

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 7 June 2018 at 7.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Leslie Gamester, Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

**Apologies:** Councillors Sue Shinnick

**In attendance:**

Andrew Millard, Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection  
Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader  
Matthew Gallagher, Principal Planner  
Chris Purvis, Principal Planner (Major Applications)  
Wendy Le, 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.

**1. Apologies**

Councillors Tom Kelly and Sue Shinnick sent their apologies. Councillor Sue Little substituted for Councillor Kelly.

**2. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26 April 2018 were approved as a correct record.

**3. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

**4. Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Little disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on item 12, planning application 17/01556/HHA, The Olives due to her being the Ward Councillor in Orsett, called in the application and spoken with residents and the objecting group. She confirmed she had no predetermined bias.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on item 12, planning application 17/01556/HHA, The Olives, stating that he had been approached by objectors and supporters. He also knew most of the people involved.

**5. 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**

Regarding planning application 18/00343/FUL, Stanford Tyres and Servicing, Councillor Piccolo stated that he had a meeting on the site two months ago with a Planning Officer. This had been to view the site from a nearby property's rear garden for information purposes only. It would not influence any decision he would make.

**6. Planning Appeals**

The report provided information regarding planning appeals performance.

**RESOLVED:**

**The Committee noted the report.**

**7. End of year Performance Report**

The report showed that in 2017/18, the Planning Service had maintained its position within the top three potential Local Authorities in the country. 878 planning applications had been determined in which 81% of those were approved.

620 new homes had been consented, 13,500 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial floor space was gained and 232 new jobs opened up. This was due to the positive decisions made which mounted to £7.8 million for the local economy. In addition, £1.4 million was secured through s106 contributions.

The Chair congratulated the Planning Service on an excellent year.

**RESOLVED:**

**The Committee noted the report.**

**8. 18/00404/FUL: CRO Purfleet Port, Land east of Purfleet Thames Terminal and south of railway line, London Road, Purfleet**

The planning application was a proposal for the development of a decked car storage building. It would provide 949 parking spaces within a steel-framed decked structure consisting of seven levels and open parking on the rooftop. CRO Purfleet Port operated the Purfleet Thames Terminal which was a site for the import and export of principle vehicles, trailers and containers. The Terminal had a berth into the river and the port was looking to expand.

It had acquired parts of land over the years and had recently been granted planning permission. The proposed development would support the function of the port so this was supported by NPPF and core development strategies.

The Principal Planner summarised that the proposal would increase vehicle storage capacity. This meant more vehicle movements on both sides of the road and an accumulative assessment was provided in the report to show this. There would be 118 two way HGV movements with a maximum of seven between AM and PM peaks. However, a condition of the previous granted planning permission for the site-wide proposal had shifted vehicle movements into the area. Vehicles would go via the Stonehouse Roundabout instead of residential roads. Highway Officers had no objection to this proposal; there were no objections in regards to air quality and there would be no significant impact on noise levels.

The Terminal was in a high risk flood area but had no objection from the Environment Agency and had passed the sequential test. There was a holding objection from the Flood Risk Manager regarding surface water drainage and the applicant had responded to this. The structure would be big but given the structures within the same area, it was considered to be harmless to the landscape. The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Chair opened the Committee to questions regarding the planning application 18/00404/FUL, CRO Purfleet Port.

Councillor Little queried the height of the building and whether it would affect the skyline of Thurrock or obstruct the view of the Queen Elizabeth 2 (QE2) bridge which was in most of Thurrock's leaflets. She also asked whether the colour of the building would fade into the background or be generic. The Principal Planner answered that it would be 30.4m to the highest deck as stated on p24 of the report. It would be slightly higher than High Speed 1 (HS1) viaduct by 18m. From the public viewpoint, it would appear to be of a greater distance but was not considered to have significant visual impact as assessed by the Council's landscape officer. He added that the structure would be of steel and concrete but with the QE2 bridge, Unilever factory, HS1 viaduct and operations of the port, it was not considered a visual area given the landscape. The proposal was considered acceptable because of this.

The Agent, Mr Joost Rubens, representative of CRO Ports, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Little gave her support to this planning application as it would help businesses to move forward. The Chair agreed adding that the car storage would be in commercially recognised spots. This would be essential for Brexit.

It was proposed by Councillor Churchman and seconded by Councillor Little that the application be granted planning permission, subject to conditions, as per the Officer's recommendations.

*Councillor Rice was unable to vote in this application having arrived after the start of the discussion of this application.*

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Leslie Gamester, Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions.**

**9. 18/00308/REM: Former Ford Motor Company, Arisdale Avenue, South Ockendon, Essex RM15 5JT**

The application sought approval for the development of Phases 4 and 5 of the Arisdale Avenue development. Historically, planning permission had been granted to Thurrock Thames Gateway Development Corporation (TTGDC) in April 2011. This was to demolish the buildings of the Former Ford Motor Company to enable the erection of 650 homes along with car parks, roads, public open space and landscaping. Phases 1 and 2 were already constructed and construction on Phase 3 was currently underway.

With approval granted for this application, there would be a further 230 homes including associated roads, paths and car parking spaces. The dwellings were considered to be of a high quality and would be an evolution of the earlier site. The Principal Planner mentioned a separate document which highlighted some corrections to the Plan Numbers provided in the application. The application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Little asked for an outline of Thurrock's requirements on affordable housing and the development would help the Council to achieve their goal. The Principal Planner stated the current policy and core strategy referred to 35% of affordable housing and that the Arisdale Avenue development had begun back in 2011, before the core strategy had been adopted. It had been dealt with by the development corporation at the time and not Thurrock Council. At the time, contained within s106, affordable housing and viability requirements between 10 – 25%, were to be considered at each phase of the development. This application showed 10% affordable homes which would be located in the north side of the development. This was a figure of 23 out of 230 residential dwellings.

Councillor Jefferies questioned whether there would be a proposal for footpaths and roads when Phases 4 and 5 were completed. Referring to s106, the Principal Planner stated there were requirements for footpaths and roads. Councillor Jefferies went on to ask if there would be additional access to the railway station.

The Principal Planner answered that there were no plans for this within Phases 4 and 5. However, there was already an existing footbridge on the site.

Councillor Sammons queried if there would be proposals for schools. The Principal Planner confirmed there was a requirement for education at each stage of the development which would be separate to this application. There was an obligation to do so in s106. Following on from this, Councillor Jefferies asked if s106 also had a requirement for healthcare to which the Principal Planner confirmed there had been none at the time of the planning permission being granted for the Arisdale Avenue development.

The Agent, Ms Jo Russell, was invited to the Committee to present her statement of support.

The Chair opened the Committee to debate.

Referring back to the level of affordable housing, Councillor Piccolo mentioned that it had been determined back in 2010 but believed that this could be reviewed as stated. Since then, house sales had risen at a greater rate. He continued on to ask if the number of affordable homes could be looked at again. The Principal Planner answered that it was the outline application in 2010 that had set s106 of the phases for the Arisdale Avenue development. It could not be reverted back or be amended and no-one had sought to revise that legal agreement or asked to increase the number of affordable homes. However, there would be a separate process to the planning application to discharge planning obligations and would include a viability assessment to explain the 10% given. Councillor Piccolo went on to say that the report stated that the 10% affordable homes could be reviewed when later stages of the development arose. Councillor Jefferies added that he welcomed further development of the Arisdale Avenue site but was disappointed in the number of affordable homes.

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

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Leslie Gamester, Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons

Against: Councillor Susan Little

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions.**

**10. 18/00316/FUL: Montrose, 168 Branksome Avenue, Stanford Le Hope, Essex SS17 8DE**

The application proposed the demolition of an existing bungalow in The Homesteads residential estate, to pave the way for the development of seven new dwellings. The proposed layout of the development showed a new access road, six of the plots to be two storeys and one plot to be the only bungalow. An updated response for the road had been provided by Highways which was now no objection. However, there was a tree to the rear of the existing bungalow that was subject to a tree preservation order.

Annexes in Thurrock's Local Plan rejected this type of development which was a form of backland development and aimed to retain the original character of The Homesteads. There was an in-principle objection to this proposal. Garden sizes would be reduced and increase the opportunity on overlooking gardens which was not acceptable.

The Principal Planner summarised that the application was recommended for refusal. The given reasons were set out in the report. Reason three did not apply as Highways no longer objected.

Councillor Piccolo agreed with the Officer's recommendations and said more houses were needed but there was a need to maintain The Homesteads' character. The Chair echoed his agreement as the area would become overcrowded.

It was proposed by Councillor Piccolo and seconded by Councillor Jefferies that the application be refused as per the Officer's recommendations.

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Leslie Gamester, Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons

Against: Councillor Gerard Rice

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused.**

**11. 17/01556/HHA: The Olives, Rectory Road, Orsett, Essex RM16 3EH**

The application sought planning permission for a single storey rear extension with a part glazed roof and a first floor extension with a new attic floor. As the site was adjacent to the Orsett Conservation Area and adjoined a Grade II listed building, the first floor extension would impact on the character of the area. National Policy charged Local Authorities to conserve and refuse consent if proposed developments were to harm listed buildings and there was seen to be some harm in this proposal.

The Principal Planner stated the application was recommended for refusal and gave a revised reason for refusal.

Councillor Little questioned if the garage on the site had been built low in the 1960s as it would have obscured the sightlines of the conservation area. The Principal Planner was unable to confirm but answered that the conservation area had been designated at the time or just after construction. He could not say when the Grade II listed building had been listed.

The Chair of Orsett Conservation Group, Mr Joseph Pigg, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of objection.

Mr Ian Thompkins was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support on behalf of the applicant.

The Chair moved the application for refusal, as per the Officer's recommendations.

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard, Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies and Terry Piccolo.

Against: Councillors Leslie Gamester, Sue Sammons and Gerard Rice.

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused.**

**12. 18/00343/FUL: Stanford Tyres and Servicing, Rear of 16 London Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex SS17 0LD**

The application set out a proposal for a two storey block for retail use and office space with stairs leading up to the first floor. There had been planning applications for the site before which had been rejected due to height issues. Progressive changes had been made overtime to overcome the scale and design which was now considered to be acceptable.

The Principal Planner stated that wording for conditions five and six of the report had been amended. Condition five was reworded as:

*“The proposed first floor offices shall be used only for purposes in conjunction with and ancillary to the primary use of the ground floor retail use and shall not be used separately as an independent business.”*

The hours stated in condition six was amended to state 21:00 hours and not 09:00 hours.

There were no questions from Members.

Ms S White was invited to the Committee to present her statement of objection.

The applicant, Mr Merwin Amirtharaja, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

The Chair opened the Committee to debate.

Councillor Piccolo mentioned visiting the site before. He asked if there was a difference in levels on the site, such as the resident's garden being built lower. The Principal Planner could not confirm and the report did not mention this. From the photos shown, it appeared the levels of the site and garden was similar. Councillor Piccolo replied that the garden was considerably lower than the building as it stepped down. The photos already showed reduced sunlight from the building and if the proposal was approved, the garden would become a night time environment in the day. He stated the Officers needed to visit the site to see this.

It was proposed by Councillor Churchman and seconded by Councillor Jefferies that a site visit be arranged for the Committee. The planning application would be deferred until after the site visit had taken place.

Site visit:

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard, Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo and Gerard Rice.

Against: Councillors Leslie Gamester.

Abstain: (0)

**DEFERRED:**

**Until after a site visit.**

**The meeting finished at 8.47 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)**