

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 19 December 2024 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Gary Byrne, Tom Kelly, Sue Shinnick and Cathy Sisterson

Apologies: Councillors Michael Fletcher (Chair), Jacqui Maney and Steve Taylor

In attendance: Ashley Baldwin, Chief Planning Officer
Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer
Emma Barnett, Planning Officer
Rachel Murrell, Planning Officer
Carly Parker, 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 YouTube Channel.

53. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from the Chair Councillor Fletcher, Councillors J Maney, Councillor Halden, and Councillor Polston. Councillor Heath attended as a substitute in Councillor Polston's place.

Vice-Chair Councillor Liddiard chaired the meeting in Councillor Fletcher's absence.

54. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2024 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

55. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

56. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Kelly advised he would be recusing himself from item 10 on the agenda due to work interests.

57. 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

There were no declarations of receipt of correspondence, and or any meetings/discussions held relevant to any planning application or enforcement actions.

58. Planning Appeals

Members noted the planning appeals. There were no further questions.

59. 21/02109/FUL Land At 52 Broadway And Adjacent Manor Road Grays Essex

The Principal Planner presented this item to the Planning Committee. Advising the application seeks full planning permission for the residential development of the site for 24 flats (in 2 blocks) and 21 houses. The Committee were advised that part of the site was most recently used sporadically for commercial purposes (the area fronting Broadway) and for a scrapyard (the area fronting Manor Road). The proposed scheme would provide for a mixture of dwelling sizes with shared parking & amenity space for the flats and private parking & amenity areas for the dwellings. The scheme would make best use of a highly sustainable site which is in close proximity to local schools and a local parade and would reuse in a positive way land which is presently underused and derelict. Approval is therefore recommended subject to conditions and s106 Agreement. The principal planner added that on page 54 of the application there is a duplication of a condition 30 is a refuse and recycling condition. This is duplicated as it already exists under condition 9. Therefore, this has been struck out and sought agreement from members.

- Speaker gave statement to the committee.

Members sought further clarification regarding the different points of access. Members were advised there are three key access points in the proposal the first is to the north adjacent to the existing access, there are two other access points to the southern end via Manor Road. The Principal Planner confirmed there would be no access through Cherry Tree Close, officers are aware of the resident concerns regarding unauthorised access. Members were advised to review condition 21 on page 51 which covers reinstating a wall along the south-western edge of the site which residents are supportive of.

Members stated that currently there is no affordable housing included and queried whether this will be reviewed. Members also queried the impact on local schools and GPs. It was confirmed that normally for an application of this size they would expect an element of 35% of affordable housing to be included. Adding that the proposal is subject to viability assessments and the most recent viability appraisal indicated that the appropriate route includes a review mechanism agreed by both parties within a legal agreement where the costs of can be assessed and if there is scope to provide affordable housing or education contributions that would be secured. It was confirmed that this would be an independent review to ensure consistency.

Members expressed concerns regarding GPs being able to manage number of residents moving into the area. It was confirmed by the officer, and by the agent who spoke, that the applicant has agreed to provide the healthcare contributions required. The officer advised that the healthcare contribution was included in the heads of terms for the legal agreement but needed to be added to the recommendation under part 16 of page 44 of the agenda.

Members also queried whether, following the review mechanism, if there would be an opportunity to bring the application back to Committee. The officer confirmed that as the application had been called in, there would be opportunity for the application to be brought back to Committee at the review mechanism stage, should Members wish.

Members queried whether the surface conditions of Manor Road will be tidied up and whether any previous issues with access would be resolved to enable future developments. It was confirmed that the conditions of the road surfacing are not great, and their understanding is that the developer will upgrade the surfacing outside on Manor Road, however it does fall outside of the application. The Highways Officer confirmed they have put in highway conditions that include improving this and potential for further adoption.

Members stated it is near a school and queried whether additional parking will be available. It was confirmed that parking will be available for anyone to use.

Members queried whether there were any provisions for electric charging points. It was confirmed there is a condition 18 on page 50 requires Electric Vehicle charging points to be provided.

Members proceeded to debate. Members were looking forward to development of the site. There were some concerns around education and the traffic implications however they were in support of the application.

Recommendations: That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT permission for the development subject to those items set out in section 16 of this report–

**A) Completion of a s106 Obligation Agreement and
B) Conditions**

Proposed: Councillor Liddiard

Seconded: Councillor Kelly

For (7): Councillors P Arnold, G Byrne, Heath, Kelly, Liddiard, Shinnick, Sisterson

Against (0)

Abstain (0)

Recommendations Approved.

60. 24/01155/FUL Petanque Court

The Principal Planning Officer presented this item to the Committee. Advising this planning application (which is retrospective) seeks permission for the

installation of two pétanque terrains on land adjacent to Orsett Cricket Pavilion. The application site forms part of a larger outdoor sports and recreational facility and is identified as such in the Thurrock Core Strategy. The application has been brought for determination at Planning Committee as the proposal is on land that is in the ownership of the Council and submitted by the Orsett Community Forum. Given the additional recreational facility created and the limited external changes proposed, the application is recommended for approval.

- Speaker gave statement to the committee.

Members had no questions regarding the application and skipped the debate.

Recommendation: That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT permission for the development subject to those items set out in section 16 of this report - A) Conditions

Proposed: Councillor Liddiard

Seconded: Councillor Kelly

For (7): P Arnold, G Byrne, Heath, Kelly, Liddiard, Shinnick, Sisterson

Against (0)

Abstain (0)

Recommendations approved.

61. 24/00965/FUL Victoria Avenue Grays

The Committee were advised that the planning application seeks permission for the erection of a two storey, two-bedroom dwelling house at the site with associated parking to its frontage and private rear garden space. The application was Called In for determination at Planning Committee by Councillors Fletcher, Shinnick and G Byrne in order to consider matters relating to loss of light to neighbours, the proposed width of the development and lack of external access to the private rear garden space, and the impact upon the character of the area. The principle of development is considered acceptable. While the dwelling would be the full width of the plot, the overall design and layout of the dwelling, together with the marked improvements to the appearance of the street scene through the loss of the large fences in Marlborough Avenue, on balance, would not result in any detrimental harm to the character or visual appearance of the street scene. Any loss of light or outlook experienced by No. 54 Marlborough Avenue would be towards a window serving a non-habitable room and would be at a level generally accepted for such uses. As a consequence, there would be no significant harm to neighbour amenity which would warrant recommending refusal. The highways, internal living space provisions and ecology impacts of the proposal would be acceptable. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies contained within the Core Strategy and the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval.

- Speaker gave statement to the committee.

Members queried if the applicant would live in the property. It was confirmed they will move into the property.

Members proceeded to the debate and questioned why the application was called in. All members were in favour of the application.

Recommendation

That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT permission for the development subject to those items set out in section 16 of this report – A) Conditions.

Proposed: Councillor Kelly

Seconded: Councillor P Arnold

For (6): P Arnold, G Byrne, Heath, Kelly, Liddiard, Sisterson

Against: (1) Councillor Shinnick

Abstain (0)

Recommendations approved.

Councillor Kelly left at 18.50pm.

62. Local Development Order London Gateway Logistics Park

Associates from Adams Hendry Chartered Town Planners presented this item to the committee. They advised that Local Development Orders (LDOs) provide permitted development rights for specified types of development in defined locations. The original LDO for London Gateway Logistics Park was made in 2013 (known as 'LDO1'). Following its expiry in 2023, an interim LDO was made in February 2024 (known as 'LDO1.5'). LDO2 is now proposed to continue to help accelerate the delivery of appropriate development on the remainder of the Logistics Park. This will allow up to 733,776 m² of commercial floorspace and amenity uses on the site of which 412,326m² is already completed or committed under LDO1 and LDO1.5, with 321,450 m² of commercial floorspace remaining to be consented.

As the "competent authority" the Council under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) is required to determine if a plan or project may have an adverse impact on a site designated under the same (or preceding Regulations) prior to any consent or permission being determined. The process of undertaking this assessment is known as a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The 'Report to Inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment: London Gateway Logistics Park Local Development Order 2.0' dated August 2024 has been prepared to provide information to the competent authority and has been scrutinised by Natural England as the statutory nature conservation body. It is recommended on the basis of the

information available, that the Council formally determines that the proposed development to be permitted by LDO2 will not adversely affect the integrity of a European site or a European offshore marine site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Members queried whether there were any provisions to manage constructors' behaviour on site and being respectful of surrounding residents. It was confirmed that conditions would be reviewed during the next decision.

There were no further questions and members skipped the debate.

Recommendations

Note the content of the “Report to Inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment London Gateway Logistics Park Local Development Order 2.0” dated August 2024 and the consultation responses received; b) Formally determine, on the basis of the information available, that the development proposed by LDO2 will not adversely affect the integrity of a European site or a European offshore marine site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Proposed: Councillor Byrne

Seconded: Councillor Shinnick

For (6): P Arnold, G Byrne, Heath, Liddiard, Shinnick, Sisterson

Against: (0)

Abstain (0)

Recommendations approved.

Associates continued to discuss the LDO2. Advising that the London Gateway Logistics Park is a world leading logistics centre sitting alongside the London Gateway Port, the UK's fastest growing deep-sea container terminal, located on the north bank of the River Thames just 25 miles from central London. The two components together, form London Gateway. Local Development Orders (LDOs) provide permitted development rights for specified types of development in defined locations. Members were advised the original LDO for London Gateway Logistics Park was made in 2013 (known as 'LDO1') and granted planning permission for a total of 829,700m² of commercial floorspace together with ancillary uses and a range of supporting servicing facilities, plant, landscaping, and infrastructure. LDO1 expired in November 2023 with 337,225m² of commercial floorspace completed or committed. An interim LDO was made in February 2024 (known as 'LDO1.5') and permits up to 85,000m² of B8 floorspace. LDO1.5 expires on the making of LDO2 or within 12 months, whichever is the sooner. LDO1 and LDO1.5 have been successful in streamlining the planning process by removing the need for developers to make a planning application. The purpose of LDO2 is to continue to help accelerate the delivery of appropriate development on the remainder of the Logistics Park, particularly where it will promote economic, social or environmental gains for the area. It is recommended that LDO2 is

made to allow up to 733,776 m² of commercial floorspace and amenity uses on the site, of which 412,326m² is already completed or committed under LDO1 and LDO1.5, with 321,450 m² of commercial floorspace remaining to be consented.

Members queried the percentage of freight that may move to rail and the impact of heavy goods vehicle traffic. It was confirmed that mitigation will review the impact of movement and National Highways are involved in the early stages. They have consulted on this extensively. The Highways officer added that the current assessment of impact is that up to 20% additional capacity could potentially be moved to rail use and that though the overall level of traffic is less than that predicted in the original LDO traffic assessment that the levels at peak times are somewhat higher than predicted and this has been accounted for with the proposed mitigation.

Members expressed concerns around coping with traffic demands particularly for those that live close to the Manor Way. It was confirmed that there will be a range of measures in place to monitor this including speed cameras and a scheme to monitor noise impact.

Members noted there was mention of the section 106 funding that offered improvements on the M25 junction and wanted further clarity on this. It was confirmed that the scheme with National Highways would increase capacity through junction 30 and reduce traffic on the A13.

There were no further questions and members skipped the debate.

Recommendations

- a) Note the Council's earlier decision (if that be the case) that the development to be authorised by the London Gateway Logistic Park Local Development Order 2 ("LDO2") will not adversely affect the integrity of a European Site or a European offshore marine site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.**
- b) That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to make LDO2 subject to the signing of the s106 legal agreement.**
- c) Note requirement for Council to advise the Secretary of State that LDO2 is made.**
- d) To delegate authority to the Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair to make minor non-material amendments to the LDO2 prior to being made.**

Proposed: Councillor Shinnick
Seconded: Councillor Byrne

For (6): Councillors P Arnold, Byrne, Heath, Liddiard,
Shinnick, Sisterson

Against (0)
Abstain (0)

Recommendations Approved.

The meeting finished at 7.17 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**