

<b>Reference:</b> 19/01058/OUT	<b>Site:</b> Land part of Little Thurrock Marshes Thurrock Park Way Tilbury
<b>Ward:</b> Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park	<b>Proposal:</b> Application for outline planning permission with some matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale): Proposed construction of up to 161 new dwellings (C3) with vehicular access from Churchill Road; construction of 7,650 sq.m (GEA) of flexible employment floorspace (Use Class B1c / B2 / B8) with vehicular access from Thurrock Park Way; provision of open space including landscaping and drainage measures; new pedestrian / cycle links; and associated parking and access.

<b>Plan Number(s):</b>		
Reference	Name	Received
110D	Master Plan / Site Plan	07.11.19
111A	Site Location Plan	10.07.19
112A	Master Plan / Site Plan	07.11.19
113	Master Plan / Site Plan: Building Parameters: Indicative Heights	10.07.19
114E	Master Plan / Site Plan	07.11.19
A232-LA04A	Landscape Strategy Plan	10.07.19
CC1442-CAM-22-00-DR-C-90-1103 Rev. P01	Flood Compensation Storage	17.09.19
CC1442-130 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Overall Plan	07.11.19
CC1442-131 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Sheet 1 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-132 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Sheet 2 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-133 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Sheet 3 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-134 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Sheet 4 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-135 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Sheet 5 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-136 Rev. P3	Access Roads Layout Sheet 6 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-141 Rev. P3	Access Roads Vehicle Tracking Sheet 1 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-142 Rev. P3	Access Roads Vehicle Tracking Sheet 2 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-143 Rev. P3	Access Roads Vehicle Tracking Sheet 3 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-144 Rev. P3	Access Roads Vehicle Tracking Sheet 4 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-145 Rev. P3	Access Roads Vehicle Tracking Sheet 5 of 6	07.11.19
CC1442-146 Rev. P3	Access Roads Vehicle Tracking Sheet 6 of 6	07.11.19

- Archaeological desk based assessment;
- Breeding bird survey report;
- Commercial market report;
- Design and access statement;
- Energy and sustainability statement;
- Environmental noise assessment;
- Essex recorders datasearch report;
- Flood risk assessment;
- Great Crested Newt surveys;
- Landscape and visual impact appraisal;
- Phase 1 habitat assessment;
- Planning statement;
- Reptile survey report;
- Statement of consultation;
- Travel plan;
- Water Vole survey;
- Botanical survey;
- Ecological mitigation strategy and habitat enhancement plan;
- Invertebrate surveys and assessments;
- Surface and foul drainage strategy; and
- Transport assessment

**Applicant:**  
Nordor Holdings Ltd

**Validated:**  
11 July 2019  
**Date of expiry:**  
31 August 2020 (Extension of time agreed)

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2020 Members considered a report assessing the above proposal. The report recommended that planning permission be refused because:

*The site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt (GB) and the benefits of the scheme do not clearly outweigh the harm to the GB and thus constitute the very special circumstances to justify a departure from local and national planning policies.*

- 1.2 A copy of the report presented to the March Committee meeting is attached.
- 1.3 At the March Committee meeting Members were minded to resolve to grant planning permission for the proposed development based upon the following reasons:
1. *the opening of Tilbury 2 port expansion would create new jobs which would attract out of Borough workers that would result in a demand in local housing that the proposal could provide for;*
  2. *there was no flooding issue and that the Environment Agency had funds for flood defence in Tilbury;*
  3. *Thurrock needed social housing;*
  4. *the applicant had worked to address previous objections and the proposals included more open space; and*
  5. *connectivity improvements within the proposals.*
- 1.4 In accordance with Part 3(b) – Planning Committee Procedures and in particular Paragraphs 7.2 and 7.3 of the Constitution, the Committee agreed that the item should be deferred to enable a further report outlining the implications of making a decision contrary to the Planning Officer’s recommendation. A further report was presented to the Committee at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> June where consideration was deferred to enable a site visit to take place.
- 1.5 The application remains recommended for refusal for the reason set out in the attached report. A copy of the original report presented at the March meeting, together with the update report presented to the June meeting are attached.

## 2.0 FACTUAL UPDATES

2.1 Shortly before the meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> June, Members received a late representation from the Essex Field Club. In summary, this representation raised the following matters:

- Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) – the site was identified as a LWS in a 2016 review. There is apparent confusion within the Council as to the site's ecological status, but it is considered that the site is a LoWS and the 'designation' is therefore a material planning consideration;
- Invertebrate survey – concerns are raised about the effectiveness of the applicant's surveys, which may undervalue the site. Nevertheless, the surveys show that the site is of County-level value and the proposals would impact on invertebrates through loss of habitat. Essex Field Club remind the local authority of its duty to conserve biodiversity through the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006;
- NPPF – reference is made to para. 175 (Habitats and Biodiversity) which states (inter-alia)-

*When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:*

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;*
- c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists*

2.2 Shortly after the June meeting a representation was received from Buglife, which raised the following matters:

- the site is a biodiversity asset and was considered as a LoWS in the 2016 review. The site should be treated as a LoWS and this matter is a material consideration;
- the site is of importance for invertebrates and the proposed mitigation is considered to be insufficient. Furthermore the applicant's surveys fail to correctly assess impacts;
- although the site may look overgrown, it contains a variety of habitats which are of interest and importance for invertebrates.

2.3 These two late representations were not reported to the June meeting and are therefore summarised for the benefit of the Committee in reaching a decision based

on all representations received. The Council's landscape and ecology advisor has been requested to provide a response to these late comments and a verbal update will be provided at the July meeting.

**Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online: <http://regs.thurrock.gov.uk/online-applications>

