

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 26 October 2023 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Steve Liddiard, Jacqui Maney, Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick and Lee Watson

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

Apologies:

In attendance:

Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner
Chris Purvis, Major Applications Manager
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor
Tracey Coleman, Chief Planning Officer
Rhiannon Whiteley, Senior Democratic Services Officer

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.

40. Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 September 2023 were approved as a true and correct record.

41. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

42. Declaration of Interests

No interests were declared.

43. 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 confirmed that he had received correspondence from Hannah Garlinge in relation to Greystead and so had the other Planning Committee members.

Councillor Liddiard confirmed he had written about the Youth Zone and therefore he would like to be excluded from this item.

44. Planning Appeals

No Planning Appeals were discussed.

Due to the high level of public interest, the Chair decided to hear the Flagship Centre item first.

45. 23/00610/FUL: Land Adjacent The Flagship Centre, London Road, Tilbury

Councillor Liddiard left the meeting.

The Major Application Manager presented the application and highlighted the following points:

- The application is for a youth facility on Anchors field with a sports hall, fitness centre, martial arts and boxing room, indoor climbing wall, external multi games area/ kick Pitch, outdoor recreation area, facilities for arts and crafts, music suite, teaching kitchen, café and performing arts studio. The facility would be for 8-19 year olds and the expected hours of use would be after school 4pm-10pm. The permitted hours of use 8am- 10pm. The application is from a Charity organisation called on-site.
- The Multi-Use Game Area will be lost (MUGA)
- The Tilbury Town Investment Plan references a youth building and outdoor site on Anchors Field, it isn't a document that sits within the Planning policy.
- The charity has other sites across the country, there is one close by in a park in Dagenham (example shown in Officer presentation)
- The proposal would create a new youth zone centre and outdoor space for the benefit of young people of Tilbury and Thurrock Council. It would result in the loss of an area of public open space and MUGA on Anchor Fields. However, on balance the principle of the development is considered acceptable. The proposal would create a high-quality designed development. The site is located in an easily accessible sustainable town centre location. There are no objections with regard to all other material planning considerations. The recommendation is for approval subject to S106 legal agreement to secure highway improvements and subject to planning conditions.

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Watson queried if the field was protected under a covenant. The Major Application Manager confirmed he did not know as that would fall outside the planning application. It is designated public open space and owned by the Council.

- Councillor Watson also queried whether the relocation of the MUGA would be funded by the Council. Councillor Watson requested more clarification that the funds will be there. Councillor Watson also queried if other sites had been considered. The Major Application Manager clarified that within the Application there were other sites that the Applicant looked at and the reasons why they were discounted.
- Stephen Taylor queried who owns the land and if it will be gifted or bought. The Major Application Manager stated that the Council owns the land although matters of land ownership fall outside of the Planning process, he understands a long lease is likely to be agreed between the Council and the Applicant.
- The Chief Planning Officer reminded Members that planning sits with the land not the ownership. Applications have to be determined as to whether it is acceptable under planning considerations, questions about ownership are not relevant. If the principle in planning is acceptable it does not mean it can be legally be built in law.
- Councillor Polley raised that there is already a children's centre and the MUGA on the Anchor Fields and there was a sports centre. Councillor Polley raised concerns about parking and the Youth Zone centre closing at 10pm and lots of young people hanging around affecting the noise levels. The hours of operation planning condition is 8am -10pm. The facility is for children 8-19 years old and therefore they will be attending school during the day so it will mostly be used between 4pm-10pm.
- Councillor Polley raised that Sports England use a Community Use Agreement so residents have a mechanism to engage with the facility if there are frustrations. The Major Application Manager stated that they did ask the Applicant to enter into a Community Use Agreement however they declined as this was not part of their business model.
- The Highways Officer highlighted that he has visited the Beacontree site in Dagenham where they also have a pick-up and drop off zone. The Applicants promote sustainable transport, staff are encouraged to use public transport. Highways have suggested that money is provided to put some double yellow lines in. Other parking measures could be introduced for residents once the building is completed and a sum of £10,000 has been suggested.
- Councillor P Arnold queried if there had been a consultation with neighbours. The Major Application Manager stated that through the planning notice process, there has been a press advert, notices put up and letters sent out. There is a statement of community involvement, consultation leaflets delivered to 2700 addresses, the Applicant completed face-to-face events at the start of this year before they submitted the planning application.
- Councillor P Arnold asked for confirmation as to why the Tilbury site differs from Beacontree. Highways clarified that they are similar in that they both sit in a residential area. Dagenham is an outer London Borough and more built up, the park is also a lot bigger. There are more public transport opportunities there than in Tilbury.

- Councillor Shinnick queried at what time of day they completed the parking checks. The Highways Officer confirmed that they will have used the Lambeth method and will have completed parking checks in the evening as this is the same time as the proposed times of the operation of the facility.
- Cllr J Maney queried the tree loss and the age of the trees. The Major Application Manager confirmed that an arboriculture assessment is within the application and no trees are subject to TPO's. The proposed landscaping will allow for new and more trees to be planted and this will be secured through a planning condition. The report does identify some of the trees are over 20 years old.

Cllr Allen (Ward Councillor) – Statement of Objection

Craig Austin (resident) – Statement of Objection

Statement of Support – Adam Ponyer – On Site Youth Zones

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Stephen Taylor raised a concern about what could be built in the future once planning was granted.
- The Chair responded that nothing will be able to go through without the permission of the Planning Committee.
- Councillor P Arnold stated that he was torn and there had been some good discussion. He did have concerns about parking and ownership. The facilities are top notch.
- Councillor Shinnick stated that there will be more pressure on local residents, they will end up with parking permits which will be at a cost.
- Councillor Watson confirmed that she is also torn. The Dagenham park which has a Youth Zone is a lot bigger than Anchor Fields. The Youth Zone is phenomenal, for all ages and a brilliant provision.
- Councillor Polley stated everybody wants services and they have to build them somewhere.
- Councillor Piccolo stated that he couldn't see parents parking in a neighbouring road and waiting an hour or two hours. Tilbury could be gaining a lot of activities for local youths. Tilbury is not an easy place to get to, hopefully the local community will benefit from it.
- Councillor J Maney stated that it is a good application but it is not the right place for it. It is likely to cause some problems for local residents.
- Councillor P Arnold stated that he believes that the centre will operate to reduce anti-social behaviour, Tilbury is a high-density area and if he was a parent he would be glad this was coming to the area
- The Chair stated that it is a tough one, the Youth Zone has a good track record.

Councillor Polley recommended the officer's recommendation to approve, Councillor Piccolo seconded it.

For: (4) Councillors T Kelly, G Polley, P Arnold and T Piccolo

Against: (3) Councillors S Shinnick, L Watson and J Maney

Abstained: (1) Councillor Liddiard

Councillor Liddiard returned to the meeting.

46. 23/00813/HHA: Greystead, Parkers Farm Road, Orsett

The Principal Planner presented the application and highlighted the following:

- The application relates to a detached dwelling and outbuilding in the Green Belt in Orsett.
- The proposal seeks to erect a single storey extension to provide a garage to the existing pool outbuilding. A previous planning application for a similar, albeit slightly larger, scheme was refused and dismissed at appeal in 2019.
- The proposal comprises of inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is considered disproportionate and therefore harmful by definition and to openness. The additional information submitted by the applicant has been fully considered but does not clearly outweigh the harm caused. The application is recommended for refusal on page 39.

Speaker Statements were heard from:

Statement of Support: Mrs K Frost, Owner

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Councillor Polley noted it was being used for a personal hobby but queried if it could become a commercial entity. The Principal Planner stated a condition could be included to state it would not be used for commercial purposes however from an officer point of view her hands were tied due to the impact on the Green Belt.
- Councillor Piccolo queried if a site visit could assist to see the impact it could have
- Councillor P Arnold stated that he did not need a site visit
- Councillor Liddiard commented that it seemed a bit excessive
- Councillor Maney queried if the extension could become residential in the future. The Principal Planner confirmed that any proposal for a different use would require additional planning permission.
- Councillor Shinnick confirmed she had no problem with it going through
- Councillor Watson commented that the family want to live there forever, it will stop the noise going outside, she therefore didn't think it would be that detrimental.

- The Chair stated that he could not approve the application without a site visit

Members took a vote, but the Chair used his discretion afterwards to propose something else. The Chair proposed the application should be deferred to allow for a site visit. This was seconded by Councillor J Maney.

For: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice Chair), Terry Piccolo, Jaqui Maney, Lee Watson

Against: (3) Councillors Steve Liddiard, Paul Arnold and Sue Shinnick

47. 23/00913/TBC: Garage site, Lyndhurst Road, Corringham

The Principal Planner presented the application and highlighted the following:

- The proposal relates to the redevelopment of a garage court site to the rear of residential properties in Lyndhurst Road and Mackley drive, Corringham.
- A further letter of objection from a resident has been received which raises similar concerns to those mentioned in the report already.
- The Proposed Site Plan and Proposed Ground Floor Plan refs. 003 and 001 respectively, have been revised and updated so that they should read 003 Rev B and 001 rev B as new plans were received today. These plans are included in the presentation but these details will need to be updated in the plans table of Condition 2 on page 58 as well as in the report on page 43.
- The proposal seeks to redevelop the site to provide 6 two storey houses. A short terrace of 4, 3 bed houses are proposed to be sited immediately south of the existing terrace fronting Lyndhurst Rd. These 4 dwellings would be well-positioned and follow the existing pattern of development locally. A pair of semi-detached dwellings would be sited to the north-eastern corner of the site and would be accessed via an internal access road leading to the units. Parking provision would be made to the south and north-eastern boundaries of the site, and the majority of the existing accesses would remain.
- The proposals would be acceptable in principle and would comply with all technical policies in relation to amenity space, parking and highway matters and neighbour amenity impacts. The devt would provide 6 affordable housing units and would be operated by the Council. The application is recommended for approval as per page 57.
- All dwellings would retain rear access except 2 Mackley Drive

Members asked the following questions: -

- Councillor P Arnold queried what steps are being taking to future proof these buildings. The Principal Planner confirmed that the application was subject to pre-application advice. There will be solar panels on the

roof of all the units and a good standard of noise insulation on the windows.

- Councillor Watson queried if they were confident there was enough access as it looks narrow. The Highways officer confirmed there are two routes in for access and he had no concerns. The proposals have been checked with refuse collection too. There are therefore no concerns from a Highways point of view.
- Councillor P Arnold queried if the access route will be properly paved. The Principal Planner confirmed it is a condition of the hard and soft landscaping that the surfacing would be replaced.

Statement of Objection – Mel Thomas (Neighbour)

Statement of Support – Newground Architects

The Principal Planner confirmed there will be a traffic condition and a traffic management plan. The hours of work, waiting restrictions will all be detailed in the condition. The Highways Officer clarified that lorries will be arriving outside of school times as it is close to Giffards school.

During the debate members commented as follows: -

- Councillor P Arnold commented that he does understand the concerns regarding traffic through Mackley Drive. There are hundreds of properties in that area and there should have been more access points. Councillor P Arnold stated that the development is only looking at 6 properties and it is nicely proportioned, he welcomed the application.
- Councillor Polley thanked the resident for attending and stated that it was refreshing to hear someone compliment a consultation process. Councillor Polley recommended that in relation to the highways issue the Local Development Plan consultation is online and residents can put comments on there. Councillor Polley also thanked officers for supporting the committee and providing detailed responses, this is the third application received which is delivering affordable housing and future proof housing. There is a lot to be celebrated in the application.
- Councillor Piccolo added that he understands residents concern over vehicles, the garages haven't been used for a while but there were 67 garages which meant there could have been 67 cars using the area, in the future it will only be 12.
- Councillor Watson stated that they are affordable council houses. She stated that she has got reservations about the access road but noted that highways are confident this will be ok. She confirmed she will be supporting the application.
- Councillor Shinnick welcomed the application and commented that more 2 bed properties are needed in the Borough.
- Councillor Liddiard stated that it will be a fantastic improvement with the anti-social behaviour behind these properties.
- The Officer's recommendation was recommended by Councillor Shinnick and seconded by Cllr Watson.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice Chair), Terry Piccolo, Jaqui Maney, Lee Watson, Steve Liddiard, Sue Shinnick, Paul Arnold

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

48. 23/00931/FUL: Treetops School, Buxton Road, Grays

The Principal Planner presented the application and highlighted the following:

- It is a full planning application submitted by Treetops School.
- The application site lies within the Green Belt and relates specifically to the existing minibus garage at the Treetops School site. The proposal seeks no operational development but the COU from Education uses to a dual education community use, to enable the building to be used as a gym to provide fitness programmes for SEN pupils at the 3 schools on the wider site, and to the wider SEN community.
- The proposal would provide a gym for the use by the Treetops Community Trust schools and the wider SEN Community. The hours proposed would not be considered harmful to residential amenity, and the use would unlikely result in any harm to the highway network locally. The proposal is considered acceptable and in compliance with all relevant policies and is recommended for approval subject to condition on page 74

Standing orders were raised at 20.30 so the meeting could continue beyond 20.30pm

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Councillor Arnold stated that the new access road was fantastic
- Councillor Polley stated that it was an outstanding facility and she welcomed it.
- Councillor Shinnick confirmed that she also welcomed the application

Councillor Polley recommended that the application was approved, this was seconded by Councillor Liddiard.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice Chair), Terry Piccolo, Jaqui Maney, Lee Watson, Steve Liddiard, Sue Shinnick, Paul Arnold

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

The meeting finished at 8.38 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**