

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 28 September 2017 at 6.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Joycelyn Redsell (Substitute)

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

**Apologies:** Councillors Colin Churchman and Roy Jones

**In attendance:** Andrew Millard, Assistant Director Planning & Growth  
Matthew Ford, Principal Highways Engineer  
Matthew Gallagher, Principal Planner  
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner  
Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader  
Sarah Williams, School Capital and Planning Project Manager  
Vivien Williams, Planning Lawyer  
Charlotte Raper, 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.

### **31. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 31 August 2017 were approved as a correct record.

### **32. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **33. Declaration of Interests**

The Chair disclosed a pecuniary interest in relation to item 11 17/00723/DVOB: DP World Development, London Gateway, Stanford Le Hope, in that it was his place of work. He would excuse himself from the chamber for that item.

### **34. 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, on behalf of the entire committee, regarding item 9 17/00772/FUL: The Ockendon Academy, Erriff

Drive, South Ockendon, Essex, RM15 5AN. The Cabinet Member for Education had sent a supporting letter to all Members of the Committee.

### **35. Planning Appeals**

The report provided information regarding planning appeals performance.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**The Planning Committee noted the report.**

### **36. 16/00923/FUL: Land to north of Rosebery Road, Castle Road and Belmont Road, Grays**

The application had been considered at the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 July 2017. The Committee had deferred determination of the application for details of access for construction traffic to be clarified. The Chair therefore reminded Members that those Members who had not participated in the original debate could not participate at this meeting either.

Since determination of the application was deferred, the applicant had commissioned a 'Construction Traffic Access Options' report. The Committee was reminded that the substantive issue for consideration remained the determination of the planning application for the residential development of the site and the recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to a S106 agreement and conditions, remained unchanged.

Councillor Ojetola was pleased that the applicant had acknowledged the concerns of the Committee. He asked whether Meeson's Lane (proposed option 4) was less busy than the existing roads to the south of the site (proposed option 3) and for clarification regarding the location of the link at the top of Meeson's Lane. The existing, unregistered land between Parker Road and the site also lay between 2 residential properties. The applicant had provided information around expected vehicle movements, at the initial stage movements would be highest, on average 17 a day falling to only 1-2 a day during later phases. Meeson's Lane had not been assessed as part of the initial application and separate planning consent would be needed but it was quite wide with no frontage of houses on the section in question. The implications would therefore be different for that route.

Councillor Piccolo queried whether it was intended for the planning permission for Meeson's Lane and Parker Road to be a delegated decision or brought back before the Committee. It was intended that the permission, on a temporary basis, to achieve development of the site should be straight forward and therefore would be a delegated decision. The Council as a Planning Authority would have to consult with the relevant residents, the highways department and those responsible for parks and open spaces and assess any concerns raised.

The Chair questioned the loss of amenity during the construction period given the play area and green space proposed for access. The site was fairly open and the swings were situated farther north therefore there would be no loss of equipment.

The Chair continued that the Committee would agree proposed Option 1 would be the preferable option, though it had been deemed unviable due to costs and negotiations with third parties. It was his view that Gloriana was, in a sense, a community project but residents would be unhappy about the impact during construction. He raised concern regarding the proposed access point in Option 4, as it lay between two residential properties and asked whether the Committee could indicate a preference for that option and retain the ability to stop it if it could not be done safely. There were only 2 commercially viable options presented and he wanted to take the burden away from residents of the three existing roads south of the site, but needed to ensure safety for Meeson's Lane. The Principal Planning Officer advised that the Committee was not determining the application based upon the preferred route, as it would form a later application, however an informative could be used to guide the applicant. Conditions would address issues around hours of construction, noise control, and dust.

Councillor Ojetola asked officers to verify that the temporary access route would cease to have access to the site after construction, and to confirm the expected duration of any parking restrictions. The access route would be temporary for use by construction traffic only. The land was unregistered and therefore could not be used otherwise. The build was expected to take 2 years with highest vehicle movements within the initial phase.

The Chair asked for clarification regarding proposals for additional parking, given the loss of turning heads in Belmont, Castle and Rosebery Road. The Senior Highways Engineer confirmed that the existing roads would remain as 2-way traffic. The new estate would follow a 1-way route. To mitigate the loss of parking there were proposals for parallel parking bays at the top of the three existing roads, these would be one way running from Belmont Road to Rosebery Road; residents of Rosebery Road would need to travel up Belmont or Castle road to access these. The rear service route between Belmont Road and Parker Road would remain 2-way. The Chair noted reference to parking management and asked what could be done to protect the existing residents. Following an informal consultation a parking management scheme was in development for the area and condition 11 concerned parking management.

Councillor Piccolo stated that the application had been deferred due to concerns regarding access and impact upon local residents. Of the two viable options he felt Option 4 seemed most resident friendly as it would cause very little inconvenience after the initial few months with no parking restrictions to residents. He had always been of the view that the scheme was positive there had just been issues to address.

The Vice-Chair noted that there were two possible options for access however they were not for determination by the Committee. He would support the application.

Councillor Ojetola recalled the Committee had raised a number of concerns initially. The reality was Thurrock would see a massive increase in houses on brown field sites and while he was sympathetic to the local residents he felt there was little that could be done given the demand for new houses. The Committee would seek to reduce the impact on residents and he appreciated the work of officers and the applicant to address Members' concerns. It was his view that option 1 would be preferential given the lack of impact to residents but he understood that it has been assessed as unviable. He therefore proposed option 4 and asked how this could be conveyed. The Chair clarified that an informative would be added, advising the Committee's preference for Option 4.

The Campaign to Protect Rural Essex representative felt Councillor Ojetola was correct. He was concerned that option 1 had been disregarded due to "additional costs" and felt the options should be costed fully. Although option 1 might prove more difficult and involve negotiations with third parties it should not be disregarded entirely as it would cause least disruption to residents.

It was proposed by the Vice-Chair and seconded by Councillor Piccolo that the application be approved subject to completion of a s106 legal agreement and planning conditions, as per the officers' recommendation, including an informative regarding the preferred option for construction access.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Tunde Ojetola and Terry Piccolo.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved subject to completion of a s106 legal agreement and planning conditions, including an informative regarding the Committee's preferred option for construction access.**

**37. 17/00772/FUL: The Ockendon Academy, Erriff Drive, South Ockendon, Essex, RM15 5AN**

The application sought full planning permission for a new sports hall with associated facilities. The site was located within the Green Belt and constituted inappropriate development, however officers had assessed the Very Special Circumstances outlined by the applicant as outweighing the potential harm. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to referral to the Planning Casework Unit and conditions.

The Vice-Chair asked for confirmation that the proposal would allow for additional school places. The principal planning officer advised that the school roll was increasing, but that the building was to provide improved facilities.

Councillor Redsell asked how much space would be lost to the school, such as parking spaces or playground space. No parking would be lost. There would be a reduction in playground space however the proposal would provide sports facilities and therefore there would be no harm to the health and wellbeing of the children.

Councillor Piccolo asked officers to verify that the school would be under provisioned if nothing were done. The Committee heard that this was correct.

The applicant, Barbara King, was invited to the Committee to present her statement of support.

Councillor Ojetola queried the additional 240 students in each year, it was confirmed that there would be 240 pupils in total in each year group.

The Vice-Chair expressed his view that the proposal would offer an amazing opportunity and increased school places which was to be commended.

Councillor Rice echoed that the application would provide brilliant facilities in a somewhat deprived area and offered his full support.

Councillor Redsell admitted that while it was a brilliant scheme she was concerned that an increase in students would mean increased vehicle movements and there were problems throughout the borough around schools. The Senior Highways Engineer advised that there was a condition for the school to provide an updated Travel Plan. The Committee was also reminded that the application was for a replacement sports facility and would not directly increase vehicle movements at the school.

Councillor Ojetola agreed the suggestion was plausible however it would have been for consideration that the time when the increased roll was agreed. The application simply allowed provision for facilities for the agreed increased number of pupils. He was pleased that the Very Special Circumstances clearly outweighed the Green Belt issues and wished to support the school and the application.

Councillor Piccolo highlighted that the increase in numbers had already been agreed and therefore the application would simply increase the schools capacity for sport provision. He felt it was important to improve provision for schools and this was for sports facilities which would improve health and wellbeing and possibly tackle the issue of obesity. He noted that the facility was also intended for use by other groups and would therefore benefit the local community. He fully supported the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Rice and seconded by Councillor Ojetola that the application be approved, subject to referral to the Planning Casework Unit and conditions, as per the officers' recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Joycelyn Redsell.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to referral to the Planning Casework Unit and conditions.**

**38. 17/00763/FUL: Barmoor House, Farm Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex, RM16 3AH**

The application sought planning permission for extensions and alterations to the existing chalet bungalow to facilitate the subdivision into 5 residential dwellings.

Councillor Rice noted neighbour letters which cited poor quality of the access road. Since the road was private land he asked why the applicant had not been asked to improve the condition of the road by way of a contribution. The Highways Engineer advised that a site visit had been carried out by highways officers and while the road was somewhat in disrepair it was not so bad as to be in conflict with the disability discrimination act and therefore it was not suitable as a condition; however it was suggested that an informative be added advising the condition of the road be improved.

Councillor Piccolo asked whether the proposals decreased the overall footprint and therefore caused less impact to the Green Belt than the existing lay out. The principal planning officer confirmed there was a decrease in volume across the site and the built footprint also decreased within the proposals.

The Vice-Chair sought clarity around proposals and asked whether there would be 5 extra buildings. The Committee heard that the single building would be extended and become a terrace of 5 dwellings.

Councillor Ojetola asked officers to confirm the function of adding an informative. The principal planning officer clarified that it was not an enforceable condition, but a point of note to the applicant.

Councillor Redsell questioned the parking provision proposed. There would be 2 parking spaces per unit with an additional 3 spaces for visitor parking.

Councillor Rice reiterated his wish to include an informative regarding the condition of the access road.

Councillor Liddiard agreed, whilst he was minded to approve the application it would be good to add the informative as the road was in poor condition and the Committee might regret not requesting improvements in future.

Councillor Piccolo understood Members' concerns but felt prospective buyers would have more power to ensure the road was improved, given that it was private land and the Council could not enforce a condition. He added that Thurrock needed more homes and an additional four homes in a nice area, without affecting the Green Belt was an improvement. He was happy to include the informative but felt it would come down to prospective buyers.

Councillor Ojetola noted that the application outlined no objections from highways officers and the fact that the road was a private matter which could not be considered by the Committee. He agreed that market forces would determine the matter and Members had made their views clearly known.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Growth advised that the Committee could not insist upon improvements to the road and therefore an informative was the correct way to convey its wishes.

Councillor Snell echoed that it was important to note the difference between building five new homes and extending an existing building to create five dwellings. He agreed with the addition of an informative regarding the condition of the road so that it would be in a fit and proper state when the development was finished, after that it would be private land and the responsibility of the landowner.

The Campaign to Protect Rural Essex representative agreed with the recommendation. Although the site was within the Green Belt, the proposal essentially filled a gap between existing properties and would result in a reduced footprint and improved aesthetics.

It was proposed by Councillor Ojetola and seconded by Councillor Snell that the application be approved, subject to conditions as per the officer's recommendation, with the addition of an informative regarding the road condition.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Joycelyn Redsell.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions, with the addition of an informative regarding the road condition.**

**39. 17/00723/DVOB: DP World Development, London Gateway, Stanford Le Hope**

The Chair excused himself from the Chamber, given his pecuniary interest in this application.

The application sought a Deed of Variation to the s106 legal agreement relating to the London Gateway Logistics Park Local Development Order, dated 5 November 2013.

Councillor Rice sought clarification that the total amount paid would remain the same, and that the only change would be there would now be two payments made rather than one. Members were assured this was the case.

Councillor Ojetola asked the legal officer to verify that all amendments had been thoroughly checked and scrutinised to ensure there would be no future implications. It was confirmed that there was no issue regarding the detail of the agreement.

Councillor Redsell asked when the two payments would be received. Page 127 of the agenda outlined that; *“TBC may only issue a written demand for the First Contribution once TBC has obtained all necessary consents for the 3 lane widening of the A13 Link 5 (or the alternative measures) and is in a position to let a construction contract for the 3 lane widening of the A13 Link 5 (or alternative measures). The Second Contribution shall be paid on the first anniversary of the First Contribution”*.

Councillor Rice commended the variation and welcomed the assurances from Officers. He expressed he was happy to support the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Rice and seconded by Councillor Redsell that the existing s106 agreement be varied in accordance with the table set out in Appendix 1.

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Joycelyn Redsell.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the existing s106 agreement be varied in accordance with the table set out in Appendix 1.**

**The meeting finished at 7.39 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)**