



**Committee and Date**

South Planning Committee

20 November 2018

**SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2018**

**2.00 - 3.40 pm in the Council Chamber, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND**

**Responsible Officer:** Linda Jeavons

Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257716

**Present**

Councillor David Evans (Chairman)

Councillors David Turner (Vice Chairman), Andy Boddington, Gwilym Butler, Simon Harris, Nigel Hartin, Richard Huffer, Madge Shingleton, Robert Tindall, Michael Wood and Tina Woodward

**23 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

**24 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the South Planning Committee held on 25 September 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the word "acknowledged" being deleted and replaced with "had taken into account" at Minute No. 17, paragraph 7, bullet point No. 7.

**25 Public Question Time**

There were no public questions or petitions received.

**26 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

Members were reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

With reference to planning application 17/05170/FUL, Councillor Andy Boddington declared that he had predetermined the application. He would make a statement and then leave the room and take no part in the consideration of this item.

**27 Housing Development Site, Sidney Road, Ludlow, Shropshire, SY8 1SQ  
(17/05170/FUL)**

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

Members had undertaken a site visit and had viewed the site and had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area.

Councillor C Sheward, representing Ludlow Town Council, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Viv Parry, adjoining Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- She did not approve of the design;
- Everyone currently living along Sidney Road objected to the proposal;
- There were many cars parked along what is a busy road;
- She objected to the loss of open space;
- There was a culvert running under Sidney Road and the ground was often muddy and soggy.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Andy Boddington, on behalf of Councillor Tracey Huffer, the local Ward Councillor, read out the following statement:

"I am appalled that this application has been resurrected with a recommendation for approval after being quiet for a year. A year ago, I exchanged emails with a planning officer who said the scheme was poor quality and he would recommend refusal. That officer has since left Shropshire Council. I am shocked that we now have this application coming flagged up for approval. How can this council say one moment a scheme is not good enough to approve but a year later say that it is just fine? That doesn't make any sense to me.

This scheme is barely different from the application this committee previously refused. It doesn't deal with any of the issues that were raised at that committee meeting. The loss of green space was huge under the previous application. Now they have moved the fences forward, even more green space is lost.

The pedestrian access to Sidney Road is badly thought out. Elderly, vulnerable people will go to catch the 701 town bus service to find their sightlines blocked by bins. This could be lethal.

We have already lost one tree on this green. The three main trees, now two, were paid for by the residents of Sidney Road. They are still part of why they enjoy where they live.

Sheet Road is one of the main access routes into Ludlow. This scheme will make this approach less attractive.

This is also a community green. I know people who walk across it four times a day. I've seen young children play with their grandparents on the green a lot of times.

I am very worried about the drainage and sewerage across the site. The council has not published any comment from Severn Trent. The site has flooded in recent years and the Stych Brook runs under it. I think this is one reason why the green wasn't built on in the first place.

This housing scheme is pretty much thrown together and should be refused. I don't want to sound negative. All of us councillors in Ludlow want more affordable and social housing. We have identified brownfield sites where we could build affordable housing. We have taken council leaders on a tour of the most promising areas in the last couple of weeks. We support affordable housing, social housing and bungalows. But we need to build them in the right place. We should not sacrifice valued green space on a major gateway into Ludlow when we don't need to."

In accordance with his declaration at Minute No. 26 and the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Andy Boddington, adjoining Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the room, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During his statement, the following points were raised:

- He had not been present at the consideration of the previous application. The previous application had not been deferred for amendment - it was refused. This is therefore a new application that must be considered on its own merits;
- National planning policy has also changed since the initial refusal decision was made and the current report made no reference to the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at all;
- **Quality of design** - This proposal is not a quality design. It is very poor compared to recent social housing schemes Ludlow councillors have enthusiastically supported at Beech Grove, the Riddings and the Foyer. No effort has been given to designing a development worthy of a major gateway into Ludlow. He referred to the revised NPPF, published in July, which placed a stronger emphasis on design than the 2012 version. Paragraphs 124 and 127 state that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. It further states that councils must ensure that developments "are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping." At paragraph 130, the new NPPF calls for poorly designed schemes to be rejected. Too often poorly designed schemes have been approved in Shropshire, despite the support for good design in CS6. The wording of the new NPPF was drafted to draw a line under that across the entire country. We should follow its lead and outlaw poor design in Shropshire. This scheme should be rejected on these grounds alone;
- The NPPF also emphasises that brownfield sites should be developed before green sites. There is not a shortage of brownfield sites in Ludlow and there

are more than six hectares listed in the Council's brownfield register. Some sites are available now and some are likely to become available shortly. Along with Councillor Tracey Huffer, Cabinet Members and Senior Officers, he had recently undertaken a tour of additional brownfield sites amounting to around one and half hectares. Additional brownfield sites have also been identified and work was ongoing to make sure these sites became available. There is not a shortage of brownfield land for housing or for business use in Ludlow. Even in Ludlow, a town surrounded by green hills and forests, urban green space is precious;

- **Loss of Green Space** - The Council's policy to protect local amenity is stated with clarity at MD2 in SAMDev. MD2.2 states that development should "Contribute to and respect locally distinctive or valued character and existing amenity value." This proposed development will destroy amenity value. MD2.5 states that development should "provide safe, useable and well-connected outdoor spaces which respond to and reinforce the character and context within which it is set." This plan will remove 42% of the usable green area from this much enjoyed green. It will reduce connectivity and make this green space less useable;
- **Trees** - One of the Norway Maples on the green had been cut down without warning "due to the high costs of maintenance". The Norway Maple destined to be felled under this scheme is a fine healthy specimen and was planted by residents shortly after Sidney Road was built;
- **Affordable housing** - Affordable housing is always a benefit in Ludlow. It is fortunate that 64 affordable homes are at the final stages of planning permission on Foldgate Lane and at Rocks Green. But affordable homes must not be built to the detriment of the quality of our townscape and the amenity of residents.
- The scheme was contrary to paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 of the NPPF, CS6, MD2.2 and MD 2.5. He urged refusal.

In the ensuing debate, Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. In response to comments, the Area Planning Manager confirmed that the application should be considered in line with the current NPPF, the right of way would be retained and given the restraints of the site it may be difficult to design something that would negate the need to fell the tree.

## **RESOLVED:**

That, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- It is acknowledged that the proposed development would be in a sustainable location, contributing to the social and economic roles of sustainable development through the provision of small affordable bungalows, which is a type of accommodation for which there is an acknowledged need in Ludlow. However, the proposal, by reasons of the loss of the large Maple tree, which is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, and reduction in the area of open space, would remove features that make significant contributions to the character and quality of the townscape and local amenity. The proposed

footpath layout within the development, with the path linking Charlton Rise with Sidney Road passing very close to the front doors of the bungalows, is likely to be used by the public and would adversely affect the amenity and perception of security for the occupants of the bungalows. Furthermore the location of the proposed parking and refuse collection points are considered to be inappropriate for the type of accommodation proposed. In addition, the external design, layout and appearance of the proposed bungalows would fail to improve the character and quality of the area. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, would not satisfy the environmental role of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and would be contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS6, CS8 and CS17, and SAMDev Plan Policies MD2 and MD12.

**28 Barn South West Of The Grove, Ashford Bowdler, Shropshire (18/03585/FUL)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members' attention to the location, layout and elevations.

Members had undertaken a site visit and had viewed the site and had assessed the impact of a proposal on the surrounding area.

Members noted the additional information as set out in the Schedule of Additional Letters circulated prior to the meeting.

Mr M Gunn, local resident, spoke against the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In accordance with the Local Protocol for Councillors and Officers dealing with Regulatory Matters (Part 5, Paragraph 15) Councillor Viv Parry, adjoining Ward Councillor, made a statement and then left the table, took no part in the debate and did not vote on this item. During her statement, the following points were raised:

- The area is designated and should remain as open countryside;
- She expressed concerns relating to the proposed annex.
- The development constitutes over development;
- The barn conversion would result in direct overlooking of neighbouring properties;
- There is potential for a further eight houses to be built on the field to the rear;

Mr J Hicks, the agent, spoke for the proposal in accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committees.

In the ensuing debate Members considered the submitted plans and noted the comments of all speakers. Members commented that the annexe was not sufficiently subservient to the main building and suggested that a lower total ridge height and/or single storey building would be more acceptable.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be deferred to a future meeting to enable the applicant to reconsider the height and design of the annex building.

**29 Barn South West Of The Grove, Ashford Bowdler, Shropshire (18/03586/LBC)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and with reference to the drawings displayed, he drew Members’ attention to the location, layout and elevations.

**RESOLVED:**

That, for the reasons as set out in the resolution at Minute No. 28, this application be deferred to a future meeting.

**30 Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Schedule of Appeals and Appeal Decisions for the southern area as at 23 October 2018 be noted.

**31 Date of the Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED:**

That it be noted that the next meeting of the South Planning Committee will be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 20 November 2018 in the Shrewsbury Room, Shirehall, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date: .....