

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 March 2024 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Gary Byrne, Steve Liddiard, Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick, Lee Watson and Joycelyn Redsell (Substitute) (substitute for Jacqui Maney)

Steve Taylor (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Apologies: Councillor Jacqui Maney

In attendance: Trevor Faulkner, Head of Planning Development
Martha Grekos, Senior Planning Lawyer
Matthew Ford, Chief Engineer
Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner
Daniel Korzelko, Legal Representative
Chris Purvis, Major Applications Manager
Jenny Shade, Principal 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.

65. Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on the 8th February 2024 were approved as a true and correct record.

66. Item of Urgent Business

There was one item of urgent business. The Chair allowed an additional exempt item to be heard after the last item on the agenda.

The Chair accepted a request from Councillor Byrne to change the order of the agenda. Item 11 will be heard before item 10.

67. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Byrne informed the Committee he was predetermined on item 11 and would not participate or vote from that item. However, he would be speaking on behalf of Corringham Traders.

Councillors Watson and Byrne gave a statements in relation to item 8 stating that they were not predetermined and would only take into account material considerations.

68. 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 Byrne confirmed receipt of email and telephone conversation from the legal department in relation to item 8.

Councillor Watson confirmed receipt of email correspondence from a resident in relation to item 8.

69. Planning Appeals

No Planning Appeals were discussed.

70. 23/00442/FUL: Car Parks Crown Road and Darnley Road, Grays, Essex

Members asked the following questions to the Planning and Highways Officers:

- Councillor Liddiard asked for the utilisation figures for the car park.
 - Figures collected on 2 days in 2021. Darnley Road did not exceed 83% capacity. Crown Road did not exceed 47%.
- Councillor Shinnick was of the opinion that EV points should be installed sooner rather than later and asked if it could be done sooner.
 - The trigger is prior to first occupation.
- Councillor Byrne asked if the survey was carried out during the day (whilst residents would be away at work), that the number of disabled parking spaces would be inadequate and why there were 107 bike spaces.
 - Parking survey was carried out during day and overnight.
 - Disabled parking meets the requirements of the application.
 - The Local Authority is trying to promote cycling.
- Councillor Watson expressed concerns regarding parking spaces and asked what mitigations are going to be put in place for existing residents.
 - Improvements of spaces under the bridge.
- Councillor Watson sort more details regarding the improvements to the parking under the bridge.
 - CCTV and improved lighting
- Councillor Piccolo argued that good transport links only means to London or Southend, there will be a need for residents to go elsewhere where links are poor. Councillor Piccolo asked if a private developer could request or make changes to the parking regulations in the area.
 - Local Authority makes traffic orders.
- Councillor Byrne asked if any changes had been made after requests from residents regarding parking.
 - No changes made.

- Councillor Watson also expressed concerns and noted that the parking would be filled quickly.
 - Parking studies show underutilisation.
- Councillor Watson sort details on affordable housing and asked if conditions could be put in place to keep affordable housing placing.
 - Would be secured through a 106 agreement.

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Councillor Piccolo believed the application was unfair towards private developers.
- Councillor Watson shared her concerns regarding the parking arrangements and asked if dedicated spaces could be assigned for each resident.
 - Spaces cannot be dedicated due to traffic regulations.

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Polley read the officers recommendation for approval.

Councillor Liddiard seconded it.

For: (4) Councillors G Polley (Vice-Chair), P Arnold, S Liddiard, and S Shinnick

Against: (3) Councillors G Byrne, T Piccolo, and L Watson

Abstained: (0)

Councillors T Kelly (Chair) and J Redsell could not vote on the application due to the matter being deferred from a previous meeting.

71. 23/01357/FUL: 10 Chestnut Avenue, Grays, Essex

The Principal Planner presented the application and highlighted the following points:

- The revised proposal would overcome previous concerns regarding appearance, overdevelopment of the site and impact on character of the area.
- Recommendation for approval.

Speaker Statements were heard from:

Statement of Objection from Councillor Hooper, Ward Member

Statement of Support from Jay Hirani, Agent

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Watson asked if there was one doorway to two properties.
 - One door at the front of the property the second round the side

- Councillor Watson asked what the distance from the boundary was.
 - Approximately 1 metre
- Councillor Watson asked if the garden was also divided.
 - Yes, lengthways with fencing.
- Councillor Watson asked what the traffic impact would be.
 - Adequate parking
- Councillor Watson sort more details on the characteristics of Chestnut Avenue.
- Councillor Arnold asked are there any controls to stipulate that all internal walls must remain to avoid the properties being knocked into one.
 - Could be difficult to impose. Other legislation related to housing could restrict property.
- Councillor Byrne was concerned about disruption in the area and asked if it had been considered.
 - Yes, plans must be agreed under conditions.
- Councillor Redsell shared her concerns with HMOs and asked why the Local Authority didn't stop development of the site sooner.
 - Planning can only deal with planning.
 - No justifiable reason to take enforcement action presently.
- Councillor Polley asked if the property changed ownership would the conditions remain.
 - Yes, conditions remain with the land.
- Councillor Piccolo sort clarification on link doors.
 - Application would be needed.
 - Legal representative gave advice to the committee.
- The Chair sort clarity on application history.
- Councillor Byrne sort clarification on the point.
 - Due to changes made from detached to attached.

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Councillor Arnold would not support the plan due to design.
- Councillor Watson would not support the application due proposal being out of character, parking issues.
- Councillor Redsell agreed with Councillor Watson and added nobody would know if the properties were later joined from the inside.
- Councillor Shinnick would not support the application due to parking and traffic concerns.
- Councillor Piccolo would support the application as applications cannot be decided on assumptions.
- Councillor Liddiard would support and did not think the application is out of character.
- Councillor Byrne agreed with Councillors Piccolo and Liddiard and would support but would like to see the two doors at the front of the property.
- Councillor Polley noted the committee needs to focus of planning considerations.

The Vice-Chair read the officers recommendation for approval.

Councillor Liddiard seconded it.

For: (4) Councillors G Byrne, S Liddiard, T Piccolo and G Polley (Vice-Chair)

Against: (5) Councillors T Kelly (Chair), P Arnold, J Redsell, S Shinnick, and L Watson

Abstained: (0)

The Chair put forward a recommendation for refusal due to characteristics and overdevelopment in the area.

Councillor Shinnick seconded it.

For: (5) Councillors T Kelly (Chair), P Arnold, J Redsell, S Shinnick, and L Watson

Against: (4) Councillors G Byrne, S Liddiard, T Piccolo and G Polley (Vice-Chair)

Abstained: (0)

72. 23/01453/ADV: Land Adjacent 57 To 89, St Johns Way, Corringham, Essex

The Planning Officers presented the application and highlighted the following points:

- The application is for an electronic public transportation board which can also displays adverts.
- Recommendation for approval

Speaker Statements were heard from:

Statement of Objection from Councillor Byrne on behalf of Corringham Traders (as a resident.)

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Arnold asked are there any known incidents of anti-social behaviour around information and advert totems.
 - None as far as officers are aware.
- Councillor Piccolo asked if there would be restrictions on who could advertise.
 - Local Authority would have final say under highways team.
- Councillor Watson asked why in Corringham where other places could better utilise them for example Stanford-le-Hope station.
 - High footfall area
 - Originally for Stanford-le-Hope train station. More totems could come forward.

- Councillor Polly asked if there was a Crime Officer contact and if it would be distracting for drivers.
 - Yes, but not for smaller applications like this.
 - Light levels will change throughout the day, highways have no objections to highway safety.
- Councillor Redsell believed it to be in the wrong place and asked if a consultation was carried out.
 - Not normal for this type of application.
- Councillor Piccolo asked if there are limits on who can advertise for example businesses in a 5-mile radius.
 - Local Authority would have final say.
- Councillor Watson asked what the cost was on maintenance and who bears the risk.
 - From the Local Authority's share of the advertising revenue
- Councillor Arnold sort more clarity and who would pay damage, for example if it was hit by a van.
 - Reclaim through insurance.
- Steve asked who it is funded by and the workings behind how locations are chosen.
 - Passenger transport unit are funding.
 - High footfall areas are chosen.

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Councillor Liddiard shared he finds the totems useful but finds the adverts irritating.
- The Chair did not have an issue with the totem.
- Councillor Arnold was in two minds and noted it would be a shame for Corringham to miss out.
- Councillor Piccolo shared his concerns about who could advertise on the totem to protect local business.
- Councillor Polley noted Corringham was a vibrant centre, but other areas could benefit more.
- Councillor Liddiard doesn't believe there would be much impact.
- Councillor Watson did not support the proposal and believed it should be put elsewhere.
- Councillor Redsell was worried the light levels could affect residents at night.

The Chair read the officers recommendation for approval.
And was seconded it.

For: (3) Councillors T Kelly (Chair), S Liddiard, and T Piccolo

Against: (4) Councillors P Arnold, G Polley (Vice-Chair), J Redsell and L Watson

Abstained: (1) Councillor S Shinnick

The Vice-Chair recommended for refusal due to visual and highways impact.

And it was seconded.

For: (4) Councillors P Arnold, G Polley (Vice-Chair), J Redsell and L Watson

Against: (3) Councillors T Kelly (Chair), S Liddiard, and T Piccolo

Abstained: (1) Councillor S Shinnick

The committee paused for a break.

73. 23/01452/ADV: Land Adjacent 1 To 21 Kings Parade, King Street, Stanford-le-Hope, Essex

The Planning Officers presented the application and highlighted the following points:

- The application is for an electronic public transportation board which can also displays adverts.
- Recommendation for approval

Members asked the following questions to the Planning Officer:

- Councillor Redsell asked for better maps in the future.
- Councillor Byrne noted the Local Authority has to be careful with planning.

During the debate the following was highlighted:

- Councillor Liddiard had not noted any anti-social behaviour.
- Councillor Watson asked what the footfall is.
 - No exact figures
- Councillor Piccolo would like priority given to local business for advertisements.
- Steve like the value of the travel information being presented but worried it is going outside the Local Authority's skill set in regard to advertising.
- Councillor Piccolo noted it was in large shopping areas and doesn't want the totems to drive business elsewhere.
- Councillor Polley believed this application would serve the residents better than the previous one.
- Councillor Shinnick also believed it was better placed.
- Councillor Arnold believed it was in a worse place.

The Chair read the officers recommendation for approval.
Councillor Liddiard seconded it.

For: (6) Councillors T Kelly (Chair), S Liddiard, T Piccolo, G Polley (Vice-Chair), S Shinnick and L Watson

Against: (3) Councillors P Arnold, G Byrne and J Redsell

Abstained: (0)

The meeting went into exempt session at 21:10pm

The recording of the meeting can be viewed from the following link:
[Planning Committee - 14th March 2024 at 6:00pm - Thurrock Council committee meeting webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

The meeting finished at 9.41 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