

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 2 December 2021 at 6.00 pm

---

<b>Present:</b>	Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson
<b>Apologies:</b>	Councillors Colin Churchman and Mike Fletcher
<b>In attendance:</b>	Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection Louise Reid, Strategic Lead - Development Services Ian Harrison, Principal Planner Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner Kenna-Victoria Healey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

---

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

The Chair stated that there was a time limit for the use of South Essex College venue which was until 9.30pm. He said that if the items on the agenda were not concluded by 9.30pm, the meeting would be adjourned and would recommence at the next Planning Committee meeting on 6 January 2022.

### **55. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2021 were approved as a true and correct record.

### **56. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **57. Declaration of Interests**

In relation to 21/01557/HHA, Councillor Halden declared that his parents lived on Second Avenue and he supported the call in of the application, however he felt he could hear the application with an open mind.

### **58. 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**

Councillor Kelly, declared the following correspondence which had been received by all Members:

- An email from Councillor Collins in relation to 21/01557/HHA

- An email from Councillor J Kent in relation to 21/01789/TBC
- An email from Mrs H Turp in relation to 21/01578/HHA

All Members declared emails being received in relation to 21/00894/TBC.

## **59. Planning Appeals**

The Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection presented the report to Members. Councillor Polley enquired as to whether officers had received the same ratio of applications as on previous years for this time of year. The Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection commented the percentage of applications which had been received was around 42% and officers had no concerns as to the amount of applications being submitted. He continued by stating the applications process was kept under review.

### **RESOLVED:**

**That the report be noted.**

## **60. 21/00304/FUL - Land Rear Of Ewen House High Road Fobbing Essex**

The report was presented by the Principal Planner.

Councillor Byrne enquired as to the difference between a two story planning application on greenbelt land for a single detached dwelling and the same application however being labelled for over 55-year-olds. The Principal Planning officer explained that as with all applications submitted on Green Belt land it was necessary to decide which was greater the need for homes or the harm to the Green Belt.

Councillor Little sought additional information on the traffic light system and the impact it could have on the surrounding roads. The Chair of the Committee followed up with asking officers if there were any examples of the proposed traffic light system being used within the borough. It was explained that the traffic lights were small in design for this application and would be the same as expected at a major road junction. Members heard that if approved the traffic lights would be on private land and not on the adopted highway.

Councillor Polley commented that as the target audience were over 55s as to whether there would be enough space for the emergency services to enter the site. Officers explained an ambulance for example would fit however it the entrance onto the site was tight.

The Chair of the Committee advised Members that unfortunately the agent was stuck in traffic, however a copy of his speaker statement was included within the speaker booklet and had been circulated to all Committee Members.

During the debate Councillor Halden referred to paragraph 6.28 of the report and commented that given the development was for an older person's

accommodation he didn't feel that Fobbing was the correct location as it was not located to any local amenities.

Councillor Byrne mentioned not far from the site was the Frost Estate in Corringham which was well known for being an estate of many bungalows.

Mr Taylor commented that the development was not only in the Greenbelt but the size of it appeared no bigger than a single back garden.

Councillor Liddiard proposed the officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Little.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained (0)

**61. 21/00894/TBC - 13 Loewen Road Chadwell St Mary Essex**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

Councillor Little enquired as to the location of the windows and the light allowed into property, as it was suggested opaque windows were to be used. The Principal Planner explained the windows suggested to be used were in line and applied with the planning policy and would be situated in all non-main living areas. Councillor Little further commented that she had visited the site and this had caused her concern with regard to traffic in the area given the extra vehicles and usage to the road. It was explained that the parking spaces offered within the application met the parking standards, therefore the 10 spaces offered was within policy. Councillor Little observed that when she visited the site she noticed a number of cars were parked in the road.

Councillor Byrne queried if the property which was part of the development was an adapted property. Officers confirmed there was a pre-existing building on the development site and within the report the provision for housing was explained.

The Chair of the Committee commented on the link the development had with the Local Authority, remarking that the applicant hadn't taken the application through appeal and therefore had listened to Members previous discussions on the application. The Principal Planning Officer explained that while it was possible for a planning refusal to be appealed it was practical for this application to be looked at via officers and the applicant and then to be brought back to committee.

Members were advised the Resident speaker had sent her apologies, however her statement has been included within the speaker booklet and circulated to Members.

Speaker statements were heard from:

Councillor Muldowney, Ward Member in objection

Mark Baggoley, Agent in support.

During discussions it was enquired as to whether it was possible to refurbish the property so to keep it suited for a disability needs and to allow parking spaces suited for someone with a disability. The Principal Planning Officer explained to refurbish the property it would have to comply with building regulations and in relation to parking spaces these would be allocated slightly differently.

Members moved to the debate during which Councillor Liddiard stated he visited the property and felt it was out of the characteristics for the area, he continued by stating he was pleased to see that parking had been included as part of the application. He further stated he was disappointed that the property was not to be refurbished, as from the road the property was not visible due to imposing housing.

Councillor Little echoed Councillor Liddiard's comments on parking, stating when she visited the site it was difficult to park as a number of vehicles were parked in the down the road.

The Chair of the Committee stated that although it was still a large development, the application would produce four new homes for four families and he felt it was a positive application.

Councillor Polley stated that it was important to remember not all disabilities are visible, and unfortunately the property was no longer fit for its purpose and appeared to be in need to be updated.

Councillor Halden stated Members first saw the application in March which they deferred, it was clear the three main concerns Members had at that meeting had been met by the applicant.

The Chair of the Committee proposed the officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Halden.

For: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley

Against: (3) Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne and Lee Watson.

Abstained (0)

**62. 21/01578/HHA - 41 Scratton Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex, SS17 0PA**

Councillor Halden declared that a family member lived on Scratton Road, however he did not feel this impacted on his ability to hear the application with an open mind.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

Councillor Halden queried how the property was out of character for the road, as at the end of Scratton Road there was a block of flats and a mansion. The Principal Planning Officer explained that although the development was good in design it was more to do with the dwelling on the rear of the property and therefore in context of the rest of the road it was out of character for the area.

Speaker statement was heard from Helen Turp, applicant in support.

During the debate all Members agreed they were surprised to see the application presented to committee, as they didn't feel the application was impacting on any of the other residents along the road and there had been no resident objections to the application.

The Chair of the Committee asked Members if anyone wished to propose the officers recommendation for refusal. There were none. Councillor Halden then put forward a recommendation of approval of the application this was seconded by Councillor Little and put to the vote.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained (0)

*The committee adjourned at 7:34pm and reconvene at 7:40pm.*

**63. 21/01548/FUL - 2 Morant Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex, RM16 4UA**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

Councillor Little enquired as to whether the development would impede the current building line. Officers explained that approval to the application would mean the development was closer to the public highway and therefore the boundary line would decrease from 3.1 m to 2.7 m.

Speaker statements were heard from:

Michelle Hall, resident in objection

Councillor Adam Carter, Ward Member in objection

Councillor Halden commented that from looking at the layout of the development it would be incredibly intrusive on the neighbours and he couldn't see how this application could be approved.

Councillor Little commented she felt the application was out of keeping with the area and the characteristics of the other properties.

Councillor Byrne proposed the officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Watson.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained (0)

*At 8:15pm, the committee agreed to suspend standing orders until 9:30pm.*

**64. 21/01789/TBC - Alf Lowne Scout Centre, Richmond Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6DN**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

Councillor Watson sought clarification as to why it was not possible to use the access via the Adult Community College. It was explained that adjacent to Scout Centre was the Adult Community College site, in October 2021 the Council submitted a Prior Notification application to demolish the site which was granted in November 2021 with works due to start in January 2022. She continued to explain currently the Scout Centre were accessing the site via the car park of the Adult Community College, and by approving the application would enable the Scouts to have their own access route as once the demolition work began there would be no pedestrian or vehicle access via that current route. The officer also explained that there is an existing rear access serving the terrace of housing adjacent to the Scout Centre, and this rear access is also currently open to the Scout Centre but that it is not the Scouts Centre's formal access Councillor Liddiard enquired as to whether any consultation had been completed relating to the number of vehicles using Richmond Road, he continued by stating whenever he had used the road there was always another vehicle coming towards him which would always leave one vehicle having to reverse towards the main road. The Chair of the Committee followed Councillor Liddiard's question by seeking confirmation that if the Scouts would have legal access to the route proposed within the application. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the Scouts would be permitted legal access via Richmond Road and that this road was an unclassified road.

Councillor Kelly sought further clarification on the number of parking spaces to be used to create an entrance route for the Scouts Centre. He continued by

explaining it had been suggested it would be more than the two spaces proposed by officers. The Principal Planning Officer explained in terms of the proposal within the application there would be a loss of two on street parking spaces to the length of 6.8 m.

The Chief Highways Engineer advised the Committee in general a parallel parking bay was between five and six meters in length, therefore the access being applied for would be less than what the Council would consider a viable parking space. He continued by commenting as there would be a need to allow a vehicle to manoeuvre in and out of the access point, officers estimated it was likely to be two vehicle spaces that would be lost to be able to provide necessary manoeuvrability.

Members enquired as to whether it would be possible for the college car park to be made available for residents use in the short term so to alleviate some of their parking concerns. The Principal Planning Officer advised Members the application site which was the area adjacent to the Scout Centre, didn't go as far as the Adult Community College and so it was outside and beyond the limits of the application and unfortunately officers didn't have any information on that.

Speaker statements were heard from:

Carol Evans, resident in objection

Councillor John Kent, ward member in objection

Councillor Watson stated that she had a family member who lived in the area and was aware of the traffic issues along those roads not to mention the impact on all local roads in the area of Richmond Road and the problem still reminded as to access down the road as it was difficult for the refuse lorries to be able to collect the bins. She further stated she didn't understand how the Council could look to demolish the Adult Community College and not have a plan in place to offer residents somewhere to park.

Councillor Polley commented she felt a site visit could be worthwhile as she found it difficult to picture the site and the layout of the roads and therefore a site visit would enable Members a chance to view how the proposed access site would be use and the possibility of the potential to use of the front car park which had been previously been suggested.

Councillor Piccolo mentioned he felt there would be further loss than just two parking spaces as entry to the site would be 6m wide and a vehicle length was 4.8m. The Principal Planning Officer offered some clarity in that the proposed vehicle access would be 4.8m wide plus an additional 2ms width to allow for the pedestrian access making the proposed access width 6.8m overall.

The Chief Highways Engineer addressed Members clarifying some points which had been raised, the first was with regards to the parking restrictions issued he advised Members that within the conditions on the application it

stated that access details were to be submitted to officers and agreed before any works could commence, he hoped this would give members some confidence that there were checks in place in terms of the access to the site within the application.

He continued by explaining as part of the next step within the application process with regards to parking restrictions this was to be subject to a separate consultation process through the Road Traffic Relations Act and this would entail a draft Traffic Regulation Order to be produced which would go out to consultation.

Councillor Polley put forward a recommendation for a site visit this was seconded by Councillor Byrne and put to the vote.

For: (3) Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne and Lee Watson.

Against: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo and Georgette Polley

Abstained (0)

The Chair of the Committee proposed the officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Halden.

For: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo and Georgette Polley

Against: (3) Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne and Lee Watson

Abstained (0)

**65. 21/01557/HHA - Falconhurst, Second Avenue, Stanford Le Hope, SS17 8DP**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

Councillor Halden sought clarification that what had been applied for and granted with regards to planning permission was not what had been built, and if the committee were minded to refuse or approve the application, what would happen to the current construction. He continued by seeking what the Council's next steps would be for the application. The Principal Planning Officer advised should Members go against officer recommendation the Council would look at all options with regards to enforcement action, this would mean working with the applicant and the land owner to produce a timescale to amend the construction to the correct planning permission which had been applied for and granted.

Councillor Byrne enquired as to if Members approved officer's recommendations to refuse the application if the applicant was to appeal if



this mean the current structure would be to remain in place. It was explained by the Principal Planning Officer that an enforcement notice would be produced and would need time to take affect and to be applied once this had been completed the length of an appeal would be the responsibility of the Planning Inspectorate.

Speaker Statement was heard from Councillor Gary Collins, Ward Member in objection.

During the debate Councillor Halden stated the construction of the wall had been completed outside and without the correct planning permission and therefore he felt that the officers recommendation to refuse should be supported.

Councillor Byrne proposed the officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Little.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, James Halden, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained (0)

**The meeting finished at 8.59 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)**