

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 25 April 2019 at 7.00 pm

- Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Graham Hamilton, Angela Lawrence, Abbie Akinbohun (arrived 19.20 as a substitute for Steve Liddiard), Sue Little (substitute for Colin Churchman), David Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick
- Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative
- Apologies:** Councillors Colin Churchman and Steve Liddiard.
- In attendance:** Andrew Millard, Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Tim Hallam, Deputy Head of Law and Governance
Jo Miles, Independent Legal Representative
Matthew Ford, Chief Engineer
Navtej Tung, Strategic Transportation Manager
Oliver Thursby, Trainee Engineer
Leigh Nicholson, Strategic Lead - Development Services
Chris Purvis, Principal Planner
Tom Scriven, Principal Planner
Matthew Gallagher, Principal Planner
Sarah Williams, School Capital and Planning Project Manager
Wendy Le, 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.

99. Minutes

Regarding item 98 – planning application 18/00450/OUT Greenwise Nurseries, in the minutes, Councillor Rice questioned if the application had received a response from central government yet. In consulting with the Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection, Andrew Millard, the Chair answered that no response had come back yet but the application had been sent.

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 21 March 2019 was approved as a correct record.

100. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

101. Declaration of Interests

The Chair declared a pecuniary interest on item 12 – planning application 17/00723/DVOB as he was an employee of DP World Development so would be unable to chair on that item and would be vacating the meeting upon the hearing of the item. He went on to mention that a Chair would need to be elected when the Committee came onto that item to chair that specific item due to the Vice-Chair's absence as well.

102. 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 had received an email regarding agenda item 10 – application number 19/00267/FUL Silver Springs from an individual.

The Chair and Councillor Rice had received an email regarding agenda item 10 – application number 19/00267/FUL Silver Springs from the Agent representative for objectors to the application, Barton Willmore.

103. Planning Appeals

The report was presented by Leigh Nicholson, Strategic Lead for Development Services.

The Committee was satisfied with the report.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning Committee noted the report.

104. 17/01668/OUT Development Land East of Caspian Way and North and South of London Road, Purfleet, Essex

Presented by Matthew Gallagher, Principal Planner, the application outlined the planning issues raised by the proposals for the redevelopment of land in the centre of Purfleet which was known as 'Purfleet Centre'. He mentioned the late email that was sent by the Agent representative for objectors to the application, Barton Willmore.

Regarding point 13.35, page 146 of the agenda, from the 10th and 11th line down, the Principal Planner said that from the sentence beginning 'Planning conditions could...' was 'will' rather than 'could' as condition L9 in Appendix 1 covered this point. In the same paragraph, the food retail floor space would be 2,750 sq. m. (gross) and other retail floor space would be as set out in the paragraph.

On point 18.13 on pages 170 and 171 of the agenda, the Principal Planner said this referred to an anticipated application for a 3G pitch for Harris

Riverside Academy. The Principal Planner confirmed that an application had already been received and this application was also referred to within the planning history section (4) of the report as the last entry on page 66.

The Principal Planner also gave a summary of the following details within the application:

- Not less than 10% of the residential dwellings proposed would be affordable;
- Railway facilities and the station would be upgraded and moved to allow the town centre infrastructure to take place;
- Railway lines and platforms would remain uninterrupted;
- 4 new crossings would be implemented over the railway lines;
- The 2011 application previously submitted had proposed mixed use of the site and had been approved following referral to the Secretary of State;
- The northern part of the site was Botany Quarry which was currently in industrial use and discussions were being undertaken on buying parts of the site that was not owned by the Council;
- Proposed demolition plans if approved included commercial buildings within Botany Quarry and at the International Timber site and some vacant residential terraces near London Road;
- Harris Riverside Academy was brought forward as a separate application and was already under construction following approval in 2017; and
- There was a reserved matters submission for zone 1A that proposed the 61 residential dwellings which was currently under consideration.

Key planning considerations outlined by the Principal Planner included:

- Purfleet was one of the 5 regeneration hubs identified by the Council's Core Strategy;
- There would be community and commercial uses within a new local centre. A sequential test had been undertaken in accordance with Government guidance and conditions were recommended to mitigate the impact of the proposed local centre on existing town centres, as set out in appendix 1, point L10 on page 260 of the agenda;
- The material planning considerations raised by the proposals were outlined within the report. It was noted that the Environment Agency would remove their outstanding objection if the recommended conditions were agreed;
- An independent viability consultant had confirmed that the scheme was not financially viable, but the applicant would be prepared to accept a lower financial return; and
- A mechanism had been agreed for binding future landowners of the site with Section 106 (s106) obligations because the Council (as the main landowner) would not be able to enter into a s106 agreement with itself as local planning authority. Recommended planning conditions would also mitigate the impacts of the proposals.

The application was recommended for approval subject to referral to the Secretary of State, planning conditions and a s106 agreement. As the applicant does not control land within the site the recommendation also included a mechanism to ensure that s106 obligations were enforceable. The recommendation also referred to delegation being passed to the Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection to finalise conditions and the s106 agreement.

The Chair opened the item up to the Committee for questions.

(Councillor Akinbohun was unable to participate or vote on the item under Constitution rules in Chapter 5, part 3, paragraph 13.5 as she had not been present at the start of the item).

Mentioning that 35% was the Thurrock planning policy target needed for affordable housing, Councillor Little noted that the application would have 10% of affordable units and questioned what type of units from the 10% would be for Thurrock's residents. She noted that 80% would be flats and 20% would be houses. The Principal Planner answered that Thurrock's Core Strategy sought 35% of affordable housing subject to viability. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required major planning applications to provide a minimum of 10% of affordable home ownership. The heads of terms for the s106 agreement secured a minimum 10% of affordable home ownership subject to viability and the consideration of costs such as significant infrastructure costs, had to be taken into account in bringing forward the development. He went on to say that if the site was left to a volume house builder, there was the possibility that the site would not be developed. However, the Applicant and the Council as landowner was prepared to accept a lower level of financial return and expected an increase in value over the construction of the development. The 35% figure of affordable housing quoted was correct but the Core Strategy and NPPF both outlined that brownfield sites were often more difficult and costly to develop due to factors such as construction costs in getting the site operational. Purfleet Centre would be delivered over an approximate 16 year timespan.

Councillor Little asked whether the 10% given for affordable housing could be negotiated. She went on to ask if there would be homes for the elderly as this was not mentioned within the report and Thurrock was an aging population. Referring to Appendix 2, the Principal Planner said that 10% was the minimum affordable housing provision and that 3% of affordable housing were reserved for wheelchair users with 10% of affordable housing as HAPPI Homes. As Purfleet Centre would be a long build, a series of viability reviews would be independently assessed over time which provided the potential to increase the provision of affordable homes beyond the 10% secured at this stage, especially if the financial return was higher than predicted.

Councillor Rice raised the same concerns on the 10% of affordable homes given and noted that would give a figure of 285 homes to Thurrock. He went on to say that within the s106, the Committee must insist that as part of the

conditions on the planning application, Thurrock Council had full nomination rights to those 285 homes to ensure Thurrock's 8,000 people on the waiting list for homes were given priority. Referring to the Agent representative for the objectors, Councillor Rice mentioned that the industrial site in Botany Quarry would result in job losses. He questioned whether the Council had a duty to relocate these workers.

On the matter of the minimum of 285 affordable homes, the Principal Planner replied that it was worth noting the 2012 planning permission given was still live so did not secure the 285 figure as a minimum. However, he stated that the minimum amount of affordable homes had increased because of the proposals from the Purfleet Centre planning application. Pages 297 and 298 of the agenda referred to the nomination agreements within the s106 heads of terms and the Council's housing officer were involved in ongoing discussions with the Applicants on the matter of affordable housing.

Regarding the existing industrial uses in Botany Quarry, the Principal Planner said that the proposals of Purfleet Centre would create a potential 2,200 jobs as a whole representing a net increase above existing jobs on the site. The Applicants did not own any land within the site and the Council, as a development partner, owned approximately 50 – 60% of the total site area. In order to secure the third party land holdings to enable development of the site, the Council, in its capacity as landowner, and Applicant would need to continue to engage in discussions with the landowners which were a separate negotiation to the consideration of the planning application and did not fetter the ability of the local planning authority as decision maker on the planning application. The Principal Planner went on to explain that any applicant could apply to build on land not owned by them, provided the right notification was served. The application before Committee fell to be considered on its planning merits. Although landowners and businesses would be affected by the implementation of the proposed development on Botany Quarry, the question of land ownership and acquisition negotiations were separate matters which did not fetter the Committee from making a decision on the merits of the application.

As the Council was a major landowner in Botany Quarry, Councillor Rice questioned whether the Council could help to relocate the businesses that would be lost if the landowners sold their land to the Council. Councillor Rice continued on to say that the Council had contacts and knew of other businesses such as Port of Tilbury and should be able to arrange an alternative for those workers working within the businesses in Botany Quarry. He asked if this was a condition or a detail that could be detailed in within s106. Councillor Rice went on to say that the detail on housing nominations must be addressed and the Council should avoid the housing association opening up the affordable homes to all applicants. Therefore Thurrock must have the sole housing nomination rights for their residents on the waiting list.

Agreeing, the Chair said Thurrock had to ensure that local residents were given the affordable housing units. On the matter of jobs within Botany Quarry, the Chair asked how the jobs there could be protected. Andrew

Millard answered that a nomination agreement was included in the s106 heads of terms. In regards to the relocation of the businesses and workers in Botany Quarry, this was not a part of the planning process so could not be drafted into the s106 terms.

The Chair questioned whether the Committee could express a willingness that the businesses in Botany Quarry could be relocated within the Borough or if they could be given priority in a new location. Andrew Millard answered that this could not be formally contained within legal agreement or planning conditions but could be mentioned within the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting.

Councillor Hamilton agreed with the points on housing nominations raised. He went on to say that it was the first time he had heard of an Applicant willing to risk a lower financial return and asked if this would be a cause of concern. Although the application submitted was an outline of the proposals, the Principal Planner explained that it was more than an intention to build on the site. The application was for permission as contained within the report. The details on affordable housing nominations were referred to on pages 297 – 298 of the agenda.

The Chair invited the registered Speakers to address the Committee.

Agent Representative for Objectors, Andrew Wilford, presented his statement in objection to the application.

Ward Councillor, Councillor Holloway, presented her statement in support of the application.

PCRL Representative and Chairman of Purfleet-on-Thames Community Forum, John Rowles, presented his statement in support of the application.

The Chair opened the item up for debate to the Committee.

The Chair said the project of Purfleet Centre had been 'in the making for many years' with media coverage. There had been a concern on whether the film studio would be implemented and deliverable if the application was to be approved but this was not a material planning consideration. He went on to say that it was good to hear the positive comments from the Ward Councillor and from John Rowles who was a pillar of the community. With the comments given on the percentage of affordable homes, the Council had to ensure that full priority was given to Thurrock's residents on the waiting list. There was also a cause of concern on the businesses situated within the Botany Quarry because of the potential job losses.

Councillor Rice felt the scheme was exciting and had lived in Borough for a long time but Purfleet had always been the forgotten part of the Borough. Central government had set Thurrock with the target of 32,000 homes to be built and the scheme would provide 2,850 homes and it would be good to see Purfleet regenerated. Councillor Rice went on to say that he would be

supporting the application provided that Thurrock had sole housing nomination rights to the affordable homes. He supported the Chair in relocating the businesses and workers situated within Botany Quarry and said the Council should be looking to protect those jobs.

Mentioning the Purfleet Centre site visit that took place on 23 April 2019, Councillor Shinnick said the scheme should be supported to enable Purfleet to move toward regeneration.

Councillor Little also said the scheme should be supported but if there was a chance that Thurrock could get more than 10% of affordable houses from the scheme, then the chance should be taken. With the businesses within Botany Quarry, the Council should look to retain or relocate these businesses within Thurrock.

Councillor Hamilton said he was swayed by John Rowles' statement as it was rare for a member of the community to support major projects similar to Purfleet Centre. He went on to say that as the proposals within the application were an outline, the design could change but the community should not be denied of the progress of regeneration.

Expressing further concern on the businesses within Botany Quarry, the Chair hoped that the workers within those businesses would get the support they needed from the Applicants and from the Council. He stated that those workers were welcome to approach Councillors for help if needed.

Moving on to the Officer's recommendation to grant outline planning permission, it was proposed by Councillor Gerard Rice and seconded by Councillor Sue Shinnick. The Chair moved onto voting.

(Councillor Akinbohun was unable to vote on the item under Constitution rules in Chapter 5, part 3, paragraph 13.5 as she had not been present at the start of the item.)

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Angela Lawrence, Sue Sammons, Graham Hamilton, David Potter , Gerard Rice, Sue Shinnick and Sue Little.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

Application 17/01668/OUT Development Land East of Caspian Way and North and South of London Road, Purfleet, Essex was granted outline planning permission subject to the recommendations at pages 219-22 of the agenda.

(The Chair allowed for a short break of the meeting at 20.47 to allow members of the public and relevant officers to leave the meeting who had been present for application 17/01668/OUT.)

(The meeting recommenced at 20.53.)

105. 19/00219/FUL Barvills Farm, Princess Margaret Road, East Tilbury, RM18 8PA

Presented by Tom Scriven, Principal Planner, the application sought to demolish two agricultural buildings to the north of the site. In place of this, it was proposed that 3 detached, 4 bedroom dwellings would be erected with associated open cart lodges, hardstanding and vehicle access road and landscaping with proposed access to be from Station Road to the south of the site.

The site was on Green Belt and as the site did not constitute previously developed land, this was considered to be inappropriate development on the Green Belt in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. There were also no very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The application was recommended for refusal.

The Chair opened the item up to the Committee for questions.

Noting the cowshed and herding unit within the photos shown in the presentation of the report, Councillor Little queried whether these were considered to be a 'footprint' of the site and if it would be a part of the proposals to be built. The Principal Planner answered that the current buildings on the site were not listed and the applicants were relying on the removal of these to enable their planned dwellings to be built.

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative, asked the end date for the solar farm that was located behind the site. The Principal Planner replied that solar farms were given temporary permission on land which was for around 25 years. The solar farm behind the site had been in place around 2015.

The Chair opened the item up to the Committee for debate.

Mentioning the proposed Lower Thames Crossing (LTC), Councillor Rice said the proposed service area for the LTC was proposed to be 1000 yards from Barvills Farm. He went on to say that by central government legislation, Thurrock needed to build 32,000 homes and despite the approved application of the previous item heard (17/01668/OUT Purfleet Centre) that would give 2,850 homes, Thurrock would still be short on the given figure of 32,000. Councillor Rice continued on to say that Thurrock's land supply was just over a year when it should be 5 years. The proposal of the homes on Barvills Farm should be seized as the proposed LTC service station may be 1000 yards away and from the report, there had been no objections especially noting Natural England and Landscape and Ecology Advisor which would be the case used to allow the Committee to depart from Council policy.

Continuing on, Councillor Rice said that the Committee may need to pass planning applications similar to Barvills Farm and allow building to commence

on Green Belt. Homes were needed and this application was proposing 3 dwellings and the Committee had to bear in mind that the proposed LTC service station may be 1000 yards away.

Disagreeing with Councillor Rice's comments, Councillor Little did not agree with building on the Green Belt and said the figure of 32,000 homes to be built in Thurrock was not a correct figure. Regarding the proposed LTC service station, that was surmise and could or could not happen. Thurrock should protect their Green Belt and although the proposed dwellings were a nice idea, it was the wrong place and the wrong time.

As Ward Councillor for East Tilbury, Councillor Sammons said she would approve this application because there had been a lot of construction work around the area including in a Conservation Area. It was 3 proposed dwellings whereas the current construction work taking place were for more homes.

Agreeing, Councillor Lawrence said the proposed 3 dwellings would improve the area and balance out its character. She went on to say that there was confusion between green fields and Green Belt sites and that as central government looked at the White Paper every year, in 5 years' time, what was currently Green Belt may not be in the future.

Regarding the cowshed and herding unit, Steve Taylor said the buildings were just cowsheds and was not an opportunity to add on to the existing floor space with its removal. The site was not previously developed land, it was farm land. Referring to the LTC comments, Steve Taylor went on to say that the LTC proposal was irrelevant as it couldn't be predetermined what may or may not happen. Conservation areas and the Green Belt were two different terms and the consideration of applications within these areas would be different. In this case, the proposal would be harmful to the Green Belt.

The Chair said the Committee needed to consider whether the application would be harmful to the Green Belt and there were many more sites similar to Barvills Farm where applications could potentially be submitted to the Council. The Committee heard just a few of these as some of these needed to come before the Planning Committee. The Chair expressed concern on approving these type of applications on the Green Belt because if it the Committee became consistent in approving, it would be 'open season' on Thurrock's Green Belt.

Councillor Hamilton agreed with the Chair and said Thurrock may end up with no Green Belt. He would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Akinbohun said she would be supporting the application as it would develop the area and provide more housing.

Moving onto the Officer's recommendation for refusal of the application, this was proposed by the Chair and seconded by Councillor Hamilton. The Chair moved onto the vote.

For: (4) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Councillor Graham Hamilton, Councillor Sue Little and Councillor Sue Shinnick.

Against: (4) Councillors Gerard Rice, David Potter, Sue Sammons and Angela Lawrence.

Abstained: (1) Councillor Akinbohun

With a tie in the votes, the Chair had the casting vote (in accordance with the Constitution Chapter 5, part 2, paragraph 5.2) which was voted for refusal of the application.

Application 19/00219/FUL Barvills Farm, Princess Margaret Road, East Tilbury, RM18 8PA was refused.

(The Planning Committee agreed to suspend standing orders for the rest of the evening to allow the rest of the agenda to be completed).

106. 19/00267/FUL Silver Springs, High Road, Fobbing, SS17 9HN

The Principal Planner, Tom Scriven, outlined the planning application which proposed the demolition of Inglefield and the erection of 6 detached dwellings with associated access road, landscaping and amenity space. The application also proposed side and rear extensions to the host dwelling Silver Springs. The site was located on the Green Belt and a large proportion was currently open garden land. As a result a significant proportion of the site could not be considered to be previously developed land. Even if the site was considered to be previously developed land, it would have a greater impact upon openness than the existing development on the site. Therefore the proposal was considered to be inappropriate development that would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The circumstances put forward with the application were not considered to constitute very special circumstances which would clearly outweigh the harm to openness.

Since the publication of the agenda, an additional letter of objection had been received from a neighbour whilst there had been an additional letter of support from the applicant. The matters raised within the letter of objection had already been covered within the Officer Report. The letter of support was primarily concerned with the weight afforded to the very special circumstances submitted with the application. Having reviewed this letter it was considered that the appropriate weight had been afforded to these circumstances. Therefore, the application was recommended for refusal as set out in the agenda.

The Chair opened the item up to the Committee for questions.

Regarding the current construction, Thames View Farm, that was taking place on the other side of High Road, the Chair questioned how Thames View Farm had been approved for building and why the current application of Silver

Springs was recommended for refusal. The Principal Planner explained that Thames View Farm had been identified within the Site Allocations Development Plan Document which was covered in points 6.23 – 6.26 of the report. This was a consideration in the determination of the Thames View Farm application but had never been adopted. As a result this allocation no longer carried any weight. In addition Silver Springs did not fall within this draft allocation and the situation on the two sites was different as Thames Farm was a small holding whilst the Silver Springs site was open garden land.

The Chair questioned if there was an avenue for the applicant to apply for allocation if the application was to be refused. The Principal Planner answered that this was part of the Local Plan process and the case could be put forward that the site could be requested to be released from the Green Belt for allocation in the future Local Plan. This was a process that was outside of the consideration of a planning application. The Chair went on to ask if the applicant could apply immediately or would they have to wait for the revised Local Plan to develop. The Principal Planner said that the consultation on the Local Plan had recently closed but Andrew Millard added that the appropriate way to consider changes to the Green Belt was through the Local Plan process and not through a series of ad hoc planning applications. The current call for sites had closed but sites could still be put forward to the Council for consideration in the Local Plan at any time.

Raising concerns on setting a precedent, Councillor Hamilton said the Committee was already seeing an example of a previously approved application being used to support a similar application on a neighbouring site..

Councillor Lawrence commented that an area near the site did not appear to be Green Belt. Mentioning that she had used Google Earth to view the site, there was a scrap yard 500 yards away from the back of the houses on High Road. The Chair reminded the Committee that green fields should not be confused with Green Belt. The site was within the Green Belt and therefore should be considered against relevant Green Belt policy. Councillor Lawrence went on to say that a row of lovely houses would give a better landscape than the scrap heap that was behind the row of current houses along High Road.

Noting Councillor Lawrence's comments, Councillor Rice suggested a site visit as the Committee had not been aware of a scrap heap situated within the open garden space. It would be difficult to make a decision without seeing the site and considering the approved building that was taking place on Thames View Farm next door to the site which was the Silver Springs application.

The Chair invited the registered Speakers to address the Committee.

Ward Councillor, Councillor Huelin, presented her statement in objection to the application.

Anthony Davis, a representative for a Resident, presented his statement in objection to the application.

James Willey, the Applicant, presented his statement in support of the application.

The Chair opened the item to the Committee for debate.

Following Councillor Rice's proposal of the site visit, Councillor Shinnick seconded the site visit. The reasons for the site visit were to enable the Committee to see what was on the proposed site as Google Earth showed a scrap yard 500 yards from the back of the houses and also to view how the site differed to the approved Thames View Farm site.

The Chair moved the Committee onto the vote for a site visit.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly, Gerard Rice, Abbie Akinbohun, David Potter, Sue Sammons, Sue Shinnick, Sue Little and Angela Lawrence.

Against: (1) Councillor Graham Hamilton.

Abstained: (0)

The application 19/00267/FUL Silver Springs, High Road, Fobbing, SS17 9HN was deferred to a later Committee meeting once a site visit had taken place.

107. 19/00271/FUL Land Adj A13 A1306 and to front of 191-235 Purfleet Road, Aveley, Essex

Presented by Chris Purvis, Principal Planner, the application sought full planning permission for the erection of a new warehouse and distribution centre with relevant facilities to accommodate staff and users of the warehouse. The proposal would use the newly created access point from Purfleet Road and a 'left-in' access from London Road along with landscaping, boundary and drainage treatment.

Table 3.4 within the report pointed out the differences between this current application and the previous application that had been heard at the Planning Committee in September 2018. This application was larger than that application but smaller than the approved outline/reserved matters application which were all live consents. The current application demonstrated improvements in terms of design, benefits to the Borough in terms of economic growth and job creation. The site is well linked to the nearby strategic road network for the A13 and M25 from the Wennington Interchange for HGVs. The application was recommended for approval subject to the planning conditions and obligations stated within the report

The Chair opened the item up to the Committee for questions.

Councillor Little noted the number of available HGV parking spaces and questioned whether these were private or open to all HGVs. The Principal Planner answered that the number of available HGV parking spaces were less than the previous application but the application includes provision for

van movements and that these were proposed to be on either side of the site. The previous application included HGV docking on 3 sides of the building. Councillor Little went on to ask if there would be cafes and toilets for people using the site. The Principal Planner confirmed that there were welfare facilities located within the buildings and enough to cater for staff and other users.

Noting the scale of the proposed warehouse and distribution centre, Steve Taylor wondered whether there was an opportunity for the local businesses from Botany Quarry (that was mentioned in the earlier application of the evening 17/01668/OUT Purfleet Centre) to relocate to this site. The Principal Planner replied that the applicant had an end user for the proposed site. The Chair commented that Steve Taylor's suggestion was good and one to bear in mind.

Councillor Lawrence said that planning permission had already been granted on the first application from September 2018 and the Applicant must have noted it was not big enough at the time. She sought more detail on point 6.29 of the report as the noise impact description seemed vague. The Principal Planner explained that noise control through the construction process could be managed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan planning condition on big construction projects. The Applicant would need to provide measures to the Council on how the site would be managed.

Regarding piling works, Councillor Lawrence asked when piling would begin and at what times of the day. The Principal Planner answered that the application was going through the consultation process and the conditions of piling were set out in points 19 and 20 on page 382 of the report and would form part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Noting the 7m bund with a 2m high acoustic to be constructed above the site, Councillor Lawrence questioned if this would be installed before construction took place. The Principal Planner explained that this was a landscape implementation and may not be installed before construction happened. However, it would be in place before the site was fully operational. Councillor Lawrence stated that this was not sufficient. On point 6.30, she asked how much room there was for expansion. If the warehouse was built, there would be increased traffic with vehicle movements and more fumes. She thought the proposal should move onto a bigger site as it would affect the residents nearby. Regarding layout, the Principal Planner said that the plan showed the development would occupy all of the site and appeared to have been designed to its maximum capacity within the site. The previous application proposed a 24 hour movement and this application would be the fall back. This application also proposed a larger landscape bund which would reduce the noise levels for surrounding residents.

On the landscape bund, Councillor Rice asked whether it could be incorporated into the s106 agreement as a condition that the bund be installed before construction began. With piling, there should be set times implemented such as between the hours of 8.30 to 17.00 to make life more comfortable for

nearby residents. Councillor Rice went on to say that on the last application, there had been discussion on planting big trees in front the site to provide a screen between the site and homes. He was concerned that with construction works, there would be lights constantly on along with noise that came with construction and asked if it could be incorporated into the conditions of the application that the bund be implemented first. The Principal Planner answered that there was a condition in regards to landscape implementation which was upon occupation of development. It would be down to the Agent to accept the condition. Regarding the detail for piling and hours of operation for construction works, the Principal Planner said the hours would be discussed and agreed upon.

Commenting on the constant HGV movements that would result from the use of the warehouse from Grays, Councillor Hamilton asked whether the entrance into the road from the roundabout could be widened. The Principal Planner explained that any HGVs from Grays could use the A13 to access the site and if they came via London Road then they would need to use the Wennington roundabout to access the 'left in' access on London Road. As this application had less parking spaces for HGVs, there would be more vehicle movement from vans and small vehicles than HGVs.

The Chair invited the register Speakers to address the Committee.

Alastair Bird, the Agent of the Applicant, presented his statement in support of the application.

The Chair opened the item up to the Committee for debate.

Councillor Rice thought the words from the Agent were encouraging where it was said that the bund could be installed first before construction began and the native species that would be planted along the road. He went on to say that the fact that the built warehouse would create a lot of jobs was significant and thought that the Applicant had provided enough detail for the Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Lawrence said residents and the environment had to be considered as there would be constant vehicle movement along the road.

The Chair said that the application was recommended for approval from Officers and if the application was approved, he hoped it would be the last time seeing this application.

Moving onto the Officer's recommendation of approval subject to conditions, it was proposed by the Chair and seconded by Councillor Sue Shinnick. The Chair moved onto the vote.

For: (7) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Graham Hamilton, David Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Shinnick, Abbie Akinbohun and Sue Little.

Against: (2) Councillors Angela Lawrence and Sue Sammons.

Abstained: (0)

Application 19/00271/FUL Land adjacent A13 A1306 and to front of 191 – 235 Purfleet Road, Aveley, Essex was approved subject to conditions.

Before moving onto the next item, the Chair asked for nominations for a Member to chair the next item.

Councillor Shinnick nominated Councillor Rice. Councillor Rice seconded.

There were no other nominations and the vote across the Committee was unanimous.

108. 17/00723/DVOB - DP World Development, London Gateway, Stanford Le Hope

The Chair excused himself due to his declared pecuniary interest on this application. Councillor Rice took over as Chair.

The Principal Planner, Matthew Gallagher, presented the application which sought to modify an existing s106 planning obligation associated with the London Gateway Logistics Park Local Development Order (the LDO). It was recommended that the existing s106 agreement be varied in accordance with the table as set out at Annex 1 to the report.

The Committee was satisfied with the report.

The Committee moved onto the vote on the Officer's recommendations.

For: (8) Councillors Rice, Abbie Akinbohun, David Potter, Sue Sammons, Sue Shinnick, Sue Little, Graham Hamilton and Angela Lawrence.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

Application 17/00723/DVOB DP World Development, London Gateway, Stanford le Hope was approved.

The meeting finished at 10.20 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**