

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 18 August 2022 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Adam Carter, Susan Little (Substitute for Councillor Paul Arnold) Terry Piccolo and Lee Watson

Apologies: Councillors Paul Arnold, James Thandi and Sue Shinnick

In attendance: Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Louise Reid, Strategic Lead Development Services
Ian Harrison, Principal Planner
Julian Howes, Senior Highways Engineer
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner
Lucy Mannion, Senior Planner
Kenna-Victoria Healey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being live streamed to the Council's website..

23. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2022 were approved as a true and correct record.

24. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

25. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Little declared an interest in item 9, planning application 22/00930/FUL in that the application was within her Ward.

26. 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 the following correspondence on behalf of all Members:

- Planning Application 22/00930/FUL, Woodlands Koi Farm, South Avenue, Langdon Hills, Essex, SS16 6JG an email in support of the application.

Councillor Carter advised he had not received the correspondence; the Chair and other Members had received.

27. Planning Appeals

The Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection presented the reports to Members.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

28. 22/00210/FUL - High Fields, Lower Dunton Road, Bulphan, Upminster, Essex, RM14 3TD (Deferred)

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

Members questioned the difference in terms of footprint between Cumbria (the neighbouring property) and the proposal that is the subject of this application on the basis that they appeared similar. The Principal Planning Officer commented that the crucial consideration in relation to green belt applications is the size of the original dwelling at the application site, rather than any other dwellings surrounding it.

The Principal Planning Officer set out that a replacement dwelling could be supported by that national and local planning policy sets out that replacement buildings should not be materially larger than the original building. Members were advised that other dwellings within the street or area were not relevant to the assessment of inappropriate development.

During the debate Councillor Piccolo stated that, as much as he could understand the concerns of the Planning Officers, he felt there was exceptional circumstances to this application and from his point of view there would be no impact on the green belt due to the limited visibility of the proposal. He continued by saying that he felt that the reasons given by Members for approval at previous meetings had been clear and that each application should be taken on its own merit.

Councillor Watson commented that she was struggling with the application as she could not understand how harm to openness of the greenbelt could be linked to this application given its location. The Chair of the Committee commented that it was clear Members disagreed with the recommendation of Officers and highlighted that, should Members be mindful to approve the application, it was likely to be referred to the Monitoring Officer for their legal opinion.

The Chair thanked Members for their comments and sought if anyone wished to recommend the Officers recommendation. No Member recommended the application as per the Officers report, the Chair then sought an alternative recommendation.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection advised the Constitution was clear that an alternative recommendation would need to be put forward. He continued by advising Members that the application was considered inappropriate development and was beyond what could be seen as a reasonable enlargement relative to the existing property. It was advised that the proposal conflicts with national and local policies.

Members then put forward their reasons for approving the application, addressing each reason for refusal in turn.

Members commented that the present building could not be seen from the roadside and the building itself was rather dishevelled. Members felt that the resultant property would not be incongruous in the location and would be reflective of the neighbouring properties in terms of scale. Overall, it was felt that approving the application would not impede on the openness of the greenbelt.

Members continued onto their second reason for approval to which they stated in their opinion 99% of the plot would be retained and the proposal would improve the appearance of the building. In addition, there would be positive impacts on the location, visual impact. Through conditions on the home would be of a high quality and sustainable. Members acknowledged the harm that would be caused by reason of inappropriate development but concluded that that harm, and the harm identified by design of the scheme would be clearly outweighed by the factors presented, which were each given substantial weight.

The Chair proposed a recommendation to approve the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Watson.

For: (4) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Terry Piccolo and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

29. 22/00930/FUL – Woodlands Koi Farm, South Avenue, Langdon Hills, Essex, SS16 6JG

The report was presented by the Senior Planning Officer.

Councillor Polley thanked the Planning Officer for the report and sought clarification on whether the council had been considering enforcement action or if officers were actually taking enforcement action. The Senior Planner explained a reference had been set-up on the system and Officers were preparing an enforcement notice, however an issue with land ownership arose and so an actual enforcement notice was never served, but it was intended to be served.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Statement of Support: Councillor Barry Johnson, Ward Member

During the debate it was mentioned that looking at that planning history and the way the applicant had come back time and time again with the plans changing very little and then the fact that the fact that the outer building had been extended. Members commented the application had been refused in the past and they couldn't see a reason to approve it now.

The Chair proposed the Officer recommendation to refuse the application and was seconded by Councillor Polley.

For: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Adam Carter, Terry Piccolo, and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained: (1) Councillor Susan Little

30. 21/01804/FUL - Beauchamp Place, Malvern Road, Grays, RM17 5TH

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

Councillor Little thanked Officers for the report, she enquired if the new day room would be plumbed into anything other than just electricity. The Principal Planning Officer explained the applicant had connected to the sewage network. It was mentioned this was something which had taken place after formal planning permission had been approved by the Planning Inspectorate.

Members heard the day room had ancillary uses so there was a kitchen, washing area and a seating area. There was also an area for one of the children on the site who had specific medical needs, so there was a room to allow recuperation and to help with their medical needs.

Councillor Carter sought clarity on how the planning application in front of Members compared to the planning application which was considered by the Planning Inspectorate and allowed on appeal. The Principal Planning Officer explained the site plan which was approved following the Inspector's decision and as part of the Inspector's decision permission for five plots were to be provided for five named families.

The Planning Officer further commented that as part of the application a condition has been included stating if this day room this built, the previous proposed day room cannot be and the conditions from the planning Inspectorates' decision had been reinstated.

During the debate Councillor Watson commented she felt the application was sympathetic to what the site was and that a lot of the Traveller sites were well kept. She continued by saying she felt it could be a benefit for the area.

Councillor Little proposed the officer's recommendation to approve the application and was seconded by Councillor Piccolo.

For: (5) Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Adam Carter, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained: (1) Councillor Tom Kelly (Chair)

31. 21/01427/CV - Cedarwood Court And Elmwood Court, Southend Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

The provision of adequate soft landscaping within the development was discussed and it was highlighted by the Planning Officer that one of the conditions which had been suggested required that the trees shown on the plans were planted in the next available planting season and required that the trees would be retained for five years. The condition also required the provision of placement trees if any died within a five-year period.

The Chair proposed the officer's recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Carter.

For: (6) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Adam Carter, Susan Little, Terry Piccolo, and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

The meeting finished at 8.13 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**