

Reference: 18/01802/FUL	Site: Beauchamp Place Malvern Road Grays Essex RM17 5TH
Ward: Little Thurrock Rectory	Proposal: Use of land to provide 5 pitches for Gypsy / Traveller families a total of 5 mobile homes, 5 touring caravans and 1 dayroom

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
DD01	Location Plan	18th December 2018
DD02	Existing Site Layout	18th December 2018
DD03	Proposed Site Layout	18th December 2018
DD04	Proposed Plans	18th December 2018

The application is also accompanied by: - Cover letter	
Applicant: Mr J O Connor	Validated: 18 December 2018 Date of expiry: 25 March 2019
Recommendation: To Refuse	

The application is scheduled for determination by the Council's Planning Committee because it is a follow up application to one that was previously considered by the Planning Committee.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks planning permission for the use of the land for gypsy traveller families. The proposal seeks consent for 5 pitches for the families, comprising 5 mobile homes, 5 touring caravans (although the proposed site plan only shows 3 tourers) and day rooms with associated parking and fencing within the site. In addition, an existing stable building on the site is shown to remain. A fenced off area is proposed behind the properties on Malvern Road and a paddock is proposed in the southern half of the site. Vehicular access is to be taken from

Malvern Road and hard surfacing is proposed to allow access to individual plots.

- 1.2 In terms of layout, the built development is shown behind No 51 – 63 Malvern Road. South of the access to the site the area is shown to be open paddock and grassland.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site is located on the eastern side of Malvern Road, adjacent to No. 51- 63 Malvern Road and to the south alongside the flank of the No 73 Malvern Road and further south alongside existing open land. To the east of the site runs the A1089. With the exception of the properties on Malvern Road the land around the site is relatively open. The site is designated as being within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 2.2 The site is as at a maximum approximately 155 metres in length and 55 metres in width. The site is approximately rectangular in shape.
- 2.3 At the time of drafting this report two mobile homes were found on the site. One of the mobile homes was unoccupied. An existing stable building of rudimental design is also present (this building was not brought onto site by the present occupiers and has been on site for more than 4 years).

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application Reference	Description of Proposal	Decision
13/00574/FUL	Use of land to provide 5 pitches for Gypsy/Traveller families a total of 5 mobile homes, 5 touring caravans and 5 day rooms	Refused – Allowed on appeal, with a 5 year temporary and personal consent to Jul 2020. The permission has lapsed as the named occupiers left the site in mid-2018.

Enforcement Reference	Nature of Complaint	Investigations / Key dates
18/00293/AUNUSE	Possible Traveller Encampment	25.07.2018: Complaint received 24.08.2018: Temporary Stop Notice (TSN) served to prevent any development on site. 28.08.2018: Further site visit showed TSN had been breached.

		31.08.2018: Injunction served to prevent any further development on the land
		18.09.2018 – Interim Injunction Served

4.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council’s website via public access at the following link: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

PUBLICITY:

This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters, press advert and public site notice which has been displayed nearby. One hundred and twenty responses have been received raising objections on the following grounds:

- The site is in the Green Belt
- The proposal would damage the outlook for neighbours
- Possibility of increased crime
- Increase in traffic in Malvern Road
- Unsuitable access along Malvern Road
- Site is visible from Dock Approach Road
- Impact on local wildlife
- Trees removed by previous occupier have not been replaced
- There is a high court injunction on the site
- The previous personal permission was for specific occupiers who have now left
- Value of properties nearby will be reduced
- Developemtn will look unsightly
- Land should be returned to its original condition
- Increase in noise and litter

A letter from the local War Councillor (Leader) has been submitted objecting to the proposals on the following grounds:

- Permission was previously granted on the very special circumstances of the previous occupiers
- The PPTS makes it clear that this form of developemtn is inappropriate in the Green Belt
- Lots of Green Belt in the nearby area is to be lost due to commercial

development around Tilbury

- Access is along Malvern Road which is narrow and unsuitable for large vehicles

EDUCATION:

No requirement for contribution given the size of the site.

HEALTH AND WELLBEING:

Advice offered, no objection raised.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

Advice offered, no objection raised.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 5.1 The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012 and updated on the 19th February 2019. Paragraph 10 of the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 2 of the Framework confirms the tests in s.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and s.70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 11 states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

7. Requiring good design

9. Protecting Green Belt land

Planning Practice Guidance

- 5.2 In March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched its planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the previous planning policy guidance documents cancelled when the NPPF was launched. PPG contains 42 subject areas, with each area containing several subtopics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application comprise:

- Determining a planning application
- Making an application
- Use of planning conditions

Local Planning Policy

Thurrock Local Development Framework (as amended) 2015

5.3 The Council adopted the “Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development Plan Document” (as amended) in January 2015. The following Core Strategy policies apply to the proposals:

Spatial Policies:

- OSDP1 (Promotion of Sustainable Growth and Regeneration in Thurrock)¹
- CSSP4 (Sustainable Green Belt)

Thematic Policies:

- CSTP3 (Gypsies and Travellers)
- CSTP22 (Thurrock Design)²
- CSTP23 (Thurrock Character and Distinctiveness)²

Policies for the Management of Development:

- PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity)²
- PMD2 (Design and Layout)²
- PMD6 (Development in the Green Belt)²

[Footnote: ¹New Policy inserted by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy. ²Wording of LDF-CS Policy and forward amended either in part or in full by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy. ³Wording of forward to LDF-CS Policy amended either in part or in full by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy].

Thurrock Local Plan

5.4 In February 2014 the Council embarked on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough. Between February and April 2016 the Council consulted formally on an Issues and Options (Stage 1) document and simultaneously undertook a ‘Call for Sites’ exercise. In December 2018 the Council began consultation on an Issues and Options (Stage 2 Spatial Options and Sites) document.

Thurrock Design Strategy

- 5.5 In March 2017 the Council launched the Thurrock Design Strategy. The Design Strategy sets out the main design principles to be used by applicants for all new development in Thurrock. The Design Strategy is a supplementary planning document (SPD) which supports policies in the adopted Core Strategy.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

Background:

- 6.1 In 2015 two planning permissions were granted upon appeal for a period of 5 years for the use of land as 5 pitches for Gypsy/traveller families comprising a total of 5 mobile homes, 5 touring caravans and 5 day rooms at the site on 24th August. Appeals A – E were granted under references APP/M1595/A/13/2208476 / 77 / 78 / 79 / 80 and resulted from the quashing of Enforcement Notices. Appeal F was granted under reference APP/M1595/A/13/2208738 and related to a refused planning application.

- 6.2 Both permissions were subject to conditions which were in materially similar terms. Importantly Condition 1 stated:

“1) The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following: Mr and Mrs A and B West, Mr and Mrs P and M Birch, Mr and Mrs J and C Newland, Mr A West junior, Mr and Mrs T and P Penfold, and Mr and Mrs P and R Birch, and their resident dependants, and shall be for a limited period being the period of 5 years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.”

- 6.3 The main occupants were Mr. P and Mrs. M Birch and Mr. P and R Birch and their one dependent. There had been visits from other members of the family named within the permission but these were not of long duration. All those named within the personal permissions have now ceased to occupy the site. On 17th July 2018 all the occupiers named in the personal permission had left the site. The Council considered that the temporary permission had ceased and there was no permission for the use of the site as a caravan site. The appeal decision from 2015 is a material consideration, however the granting of the personal permission on appeal does not allow the present occupiers to live on the site. Furthermore, the grant of those permissions were based on the very special circumstances case put forward by those occupiers, on the basis of their specific needs. The use for other occupiers, whether they are gypsies, or not, cannot simply be transferred.

- 6.4 The main issues relating to this are considered to be;

1. Plan designation and principle of development
2. Harm to the Green Belt (Principle and ‘other harm’)
3. Gypsy traveller status, personal circumstances and need for traveller sites
4. Access and parking
5. Residential Impacts
6. Environmental Impacts

1. PLAN DESIGNATION AND PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 6.5 The site is identified on the Core Strategy Proposals Map as being within the Green Belt where policies CSSP4 and PMD6 apply. Policy CSSP4 identifies that the Council will 'maintain the purpose, function and open character of the Green Belt in Thurrock', and Policy PMD6 states that the Council will 'maintain, protect and enhance the open character of the Green Belt in Thurrock'. These policies aim to prevent urban sprawl and maintain the essential characteristics of the openness and permanence of the Green Belt to accord with the requirements of the NPPF.
- 6.6 Paragraph 133 within Chapter 13 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that the "fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence." Paragraph 145 states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. The NPPF sets out a limited number of exceptions to this, namely:
- buildings for agriculture and forestry;
 - appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, recreation and cemeteries;
 - proportionate extensions or alterations to a building;
 - the replacement of a building;
 - limited infilling in villages; and
 - the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development
- 6.7 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that 'inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'. Paragraph 144 goes on to state '*when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations*'.
- 6.8 Consideration also needs to be given to Department of Communities and Local Government 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' [published in August 2015]. This document sets out the Government's planning policy for traveller sites. The document has been produced to be read in conjunction with the NPPF. Policy E of the document reinforces the guidance within the NPPF and states that Traveller sites, both temporary and permanent, in the Green Belt are inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to it and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- 6.9 The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and harmful by definition.

II. HARM TO GREEN BELT (PRINCIPLE AND 'OTHER' HARM)

- 6.10 Having established that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is necessary to consider the matter of harm. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, but it is also necessary to consider whether there is any other harm to the Green Belt and the purposes of including land therein
- 6.11 At paragraph 134, the NPPF states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
- 6.12 With regards to the impact on openness, the proposals would result in the permanent development of the countryside. Members should note that while the site previously benefitted from temporary consents, these have expired.
- 6.13 The permanent development would fail to comply with the requirements of PMD6 of the Core Strategy in principle.
- 6.14 In addition, criteria (iv) of Policy CSTP3 seeks to ensure development would not unacceptably harm the character and amenity of the area and result in an unacceptable visual impact.
- 6.15 The development proposes five plots, each comprising a mobile home, (the application form specifies 5 tourers, though only 3 are shown on the plan), a day room building and the retention of the existing rudimentary building. Hard surfacing would be provided towards the centre of the site and fencing would be required to define areas within the site. Vehicle parking would also take place on the site.
- 6.16 The existing structures and proposed buildings, structures, fencing and surfacing are considered to be urbanising features that fail to integrate into the surrounding rural area. The permanent development would be utilitarian in design and would fail to comply with the requirements of CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy.
- 6.17 The NPPF advises that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. The introduction of built development combined with the removal of vegetation and the parking of vehicles and caravans would reduce the openness and damage the rural character of the site. The proposal would therefore result in significant harm to the openness and rural character of the area contrary to Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy and the guidance within the NPPF.
- 6.18 Criteria (ix) of Policy CSTP3 requires the incorporation of adequate landscape strategies where appropriate. No details have been provided in relation to any landscaping. The proposal is considered to have a harmful impact upon the area contrary to policies PMD2, PMD6 and CSTP3 of the Core Strategy.
- 6.19 In conclusion under this heading, the development is considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and further harm is also identified

through the loss of openness arising from the built development and occupation of the site. In accordance with the NPPF, substantial weight should be given to this harm.

III. GYPSY TRAVELLER STATUS, PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND NEED FOR TRAVELLER SITES

Gypsy Traveller Status and Personal Circumstances

- 6.20 Given the nature of the application, it is necessary to firstly establish whether this development relates to a bona fide Gypsy/Traveller site before considering the applicant's case in more detail.
- 6.21 The information provided by the applicant as part of the formal submission is very limited. There is no specific detail as to the status of the occupiers, their health needs, their education needs, details of their travelling pattern or details of any links to the area.
- 6.22 For the purpose of planning policy, the definition of 'Gypsies and Travellers' is detailed within Annexe 1 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. This definition is as follows;
- "Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on the grounds only of their own or their own family's or dependents' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such."*
- 6.23 There is no information submitted with the application to demonstrate the current occupants' recent travelling habits. In addition there is nothing to explain any travelling habits for potential occupiers. Officers have visited the site during the enforcement process and planning application process and through discussions with the current occupiers they would appear to be following a nomadic lifestyle.
- 6.24 There is no evidence to suggest the current occupiers, who are listed as applicants are not gypsies. Based on the very limited details submitted in this application and discussions, there is some evidence that the occupants are of a nomadic lifestyle. Accordingly, for the purposes of assessing the application the applicants should be considered to have gypsy traveller status. No details are available as to potential other occupiers.
- 6.25 The applicant has not indicated that there are specific family ties in this Borough, nor have they made it clear where they have most recently been in occupation nor why they have had chosen to locate on this site.
- 6.26 There are three children on the site: one of school age, one who could attend nursery school and one a baby. The Council's Traveller Welfare Officer has

visited the site and has worked with the family to complete education forms for schools. No information has been put forward from the applicants in this regard.

- 6.27 The educational needs of the occupants are of course important in terms of the Council's core aims and objectives to make Thurrock a great place for learning. The Council has considered the best interests of the children in the determination of the application, but alone it is not considered to be a determinative factor in the consideration of the application. In addition, there has been no evidence to show why the occupiers, or other potential occupiers need to be located on this site. It is considered that this matter would carry little weight in the determination of the application.

Need for Traveller sites

- 6.28 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' (August 2015) states that Local Planning Authorities should set pitch targets within their Local Plan. Policy CSTP3 (of the amended 2015 Core Strategy) details the approach of the Council to gypsy and traveller accommodation within the Borough and sets out a target of 87 additional pitches for the Plan period to 2026 (the Core Strategy was originally adopted in December 2011).
- 6.29 The Thurrock GTAA, Need Summary Report, of January 2018 indicates a need for 10 additional pitches for Gypsy and Traveller households that meet the planning definition, 38 additional pitches for households that may meet the definition and 37 for households that do not meet the planning definition up to 2033.
- 6.30 The requirements of the GTAA will be addressed through the new Local Plan. This will allow for planned provision in the Borough.
- 6.31 In determining the current application the Council must be satisfied that there is a clear need for the site and that the number of pitches involved cannot be met by an existing authorised site. In this case, the proposal would provide accommodation to persons who, due to the paucity of information provided, do not have ties with family members currently residing in the Borough. The information provided does not provide a convincing case to justify the development in this location, or indeed anywhere within the Borough. Furthermore, this site was not designated as a Gypsy site within the Site Specific Allocations DPD – Issues and Options. Therefore, this element of Policy CSTP3 is not considered to be complied with.
- 6.32 Policy H 'Determining planning applications for traveller sites' contained within the Planning policy for traveller sites (August 2015) requires, amongst other things, the Local Planning Authority to consider the existing local level of provision and need for sites and the availability of alternative accommodation for the applicants. There are no known available sites within the Borough where two pitches would be available within Council owned sites. However this does not justify the development in this Green Belt location.

6.33 A Ministerial Statement from the Local Government Minister published in July 2013 is of relevance to this case. Under the heading 'Protecting the Green Belt' this statement reiterates the position set out within the NPPF that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The statement continues:

"The Secretary of State wishes to make clear that, in considering planning applications, although each case will depend on its facts, he considers that the single issue of unmet demand, whether for traveller sites or for conventional housing, is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute the 'very special circumstances' justifying inappropriate development in the green belt."

6.34 Therefore, the issue of whether or not there is a shortfall in the supply of traveller sites on its own will be unlikely to comprise very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Very little weight should therefore be afforded.

6.35 In conclusion under this heading and based on the information provided, the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the site, do not when taken in isolation or collectively constitute very special circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm arising as a result of its inappropriateness nor the harm to the openness and rural character of the Green Belt. The Ministerial Statement reinforces the fact that unmet demand alone is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt. It follows that the application should attract a recommendation of refusal on this basis.

IV) RESIDENTIAL IMPACTS

6.36 Criteria (iii) of Policy CSTP3 seeks to ensure the proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring uses. The development is located in close proximity to the rear boundaries of properties, particularly Nos 51 - 63 and the side boundary of 73 Malvern Road. These are two storey properties which would have previously enjoyed views over an open area of countryside.

6.37 In allowing the previous appeal, the Planning Inspector considered the issue of neighbour amenity, she noted (para 108) that *"Subject to a condition controlling their layout, the caravans need not cause any harmful overlooking of the adjoining dwellings or gardens"*, that (para 111) in relation to views for neighbours she accepted that the caravans would be visible "but not to the extent of unacceptably compromising the living conditions of adjacent occupiers" and that (para 113.) *"I also find that the activity on the site would not give rise to any unacceptable noise"*. Whilst the comments of the neighbours are noted it is considered that an objection on amenity grounds would be difficult to substantiate given the Inspectors previous conclusions.

V) HIGHWAY IMPACTS

- 6.38 Criteria (vi) and (vii) of Policy CSTP3 seeks to ensure the proposal would have safe and convenient access to the road network and would not cause significant hazard to other road users. The policy also seeks to ensure that there are sufficient areas for the parking and turning of vehicles within the site.
- 6.39 Adequate parking and turning space would be available within the site for occupiers and visitors accessing the site. In allowing the previous appeal the Inspector found that it was not demonstrated “that the development would have severe residual cumulative effects. [and that] The traveller site would have sufficient and suitable access” (para 106). Accordingly, no objection is raised on highways grounds.

VI) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 6.40 Criteria (viii) of Policy CSTP3 requires sites to have adequate services provided, such as water, power, sewerage and drainage, and waste disposal. The site at present has septic tanks on site, these were used by the previous occupiers.
- 6.41 The site is located within a sewered area and whilst the use of septic tanks is not ideal in areas where main sewers are available, it would be difficult to object to the proposal on these grounds at this time.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 The proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition harmful. In addition, the proposed development is considered to be an unacceptable urbanising feature which is harmful to the openness and would erode the rural character of the Green Belt. Substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.
- 7.2 The development would seriously conflict with Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and Policies E and H of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015). The circumstances of the applicants and their needs have been carefully considered however it is not considered that these factors outweigh the harm caused to the Metropolitan Green Belt together with the other harm identified. No very special circumstances therefore exist to enable an exception to policy to be made in this instance.
- 7.3 The applicant has failed to justify the need for the proposed development in this location; the proposal would, if permitted, result in the urbanisation of this rural site, resulting in the provision of gypsy traveller accommodation causing significant harm to the character and appearance of this rural area contrary to Policy CSTP3 of Thurrock's Core Strategy.

- 7.4 The proposed development, by reason of the development proposed would affect the rural character of the area and would poorly integrate into the area contrary to Policies, PMD2, PMD6 and CSTP22 of the Core Strategy.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reason(s):

1. Policy PMD6 of Thurrock's Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development states that, within the Green Belt, permission will not be granted for new development unless it meets the requirements and objectives of government guidance. Paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts, with the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 143 states inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Policy E: 'Traveller sites in the Green Belt' contained within Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by Department of Communities and Local Government in August 2015 reinforces the guidance within NPPF and states that Traveller sites, both temporary and permanent, in the Green Belt are inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to it and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition harmful. In addition, the proposed development is considered to be an unacceptable urbanising feature which is harmful to the openness and rural character of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore also contrary to Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015).

The information put forward by the applicant has been carefully considered, but does not amount to the very special circumstances that would be required to enable an exception to policy to be made in this instance.

2. Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by Department of Communities and Local Government in August 2015 requires the assessment of the level of provision and need for traveller sites, availability of alternative accommodation, the personal circumstances of the applicant, allocation of pitches in the development plan and consider needs of all travellers not only those with local connections.

Policy E of the national traveller site policy also states that allocation of sites for travellers should be identified through the plan making process and not in response to a planning application.

The circumstances of the applicants have been fully assessed. However, the designation of the site within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the harm arising as a result of the development carries significant weight in the consideration of the application. On balance, the circumstances of the applicants and their needs do not outweigh the harm to the Metropolitan Green Belt together with the other harm identified in other reasons for refusal in this decision notice.

3. Policy CSTP3 of Thurrock's Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development aims to support proposals that seek to ensure the standard of the existing approved Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough is progressively improved and upgraded. Policy CSTP 3 deals with proposals for new or extensions to existing Gypsy and Traveller Sites which are considered against the 10 criteria listed within the policy.

Policy PMD2 of the Core Strategy requires that all design proposals should respond to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings and must contribute positively to the character of the area in which it is proposed and should seek to contribute positively to local views, townscape, heritage assets and natural features and contribute to the creation of a positive sense of place.

Policy CSTP22 of the Core Strategy indicates that development proposals must demonstrate high quality design founded on a thorough understanding of, and positive response to, the local context.

The application site was not a site allocated for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation with the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) - Issues and Options.

Furthermore, the proposal fails to comply with the criteria with Policy CSTP3 for new sites for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation with the Borough. The applicant has failed to justify the need for the proposed development in this location and the proposal would result in the urbanisation of this rural site, resulting in a gypsy traveller site which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the rural area contrary to Policies CSTP3 and PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) 2015.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

