. They consider that the enlarged public open space accessible via the bridge would generate unacceptable numbers of visiting dog walkers, parking their cars along the road and causing congestion and inconvenience. Added to this, they consider that there would be an increase in general activity and potential antisocial behaviour in Fishmore View, associated with the proposed development and the bridge, and that this would cause further harm to their living conditions.
35. Clearly, there would be some degree of change in the area by virtue of the presence of the bridge itself and the potential for greater numbers of visitors and passing pedestrians and cyclists. This would be noticeable and no doubt irritating to residents. However, there is no evidence, nor intuitively does it seem likely, that additional pedestrians, cyclists, cars or parking activity would reach such a level as to warrant planning objection. That is given also that

other legislation exists to control kerbside parking or antisocial behaviour in the event that either should arise.

36. On a balance of judgement, the broad public benefits of the Fishmore View bridge to the proposed development and the community at large are significant, compared with the essentially local amenity concerns of FFV. Even though the proposed development would be sustainable without the Fishmore View bridge, its retention within the appeal development as proposed is therefore justified, as a suitable means of pedestrian and cycle access.

Overall Planning Balance

37. Notwithstanding some degree of conflict with Policy CS5, the development now proposed on the appeal site is, in principle, compliant with the adopted CS as a whole and its housing strategy, when taken with the material provisions of the emerging SAMDev Plan.
38. As a demonstrably sustainable proposal, the appeal development would be compliant with SAMDev Policy MD3, which carries significant weight. To the extent that the development is to be regarded as being in any conflict with Policy CS5 due to its location outside the Ludlow development boundary, this consideration is outweighed by the material need to boost the supply of housing in the County.
39. Moreover, the socio-economic benefits of providing up to 215 new market and affordable homes, together with a neighbourhood store, significantly and demonstrably outweigh any small degree of environmental harm that might result. The presumption of the NPPF in favour of sustainable development is thus engaged, in further support of the proposal.
40. Finally, it was necessary to the requisite fresh assessment of the proposal to explore at the Inquiry whether the Council can demonstrate the existence of a 5YHLS. That was because its claim of doing so was contended by the Appellants, whereby the NPPF provides that Council policies for the supply of housing could not be regarded as up to date in any event, and any shortfall in 5YHLS supply would have to be taken into the planning balance.
41. The Council is content that it can demonstrate a 5YHLS equivalent to some 5.7 years, whilst the Appellants quote other evidence that it is of the order of only 3.8 years. The difference results from variation in the calculation methodology, including with reference to CS Policy CS10 on phased land release, and assumptions regarding effective deliverability and build rates of individual sites. On balance, it is apparent that the 5YHLS for the purposes of this decision is likely to be just above the requisite equivalent five years. Thus giving the benefit of any doubt to the Council, the existence of a 5YHLS is no impediment to the grant of permission for the development in view of the foregoing conclusions in its favour.

Conditions

42. Suggested Conditions were discussed at the Inquiry with reference to a schedule put forward by the Council [*Listed Document 9*]. It was agreed that certain of the conditions initially suggested by the Council (Nos 12, 13, 15 and 22-25) relate to reserved matters and are unnecessary to this outline permission. Of those imposed in the Schedule appended to this decision, Conditions 1-4 set standard time limits for the submission of reserved matters

and commencement of development and, for the avoidance of doubt, expressly required compliance with the approved plans, including the means of access in detail, whilst confirming that the rest of the information shown on the plans is taken as illustrative. Conditions 6-8, 11-12 and 18 require full details of the construction and drainage of the road, rail and river bridge accesses, and closure of the level crossing, to be approved in advance of commencement, in the interests of good practice and safety. Conditions 9-10 impose appropriate working hours and require an agreed construction method statement to control noise, disturbance and pollution. Condition 13 ensures the completion of any necessary protective archaeological work in advance of the construction of the accesses. Conditions 14-17 safeguard retained trees and wildlife from the access construction works. Condition 19 precludes the raising of ground levels or the construction of buildings or other obstructions within the River Corve flood plain. Finally, Condition 20 requires compliance with a travel plan and is relevant to the detailed approval of the means of access.

43. All the conditions imposed accord with national guidance on their use and are necessary to control the effects of the development for which permission is granted.

Conclusion

44. For the reasons explained, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions described above.

B J Sims

Inspector

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A 537 32 Rev A; A 537 07 Rev G; T171130-120; Ludlow North Side Area Planning Condition Fig 1; J244/A49/footpath River/Fig 4; J244/A49 footpath RT/Fig 3; and J244/Broomfield [*sic*] Proposal/Fig 2.
- 5) Nothing in this permission shall be construed as giving approval to the housing layout shown on the approved plans as such details are for illustration purposes only.
- 6) No construction works associated with the development, on land between the A49 and the railway line requiring access from the A49 (hatched red in drawing J244 Figure 1), shall commence until the access proposals have been completed in accordance with drawing T17113-120, or any revision thereof approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency.
- 7) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until drainage plans for the disposal of surface water have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use.
- 8) No works in connection with the construction of the houses or neighbourhood store hereby permitted shall take place until the footbridge over the railway line is completed and open for use and the level crossing, known as Feltons, adjoining the site is permanently closed to vehicles and pedestrians in accordance with details that shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) With the exception of work to provide the roundabout on the A49, construction works shall not take place outside the following times:
 - Monday to Friday 07:30hrs to 18:00hrs
 - Saturday 08:00hrs to 13.00hrs
 - Nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holiday.
- 10) No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development

- iv. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - v. wheel washing facilities
 - vi. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - vii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
- 11) No development shall take place until details of pedestrian and cycle accesses via the bridge over the railway line and the bridge over the River Corve including the layout, design and construction have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The accesses shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the first house is occupied or otherwise in accordance with a timetable to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
- 12) No development shall take place until details of the means of access to Bromfield Road, including the layout, construction and sightlines, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be fully implemented before any of the houses or retail unit to the south west of the railway line are commenced.
- 13) No development approved by this permission shall commence until a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved WSI.
- 14) No ground clearance, demolition, or construction work shall commence until a scheme has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to safeguard trees to be retained on site as part of the development. The submitted scheme shall include the provision of a tree protection plan that reflects the guidance given in to BS5837:2012. The approved safeguarding measures shall be retained on site for the duration of the construction works.
- 15) Where the approved plans and particulars indicate that construction work is to take place within the Root Protection Area of any retained trees, large shrubs or hedges, prior to the commencement of any development works, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) detailing how any approved construction works will be carried out, shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved AMS.
- 16) No development or clearance of vegetation shall take place until a Wildlife Protection and Mitigation Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include:
- a. An appropriately scaled plan showing 'Wildlife/habitat Protection Zones' where construction activities are restricted and where protective measures will be installed or implemented;
 - b. Details of protective measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid impacts during construction;
 - c. A timetable to show phasing of construction activities to avoid periods of the year when sensitive wildlife could be harmed (such as the bird nesting season);
 - d. Persons responsible for:

- i) Compliance with legal consents relating to nature conservation;
- ii) Compliance with planning conditions relating to nature conservation;
- iii) Installation of physical protection measures during construction;
- iv) Implementation of sensitive working practices during construction;
- v) Regular inspection and maintenance of physical protection measures and monitoring of working practices during construction;
- vi) Provision of training and information about the importance of 'Wildlife protection zones' to all construction personnel on site.

All construction activities shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timing of the plan unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 17) No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until the Local Planning Authority has been notified of the full establishment of the tree protection measures and has given written approval of those measures.
- 18) No development shall take place until details of a phased drainage scheme, that has been informed by an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development in relation to the disposal of surface water, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until the drainage scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority has been implemented and the works completed in accordance with the approved details.
- 19) There shall be no new structures (including gates, walls and fences) or raising of ground levels on land below 85.71m AOD, within the 1% plus climate change floodplain, or within 8 metres of the top of bank of the River Corve (Main River) inside or along the boundary of the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 20) The Travel Plan Measures (ref: DTTPC report no. J244/FTP dated September 2013) shall be implemented within one month of the first occupation of any part of the residential development. The Travel Plan measures shall relate to the entirety of the development, and reflect the phasing of occupation as appropriate.

APPEARANCES

FOR TESNI PROPERTIES LIMITED - APPELLANTS:

Mr Roger Lancaster	of Counsel
He called	
Mr Alan Davies	Director
MSc CMILT MIHT MAPM	Development Transport Planning Consultancy
Mr Andrew J Williams	Planning Consultant
DipTP MRTPI	Advance Land and Planning Limited
Mrs Helen Howie	concerning housing land supply
MA(Hons) MCD MRTPI	

FOR FRIENDS OF FISHMORE VIEW – RULE 6 PARTY:

Cllr Andy Boddington	Ward Member of Shropshire Council for Ludlow North where the appeal site and Fishmore View are located but appearing independently for the Rule 6 Party
----------------------	---

FOR SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL - LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Tim Rogers	Area Planning Manager
BA(Hons) DipTP	
Mr Daniel Corden	Senior Policy Officer
BSc(Hons) MSc MPlan MRTPI	

FOR LUDLOW TOWN COUNCIL – INTERESTED PARTY:

Cllr G Ginger	c/o Clerk to Ludlow Town Council Guildhall, Mill Street, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1AD
Cllr C Sheward	- ditto -

APPLICATION PLANS

Plan No	Ref No	Description	Revision
A	A 537 32	Location Plan	A
B	A 537 07	Indicative Layout	G
C1	T17113-120	A49 Ludlow Construction Proposals	n/a
C2	Fig 1	Ludlow North Side Area Planning Condition	n/a
C3	J244/A49/footpath River/Fig 4	River Footpath Route	n/a
C4	J244/A49 footpath RT/Fig 3	Broomfield <i>[sic]</i> Access Layout	n/a
C5	J244/Broomfield <i>[sic]</i> Proposal/Fig 2	Broomfield <i>[sic]</i> Access Proposed Layout	n/a

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

Document No	Description
1a-b	Lists of Persons Attending the Inquiry
2	Letter of Notification of the Inquiry
3	Certificate of Incorporation on Change of Name
4	Section 106 Planning Agreement
5	Mr A Davies - Proof
6	Mr A Davies - Addendum/Revision to Proof
7	Mr A Williams - Proof and Appendices 1-8 (Appendices 7 and 8 added regarding housing land supply covered by Mrs H Howie)
8	Cllr Boddington - Statement of Case used as Proof
9	Draft Conditions suggested by the Council
10	Opening Submissions for the Appellants
11	Closing Submissions for the Appellants
12a-b	Core Documents provided by the Appellants
13	SAMDev Examination Report - extracts