

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 20 April 2017 at 6.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker (*arrived at 18:13*), Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter (*arrived at 18:06*) and Gerard Rice(*arrived at 18:19*)

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

**In attendance:** Andrew Millard, Head of Planning & Growth  
Matthew Ford, Principal Highways Engineer  
Matthew Gallagher, Principal Planner (Major Applications)  
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner  
Steven Lines, Senior Engineer  
Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader  
Chris Purvis, Principal Planner (Major Applications)  
Sarah Williams, School Capital and Planning Project Manager  
Vivien Williams, Planning Lawyer

---

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

### **101. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 16 March 2017 were approved as a correct record.

### **102. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **103. Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Ojetola declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest regarding Item 8: 16/00307/FUL: Land to rear & north of Bannatynes Sports Centrem Howard Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays in that he had attended a meeting with the applicant, in the presence of Planning Officers. He had declared this when the application was first heard on 23 February 2017.

### **104. Declarations of receipt of correspondence and/or any meetings/discussions held relevant to determination of any planning application or enforcement action to be resolved at this meeting**

The Chair declared receipt of correspondence regarding Items 9, 10 and 11: 16/01574/FUL, 16/01582/FUL and 16/01698/FUL: C. Ro Ports London Ltd, Purfleet Thames Terminal, London Road, Purfleet, RM 19 1SD on behalf of all Members of the Committee in that an email had been sent to Members by the agent.

Councillor Churchman declared receipt of correspondence from a resident regarding Item 8: 16/00307/FUL: Land to rear & north of Bannatynes Sports Centre, Howard Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays. The Chair declared receipt of the same correspondence on behalf of all Members of the Committee.

#### **105. Planning Appeals**

The report provided information regarding planning appeals performance.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**The Committee noted the report.**

#### **106. 16/00307/FUL: Land to rear & north of Bannatynes Sports Centre, Howard Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays**

The Committee heard that the application had been presented to the Committee at the meeting on 23 February 2017 but had been deferred. The application sought planning permission for a mixed use residential development with 203 residential units, parking, commercial units and a doctor's surgery. The applicant had responded to Members' concerns and the Head of Terms and planning conditions had been amended.

*The Chair advised Members that Councillors Baker, Potter and Rice were unable to participate in the debate and vote for this item as they had not been present at the start.*

Members still expressed concerns regarding the number of parking spaces. Officers advised that the level of available parking was 'acceptable' in terms of the Council's Policy. As the properties were not for sale, but were part of a Private Rental Sector model it would be made clear to tenants that there were not guaranteed spaces. It was considered that mitigation such as the car club and parking management schemes, as well as proximity to the train station were sufficient.

The Chair expressed his own opinion that whilst 'acceptable' he did not feel it was correct, or in the best interest of the wider community and he was not in support of the application on those grounds. The Committee echoed his concerns that resident's vehicles would be displaced causing increased pressure in the surrounding area of Chafford Hundred, which was already hugely congested. Councillor Piccolo suggested that the Council should review its minimum standard for parking to avoid a recurrence with future applications. He was not satisfied that there was sufficient parking, but admitted he would support the application as it complied with existing policy.

The Vice-Chair interjected that Members had focused entirely on the issue of parking with no comments around the quality of the build. The site had sat derelict for a decade and the longer it was left the more difficult it would prove to find a developer to take ownership. He felt the authority should do more to encourage development for homes in the area and he supported the application.

Councillor Ojetola explained that there had been much discussion about the quality of the design when the application had first been heard. The state of the site was a concern and he was keen to work with developers but there were real issues in Chafford Hundred around parking and congestion and the ratio of units to parking spaces was likely to exacerbate the problem.

It was proposed by the Vice-Chair and seconded by Councillor Piccolo that the application be approved subject to conditions as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Steve Liddiard and Terry Piccolo.

Against: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair) and Tunde Ojetola

Abstain: Councillor Colin Churchman

**107. 16/01574/FUL: C.Ro Ports London Ltd, Purfleet Thames Terminal, London Road, Purfleet, RM19 1SD**

The Principal Planner offered some context as there were three consecutive applications for the same site. These applications were connected and, if all three were successful, there would be a phased approach. This application sought permission for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new roundabout and highway works at Stonehouse Corner / London Road, new secure site access and associated works. The proposal would reroute substantial numbers of HGVs away from the residential areas and there were no objections from the Environment Agency or on Highways grounds.

Councillor Churchman asked whether the majority of works would be completed off plot before joining the existing Stonehouse roundabout to minimise the impact on an already congested road network. The majority of the site was considered private land and work would be completed with suitable highways agreements to join up to London Road.

Councillor Rice queried the lack of objection from the Environment Agency compared to the comments from the Council's Flood Risk Manager. Members heard that the Environment Agency had no objections as the site was protected from flooding from the River Thames, but the Council's Flood Risk Manager was concerned about surface water drainage. Condition 16 ensured adequate measures for the management of surface water would be incorporated into the development.

Councillor Piccolo expressed concern that HGVs might travel through Purfleet in an attempt to avoid congestion at the Stonehouse roundabout and asked if anything could be done to ensure that would not happen. Members were advised that work was currently underway to develop a Freight Management Strategy for Purfleet. A planning condition addressing an HGV routing strategy could be found within the site-wide application.

The applicant, Joost Rubens, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Ojetola asked what impact the application would have on the wider Purfleet Regeneration Plan. This application had no significant impact. However the issue would be re-visited within the site-wide application.

It was proposed by Councillor Churchman and seconded by the Chair that the application be approved subject to conditions as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter and Gerard Rice.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**108. 16/01582/FUL: C.Ro Ports London Ltd, Purfleet Thames Terminal, London Road, Purfleet, RM19 1SD**

The application sought planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and construction of new internal access roads, structures including a bridge, and railway works.

Councillor Ojetola sought clarification around the shared access road for the Port and Unilever. There would be a single bridge but for security reasons it would be separated by a physical barrier.

The applicant, Joost Rubens, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Rice expressed his view that the Committee had a duty to protect both residents and employment opportunities within Thurrock. He felt there were sufficient safeguards in place so that the application was acceptable.

It was proposed by Councillor Rice and seconded by Councillor Ojetola that the application be approved subject to conditions as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter and Gerard Rice.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**109. 16/01698/FUL: C.Ro Ports London Ltd, Purfleet Thames Terminal, London Road, Purfleet, RM19 1SD**

Members were informed that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of new buildings and infrastructure. The application included the erection of a car storage building on the former Paper Mill land adjacent to the current site. The application included land which overlapped with existing permission for the Purfleet Centre however the land was currently under ownership of the applicant and there were no formal plans in the public domain regarding the Purfleet Centre Regeneration revised masterplan and therefore there were insufficient grounds to object to the application.

The Principal Planner advised that, since publication of the agenda, the Health & Safety Executive had responded regarding development of the Paper Mill site. Due to the proximity to fuel storage on the Esso site the application should be dependent upon an additional condition requiring details of suitable cladding for the ground floor to all elevations of the car storage building to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

The Chair queried the impact on the local highways network of traffic movements between the south park site and the car storage to be erected on the Paper Mill site. At present there was no through route and so vehicles would travel via London Road. He asked if there were any way to monitor movements and also to ensure that transporters would exit the site using the new roundabout, to avoid Jarrow Cottages. The Committee was assured that the purpose of the new access was to divert HGVs from London Road, the movement along London Road to the Paper Mill site would principally be cars. The applicant had sought potential access to a through route via the Esso terminal but at present the land belonged to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party and thus was not included within the application.

The Principal Highways Engineer informed the Committee that the Transport Assessment contained an extensive review of the application, particularly the car storage facility to the West. The sites were not a considerable distance apart, there was currently no HGV weight limit on that stretch of road and it was not in close proximity to the air quality area. Condition 25 outlined HGV routing and ensured that the HGVs would not pass Jarrow Cottages.

Councillor Piccolo asked for clarity on the location of the Paper Mill site in terms of the Purfleet Centre application. The paper mill site had been included in the Purfleet Regeneration plan however the proximity to the large

scale fuel storage on the Esso site placed severe limitations on its usage and it had never been shown to be developed for conventional buildings. Permission had also been previously granted for car storage on the site and so the principle of commercial use was established.

A Ward Councillor, Councillor Gerrish, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of objection.

The applicant, Joost Rubens, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Ojetola asked if it was possible to prevent traffic movements on London Road. The Committee was advised that as there was no agreement by the third party for use of the Esso land to connect the two sites it was not included in the application and the application should be considered as presented. The application was not considered objectionable from a highways point of view.

Councillor Ojetola referred to the Ward Councillor's comments around the impact on the Purfleet Regeneration Plan and asked how likely this application could be to have an impact. Officers confirmed they were happy with both the individual and cumulative impact on the objection points raised within the application. In particular the Environmental Statement considered cumulative impact including the approved Purfleet Centre masterplan.

Councillor Rice interjected that the site had been earmarked as regeneration land for employment but it was impossible to assess the impact without an updated application for the Purfleet Centre and it was unwise to jeopardise businesses within the area. He would support the application and felt the recommended planning conditions protected residents.

Councillor Ojetola agreed that Thurrock should support and encourage business within the borough but that should be balanced with the impact on residents. Though there could be some impact on future plans it could only be assessed on the facts presented.

Councillor Piccolo expressed his opinion that, in light of the job generation opportunity and use of the site, he could see no reason not to accept the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Churchman urged the applicant to continue to pursue the possibility of access links through the land currently owned by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party.

The Chair expressed support for the application. It was positive regeneration for that part of Purfleet and while the Committee was right to be cautious of the overall impact the application had to be assessed on its own merit. The proposed development would allow for over 250 job opportunities and he welcomed the application in terms of the local economy. He echoed desires for the access road, if possible.

It was proposed by the Vice Chair and seconded by Councillor Churchman that the application be approved subject to conditions as per the Officer's recommendation and the additional condition required by the Health & Safety Executive.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter and Gerard Rice.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

*The Chair adjourned the meeting at 20:13 and resumed at 20:20.*

*The Committee agreed to suspend Standing Orders and extend the meeting so that all applications could be heard.*

**110. 17/00194/FUL: Coryton Asset Ltd, Offices At Former Petroplus Refinery, The Manorway, Coryton, Essex, SS17 9LN**

Members were advised that the application sought permission for the demolition of existing structures, stockpiling of inert material, treatment of contaminated land and the creation of a temporary bio-remediation compound and associated ecological mitigation landscaping. These steps would usually be found as a condition in an application for permission to develop a site but instead with this application the applicant sought to frontload the planning process and obtain planning permission to undertake the contamination remediation work and ready the land for future development.

The agent, Lyndon Gill, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Ojetola queried why no figure for the financial contribution towards Habitat Management had been provided within the application. The Committee was advised that until the necessary works had been completed the monetary value required was unknown; however Condition 6 ensured that any off site ecological mitigation measures would be presented in the Habitat Management Plan. Therefore any financial contributions would be unknown until the further survey work had been undertaken (condition 5). The conditions required approval from the local planning authority.

Councillor Rice expressed excitement at an application to clean up areas within Thurrock ready for employment, proving Thurrock was viable and open for business. He offered his support.

The Vice-Chair agreed and recalled the impact when the site closed. Thurrock seemed to be reinventing itself and he expressed admiration for the application for looking to clean up the site.

Councillor Piccolo was pleased to see an applicant seeking permission rather than it being imposed as a condition for a development proposal.

Councillor Ojetola noted the positives from the applications presented at this meeting and the large number of job opportunities being provided for Thurrock.

It was proposed by Councillor Rice and seconded by Councillor Churchman that the Committee formally determined that the development proposed would not have a likely significant effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter and Gerard Rice.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

It was proposed by the Councillor Liddiard and seconded by Councillor Churchman that the application be approved, subject to the s106 agreement and conditions, as set out in the Officer's report.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter and Gerard Rice.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**111. 16/00767/TBC: Open Space Adjacent Delargy Close Defoe Parade And Brentwood Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex**

The Principal Officer advised the Committee that the application sought planning permission for a residential development of 53 affordable units, with a mixture of 1-2 bedroom flats, 1-2 bedroom bungalows and 3 bedroom houses.

Councillor Ojetola sought clarity as to why there was no mention of a financial contribution towards education, and why it was deemed the proposal offered improved open spaces. Members were advised that the applicant indicated the viability of the development was marginal. The site would provide 100% affordable housing and 3 high-quality outside space areas. In addition the proposed development would provide homes for existing residents and accordingly not create new pressures in terms of residents and an increased education burden would not therefore arise. In terms of the improved outside spaces the site currently was a walkthrough rather than a destination and was not well used at present. The application proposed 0.5 hectare of high quality



open space with structural planting and a poppy meadow, which would be accessible to everyone, not just residents of the new development.

Councillor Piccolo asked for confirmation that there would still be access for members of the public to get through if the current site was used as a footway. Members were assured that there would be footpaths so the links through the site would remain, and would be both better and safer for pedestrians.

Councillor Piccolo expressed concern, recalling a recent application to reduce the affordable housing provision of a development following unforeseen costs. He asked for guarantees that, given the marginal viability of the development, all appropriate investigations and had been carried out to avoid the provision for this development being compromised. The Committee was advised that the development's funding was based upon provision of entirely affordable housing.

The Vice-Chair enquired whether the properties would be run by the Council or a Housing Association. Members were advised that the scheme was for social housing units.

The agent, Michelle Minogue, was invited to the Committee to give her statement of support.

Councillor Rice, as a Chadwell-St-Mary Ward Councillor, welcomed the application. He felt the development would provide valuable units, particularly the bungalows which might help free larger, family homes by relocating sole tenants. Councillor Rice said there were currently around 8000 people on the Council's waiting list and these were the first Council homes to be built in Chadwell since the 1970s. He informed the Committee that the Chadwell-St-Mary Community Forum supported the scheme, and so did he.

Councillor Ojetola also welcomed the development and agreed that it was well designed and would be good for the area. While he understood the reasons in this instance, he was cautious that there were seemingly an increased number of applications which could not provide financial contributions, and suggested the Council should do more to concrete the details around this. On the whole however he felt the scheme in question was quite brilliant and he offered his support.

The Vice-Chair suggested this application could stand as a blueprint for other Local Authorities, and that it should be replicated throughout Thurrock. He expressed his view that the Committee, Officers and applicant should be proud and that it was a very well designed development.

Councillor Baker agreed entirely that this was a very welcome application and there should be more of its kind, there was a need to build properties for Thurrock residents.

The Chair agreed that it was a well-designed development, and particularly welcomed the range of properties. The application had been through a CABE design review which was very positive. He expressed interest in ensuring that the landscaping remained as projected as the development progressed.

It was proposed by Councillor Rice and seconded by the Vice-Chair that the application be approved subject to conditions as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Kevin Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Steve Liddiard, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, David Potter and Gerard Rice.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

The Chair expressed his opinion that it had been a very constructive meeting in which the Committee had approved applications which would provide lots of jobs for the area and over 250 homes, which was a quarter of the Council's yearly target.

**The meeting finished at 9.04 pm**

Approved as a true and correct record

**CHAIR**

**DATE**

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact  
Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)**