

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 15 July 2021 at 6.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun (Substitute) (substitute for James Halden) and Susan Little (Substitute) (substitute for Colin Churchman)

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

**Apologies:** Councillors Colin Churchman, Mike Fletcher and James Halden

**In attendance:**

Ian Hunt, Assistant Director Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer  
Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection  
Louise Reid, Strategic Lead - Development Services  
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner  
Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager  
Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner  
Lucy Mannion, Senior Planning Officer  
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer  
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor  
Wendy Le, 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.

### **12. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2021 was approved as a true and correct record.

### **13. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **14. Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Byrne declared that he was pre-determined on 20/01743/FUL, 20/01811/FUL and 21/00073/FUL. He stated that he would remove himself from participating on these items.

Councillor Piccolo declared that he had presented a speaker statement at the request of his residents on 20/01743/FUL when it had been considered at Planning Committee previously. He stated that he would keep an open mind and listen to the officer's presentation and committee debate before making a decision.

Councillor Little declared that residents in her ward had contacted her about 21/00077/FUL and she had directed them to their other Ward Councillor, Barry Johnson as she would be sitting on this Planning Committee meeting.

**15. 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**

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair declared that correspondence had been received from Jennifer Wrayton on 20/01662/OUT and from Adam Beckford on 21/00073/FUL.

**16. Planning Appeals**

The Committee was satisfied with the report.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the report be noted.**

**17. London Gateway Logistics Park Local Development Order**

The Chair stated that he was employed by DP World and would remove himself from participating on this item. The Vice-Chair would chair this item in his place.

Matthew Gallagher presented the report.

There were no questions or comments from the Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the report was noted.**

**18. 20/01743/FUL Stanford Le Hope Railway Station, London Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex, SS17 0JX**

The report was presented by Lucy Mannion.

Councillor Little asked if the footbridge was for passengers or for the general public. She also sought clarification on the location of the bus stop and commented that there could be potential traffic queues if the bus was stopping on the road for pick up/drop off. Lucy Mannion answered the footbridge was for passengers. She said that the application was for the station building and

that it did not include the bus facilities whereas the previous application had. She said that the daybreak site next to the station had room for buses to turn around.

Councillor Little pointed out that some Ensign buses were large so needed adequate room to turn. She was concerned that the application would be approved but without plans for a bus stop or a facility for buses to turn around. She also pointed out that the general public was currently able to access the footbridge. Julian Howes explained that buses would stop where they currently stopped now just east of the station and west of the station in a layby. There was a potential that the Daybreak Windows site would have a transport hub with a bus turn round facility. He went on to say that the current station layout did not have a turnaround facility and the proposal did not have one either so the Highways Team had no objection on this part. He explained that members of the public should not be able to access the footbridge and had not been able to in the past but there were times when the barriers were open and pedestrians were able to access the footbridge. The footbridge had always been the station side of the development and only train passengers were able to access the footbridge.

Speaker Statements were heard from:

- Shane Hebb, Ward Councillor – in support.
- Colin Black, Applicant's Representative – in support.

Steve Taylor sought clarification on who owned the land. He also said that there was a missed opportunity in the proposals for a pedestrian footbridge. Lucy Mannion answered that Network Rail owned the land which was leased to c2c. Julian Howes added that installing a footbridge would involve a lot of logistics in another location.

Councillor Piccolo said that he was concerned over how long the project had taken to complete and felt it would take longer in the winter months to come. He commented that a bus layby was needed but that the Committee needed to consider the application that was before them on its own merits. He pointed out that some projects would come in separate applications due to the separate phases of each project. He said that it would not be fair to delay this application to wait for other applications that was related to this project. Councillor Polley said that Members comments needed to be considered to help shape the masterplan but agreed that it was the application before Committee that needed to be considered. Councillor Watson said that care around the lizards on the site should be taken during construction and asked if the transport phase would come to Committee for consideration. It was confirmed that this would.

The Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to approve planning permission and was seconded by Councillor Piccolo.

*(Councillor Byrne did not participate in this application due to his declaration of interest.)*

**FOR:** (7) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**19. 20/01662/OUT Greenwise Nurseries, Vange Park Road, Vange, SS16 5LA**

The report was presented by Jonathan Keen.

There were no questions.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Russell Forde, Agent – in support.

The Chair noted that the previous application had proposed all custom build homes and that the current application now included affordable housing which was not considered appropriate development on Green Belt (GB). He asked if Basildon Council had commented on this application as well. Jonathan Keen explained that the affordable housing factor had been given some weight in balancing the harm to the GB. Along with other factors, it was not enough to clearly outweigh that harm to the GB so the application was recommended for refusal. He said that the previous application had been recommended for approval as it proposed custom build homes but the number of those proposed in the current application had dropped significantly.

The Committee commented that the proposed homes were too small and that the development would result in traffic issues with the increase of vehicles in the area. They felt that there would be overcrowding issues in the development and that the density of the development was not appealing. The Committee said that affordable housing did not always address housing need nor did it mean that it was affordable for people on the Council's housing waiting list. The Committee commented that the original application had been attractive as it had offered people the opportunity to build their own homes.

The Vice-Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission and was seconded by Councillor Watson.

**FOR:** (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**20. 20/01811/FUL The Willows, Morley Hill, SLH, Essex, SS17 8HY**

The report was presented by Nadia Houghton.

Councillor Little asked which part of the road would be hard surfaced by the Applicant. She questioned whether future occupants of the bungalows would be allowed to make adjustments on the roof and also where the waste bins would be placed on each property. Nadia Houghton answered that hard surfacing would take place on the road of Morley Hill that was in front of the application site. With regards to adjustments to the bungalow roofs, she said that there were strict restrictions in place preventing these under condition 14 on page 99 of the agenda. For the waste bins, she explained that each plot had its own designated area for waste bins which were either to the rear or side of the property.

Steve Taylor noted the access road at the end of Branksome Avenue and sought further clarification on the road widening proposal. He commented that there could be a potential 'pinch point' on the road as it was likely that bin lorries would have to reverse into the road to access those properties on Morley Hill. Nadia Houghton explained that the application site boundary was before the properties on Morley Hill and not at 98 Morley Hill which was the first property in front of the application site. She said that the road that was part of the application site would be widened to 4.8 metres. She explained that the Applicant's submitted plans indicated that bin lorries would have enough room to turn out from that road as well.

Councillor Akinbohun questioned the number of car parking spaces allocated to each property. Nadia Houghton answered that there were two allocated to each property and two visitor spaces located at the top of the 'T' of the development so it was 18 spaces in total.

Referring to the road at the bottom of the 'T' on the application's plan map, the Chair sought clarification on who owned that road. Nadia Houghton explained that the Land Registry had no title deed for who owned that road so it was not an adopted road. It could potentially have a private established right of way as there was a public footpath north of the road. She said that the Applicant had satisfied all planning procedures by searching into this strip of road and with its notification process.

Councillor Polley asked whether there would be policies in place to prevent internal adjustments to the properties. Nadia Houghton answered that this would fall within the remit of building controls and legislation. She highlighted that the proposal before the Committee was of a high quality design and materials. She said that permitted development rights were restricted to prevent additional extensions or alterations which would require a formal planning application to be submitted for these.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- James Halden, Ward Councillor – in objection.
- Adam Beckford, Agent – in support.

The Chair asked if the right processes had been carried out in regards to the amount of homes proposed on this development due to the amount of space

on the site. He also noted the concerns on HGVs and other large vehicles accessing the single track road and asked if the service was confident that the road would be safe in regards to weight limit. He also asked if parking would be allowed on the road. Nadia Houghton explained that the proposed eight bungalows were acceptable on the application site because of the limited impact it would have in the area. She said that a higher number of properties would have a bigger impact as properties would be smaller and gardens would be squeezed in. With regards to the weight limit on the unadopted road, Julian Howes said that the road would be hard surfaced to a level that would be able to withstand the appropriate type of vehicles needing access to the site. He said that the Highways Team had looked at accident records which showed that there had not been any. The application was considered to be finely balanced in highway terms. In regards to parking, he said that the inside road was 6 metres wide which was a shared surface but there was sufficient room to park a car there if needed. He stated that the parking spaces proposed met the Council's draft parking standards.

Councillor Little questioned whether there was proposal for a footpath on the single track road. She said that the accident records showed no accidents because it was currently not tarmacked. Julian Howes explained that there was no proposal for footpath as it was a dirt track road which had a public right of way over a footpath. Nadia Houghton said that the access road on Morley Hill would be widened to 4.8 meters and within the cul-de-sac of the development, it would be six meters wide with a shared surface for pedestrians and vehicles. This would provide a better surface for pedestrians to walk upon than what was currently in place.

Councillor Polley questioned who would own the unadopted road once the development was built. She also sought clarification on where there was a turning head for fire engines. Julian Howes answered that the Council could not adopt the road as it linked to a private road. However, the service had asked for planning conditions that required the road to be constructed to an acceptable standard under highway terms. Nadia Houghton explained that the plan showed access for a pump appliance so a fire engine would be able to go in forward gear and reverse in the turning head, that was the little 'T' at the end of the road, and then come out in forward gear.

Councillor Watson mentioned that an objection stated that Highways England had concerns on the track and access road and asked whether these concerns had been addressed. She also highlighted her concerns on the access which she noted from objections was dangerous and obstructive. She asked what the developers would do to ensure that the road was safer and what mitigations were in place to prevent a potential accident. She also questioned whose responsibility it was for the unadopted road if it was to cave in. Julian Howes explained that Highways England would not have been consulted on this application as it was a small scale application. He said that Network Rail could potentially have concerns as they would need to access the railway track from the site's location. Nadia Houghton said that the objection may have referred to a previous response from the Highways Team that had raised a concern on the red line boundary which had now been

mitigated as the red line boundary had moved. In regards to the safety of the road, Julian Howes explained that the site had been visited by the Highways Team and were satisfied that the visibility was adequate at the access road and reiterated his point about the accident records. He also added that the Council could be involved if the unadopted road caved in or became dangerous but other than that, it would be the responsibility of the owners to fix the road.

Councillor Piccolo questioned who was responsible for the upkeep of the unadopted road. Julian Howes explained that the responsibility would fall to the owner of the land which was potentially the homeowners of the proposed properties. However the hard surfacing would help to maintain the road for at least 20 – 30 years.

The Vice-Chair said that infill was possible on the site and the proposed development was of a high quality design. He thought that the access was adequate and there were enough parking spaces. The Chair agreed and said that the current properties near the site did not have traffic issues. He said that it would be good to see more bungalows as currently there was only one bungalow on the site. Councillor Piccolo said that there were a lack of bungalows in Thurrock and the number proposed was not considered to be an overdevelopment. He agreed with officers that the bungalows would keep to the character of the area. Councillor Watson agreed and said that it would be good to see some safety measures put in place such as road mirrors to help road users see other vehicles coming in and out of the access road. The Committee felt that the concerns with the access road had been addressed.

The Vice-Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission and was seconded by the Chair.

*(Councillor Byrne did not participate in this application due to his declaration of interest.)*

**FOR:** (7) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

The meeting was adjourned at 8pm for technology issues to be resolved. The meeting recommenced at 8.15pm.

**21. 21/00073/FUL 53-55 Third Avenue, SLH, Essex**

The report was presented by Nadia Houghton.

The Committee agreed to suspend standing orders at 8.22pm to allow the agenda to be completed.

Councillor Polley sought clarification on the difference between the current and previous application. Nadia Houghton answered that the current application now had an s106 attached and there was now no justifiable reason to refuse planning permission. She explained that there was no RAMs payment and the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) offered as part of an s106 on the previous application and the Planning Inspectorate had dismissed the appeal because of this reason. The Planning Inspectorate had not agreed with officers' assessment of the proposed development to be a case of overdevelopment and had said that it was not harmful to character. However the s106 was needed to make the development acceptable.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- James Halden, Ward Councillor – in objection.
- Ian Coward, Agent – in support.

Councillor Little asked whether the contributions on the s106 could be increased. She felt that the amount contributed was minimal and that the community would not be able to benefit from this. She also said that the development would result in parking issues. Nadia Houghton explained that the s106 contributions were not for the developers and that these were for the RAMs implications that related to ecological mitigations from the impact of the development. The other contribution was the TRO to facilitate funding for parking restrictions along the access road and the immediate stretch of Third Avenue near the cul-de-sac. The development's proposed parking spaces were compliant with the Council's parking standards so the service would not ask for more than the 16 parking spaces proposed in the application.

The Chair felt that there was not enough parking spaces and that the roads were narrow. He questioned what the process was in regards to the Council's draft parking standards and where this resulted in potential parking issues around the site's area. Nadia Houghton answered that each site was considered on its own merits and that the current application had been considered before but had been refused on other reasons that did not include parking spaces. On appeal of the previous application, the Planning Inspectorate had agreed with the Highways Team that a TRO was needed but did not agree that there would be parking issues. She said that the site was 800 metres away from the nearest shops and that the station was 2km away. The parking standards had been met by the Applicant and the service could not reasonably see what else could be done with the parking spaces proposed. Julian Howes added that the draft parking standards may not change in the future as national government was encouraging people to use other modes of transport.

Councillor Watson commented that the proposed plans looked nice and questioned whether there was a demand for 4 bedroom properties. Councillor Polley noted that the oak trees on the site had Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and questioned whether the construction works would impact on those trees. She asked what plans were in place if the trees were damaged. She also asked who was responsible for the unadopted road. Nadia Houghton answered that the Council's landscape advisor had confirmed that the

proposal would not impact upon the oak trees. She pointed out that condition 7 detailed how the trees and its root systems would be protected. Condition 4 also gave a detailed construction management plan that would protect the trees. Julian Howes said that the Council would not adopt the unadopted road.

Councillor Little questioned whether the proposed properties would have the option to install an electric powerpoint for electric cars. Julian Howes said that developments now had the facility to install an electric power point as the service now requested that a number of parking spaces were made available for electric vehicles.

Councillor Piccolo raised concerns over the unadopted road as it would create issues for people in the future. He felt that the proposal looked cramped and there were many similar properties and sites in the area that was demolishing houses and rebuilding with more homes. He felt that this would change the character of the area. Councillor Polley said that back land development needed to be carefully considered and that the proposal was an overdevelopment on the site. She was concerned on the type of houses proposed on the site and the increased amount of traffic from that site once the development was built.

The Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

*(Councillor Byrne did not participate in this application due to his declaration of interest.)*

**FOR:** (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (2) Councillors Terry Piccolo and Georgette Polley.

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**22. 21/00077/FUL Land adjacent Fen Farm Judds Farm and part of Bulphan Fen, Harrow Lane, Bulphan, Essex**

The report was presented by Lucy Mannion. Since the publication of the agenda, the following updates had been received:

- A response from Highways England who had no objections to the application.
- A response from Havering Council who had no objections in principle.
- An additional objection from the owners of Fen Farm who had also submitted the same objection previously.

Steve Taylor sought clarification on the battery storage and how the solar energy stored would be discharged to the energy grid. Lucy Mannion answered that the power would be discharged directly to the grid and needed to be near a substation.

Councillor Little asked how many hectares were 18 arable fields. She also questioned how Thurrock would benefit from the proposal. Lucy Mannion answered that 18 arable fields was equal to 138 hectares. She explained that the proposal would bring clean energy and lower carbon emissions to Thurrock which was beneficial for Thurrock and the country. Matthew Gallagher pointed out that the proposal was for up to 49.9MW of clean energy and if this had been over the 50MW mark, the application would have gone directly to the Secretary of State for determination and Thurrock Council would have been a consultee in that only. He stated that planning policies did not require an Applicant who was promoting clean energy to justify the need for more energy and that as traditional thermal generation stations had gone out of commission there was a clear need for new clean sources of energy. There was a need to consider green energy which would be a nationwide benefit and not just a borough wide benefit. He said that a local benefit would be that the proposal would increase biodiversity on that site.

Councillor Little said that the Fens were special to the people of Thurrock and that everyone should have been consulted on the application. She agreed that energy was needed but pointed out that green spaces were also needed. She noted that there had been no objections in regards to archaeology but pointed out that Fen Farm was a historical bronze age farm. She stated that the geese on the site was not mentioned in the report either and that Bulphan was famous for these geese. Lucy Mannion explained that the archaeology advisor had looked at the information on the application and considered the application to be acceptable as long as any archaeology on the site was not affected. Referring to the ecological survey report in 6.89 of the report, Matthew Gallagher said that the site was not a designated nature conservation site and that arable fields and farmland tended to be relatively sterile sites with regard to ecological interest. The Applicant had undertaken habitat and species surveys which did not reveal much interest other than some in the hedgerows with nesting birds. He said that he understood the point about geese but there was no known link between the location of solar farms and incidences of bird strike. He referred to a previous case in East Tilbury which had been close to a mud flats site that was a special conservation area. However, he pointed out that the surveys had been undertaken and the ecological advisor had no objection subject to mitigation measures which included a 10 metre buffer for wildflowers to grow to increase the biodiversity on the site.

The Chair questioned why the Applicant had chosen to keep the energy output lower than 50MW which left the decision in the hands of the Planning Committee. Matthew Gallagher explained that the application process through national government was a longer process that could take up to two years. He said that changes to the thresholds for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects allowed for battery storage schemes above 50MW to be considered as normal planning applications.

The Chair commented that there needed to be alternative solutions as solar energy was not effective in the winter months and felt that the solar farm

would obliterate the Fens. He felt a site visit was needed. Matthew Gallagher explained that the alternatives highlighted in the report referred to other potential sites and the current location was a key location due to its proximity to the Warley substation that would allow the site to easily connect to the power grid. If an alternative location was used, time and money would be spent on making the power grid connection which was costly, therefore there was no alternative site for this proposal. As the site was in the GB, he explained that the harm to the GB would have to be assessed and based on the landscape advisor's report and the applicant's environmental statement, it was considered that one would have to be very close to the site or within the site to notice the significance of visual impact to the GB. Officers had assessed the harms and benefit of the application to the GB and had considered the harm to be clearly outweighed.

Councillor Akinbohun asked whether the proposals would impact upon people's health. Lucy Mannion answered that there were various information from other sources that found toxins from solar panels to be harmful but some other sources would disagree. The service went by the British Standards on solar panels. Matthew Gallagher added that the noise and air quality implications had been considered and that the Environmental Health Officer had considered there to be no impact.

Councillor Polley asked whether the 49.9MW of energy would be over the site area of 138 hectares that was within Thurrock's borders or if this would be on the overall site of 143 hectares. Matthew Gallagher answered that the Thurrock part of the application was of the solar panels which was 138 hectares and that the remaining hectares was for the grid connection within Havering's borders so it would be 49.9MW.

Councillor Polley said that the Fens were ancient fenland and geese had been there as it was once a wetland so it was a natural flood plain. She was concerned on the use of electricity here. She noted that the Applicant needed to provide 3 months' notice if they were to cease operations on the site and was concerned over how the batteries would be safely disposed of. She also pointed out that the site was a large amount of land that could be used for food production, once it was returned to its organic state, and food production had been an important issue in the press recently. Matthew Gallagher said that the service was aware of the flood risk on the site and that a sequential test had been undertaken. It was found that the important components of the battery storage and substation proposed would be located in the areas of the site that had the lowest flood risk. With the disposal of the batteries, he said that if the batteries were hazardous, these would need to be disposed of safely. On agriculture, he agreed that government guidance was that grades 1, 2, 3a should not be used for solar farms and the Applicant had carried out the assessments that identified the site as grade 3b which was below average. Therefore there would not be an in principle objection to the loss of land but the balancing act of harm to the GB still had to be assessed.

Councillor Piccolo questioned what would the minimum energy output be. He was concerned that the Applicant may not maximise its energy output. Lucy

Mannion explained that the minimum energy output could not be controlled but as it was a business, it would seek to maximise its output.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Joy Jarvis, a resident – in objection.
- Barry Johnson, Ward Councillor – in objection.
- Simon Wheeler, Applicant – in support.

The Chair asked if there was a solar farm in South Ockendon and whether it had been built yet. Matthew Gallagher confirmed that there was permission for a solar farm to the south west of this site within South Ockendon but there was no solar panels in place yet.

The Chair noted that there was a lot of opposition to the proposals in a rural area which he felt suggested that there would be a visual impact as Bulphan had different levels of land. He said that the site was on a hill and would have a visual impact from afar particularly as the poles were 3 metres high. Lucy Mannion explained that the immediate visual impact would be on Fen Farm, Judds Farm and Glasshouse Retreat. There would be a minimal impact for other residents looking out of their windows as hedgerows would be planted. Matthew Gallagher explained that the environmental impact statement from the Applicant had detailed a theoretical zone of influence that the proposal would have in terms of potential visual impact. Unless one was inside the site or very close to the site, the visual impact would not be very significant. Fen Farm would be affected but they would not be overshadowed and other properties down Harrow Lane would not be affected due to the distance from the site.

Steve Taylor stated that he disagreed with the assessment of the proposal's impact to the GB. He said that the openness of the GB would be taken away and destroyed even with the hedgerows planted as there would no longer be an open view. He raised concerns over the safety of the batteries as there had been articles in the media where batteries on solar farms had exploded. He pointed out that battery storages were unregulated in the UK.

The Chair felt that he needed to see the site as he was not familiar with the area or what a solar farm looked like. The Committee commented that they wished to see a travel plan as the building of the site would increase traffic in the area and to also see the routes into the site. The Committee wished to see where the batteries would be placed on the site and to have a 3m pole placed on the site to view the visual impact. Photos of Fen Farm flooding was also requested. The Committee requested to see the Lower Dunton Farm site that had similar proposals but officers highlighted that the applications were separate and had to be assessed on its own merits. As the site was large, officers explained that it would take some time to organise the site visit and the Committee suggested that a minibus be hired to take them around the site and the routes into the site.

The Chair proposed to defer the application for a site visit and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

**FOR:** (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**23. 21/00729/LBC - JD Wetherspoons PLC Old State Cinema George Street Grays Essex RM17 6LZ**

The report was presented by Jonathan Keen.

Councillor Little sought clarification on the use of blackout blinds inside the property. The Chair said that he understood the need to preserve the building as highlighted by Heritage England but felt that the building would be a pub and lighting would be needed. Jonathan Keen explained that the building had limited building and by installing windows in the south western side of the building, it would change the original feel of the building. With the blackout blinds, it would potentially hold events that would use the blinds to bring back a 'cinema feel'. There were conditions in relation to the blackout blinds that would look to maintain the original design of the building as much as possible.

The Committee said that they were supportive of the application as the original building design would be maintained. The Committee commented that the proposal was much needed for Grays and hoped it would help to bring in other businesses and investments into Grays.

The Vice-Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission and was seconded by Councillor Polley.

**FOR:** (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**24. 21/00728/FUL - JD Wetherspoons PLC, Old State Cinema, George Street, Grays, Essex, RM17 6LZ**

The report was presented by Jonathan Keen.

The Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

**FOR:** (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson, Abbie Akinbohun and Susan Little.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

The Chair stated that the public meeting would now close at 10.30pm and go into exempt session for the remaining item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as specified in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

**25. Planning Appeal for Arisdale Avenue Planning Application 20/00827/FUL**

This part of the meeting was held in exempt session as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as specified in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**The meeting finished at 11.07 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)**