

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22 October 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Mike Fletcher (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Angela Lawrence, David Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

Apologies: Councillor Colin Churchman

In attendance:

Jonathan Keen, Interim Strategic Lead of Development Services
Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager
Nadia Houghton, Principal planner
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer
Sarah Williams, Service Manager, Education Support Service
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor
Lucy Mannion, Senior Planning Officer
Wendy Le, Democratic Services Officer

Before the start of the meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being live streamed and recorded, with the video recording to be made available on the Council's website.

49. Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 17 September 2020 were approved as a true and correct record.

50. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

51. Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interests.

52. Declarations of receipt of correspondence and/or any meetings/discussions held relevant to determination of any planning application or enforcement action to be resolved at this meeting

Councillor Lawrence declared that she had received a voicemail.

The Committee declared they had received an email or phone call from Hilary Goodban in regards to 19/01058/OUT.

Councillors Potter and Rice declared receiving an email from Gillian Sanders in regards to 20/01051/FUL.

53. Planning Appeals

There were no questions or comments from the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the report was noted.

54. 19/01058/OUT Land part of Little Thurrock Marshes, Thurrock Park Way, Tilbury (deferred)

The report on pages 13 – 96 of the Agenda was presented by Matthew Gallagher. Since the publication of the Agenda, there had been two updates, the first was that the Applicant's representative had sent legal advice from a QC which Members had also received. The second was a letter of objection from a resident highlighting the flood risk; highway safety particularly at the junction between Churchhill Road and Dock Road; and did not feel that the reasons for approval put forward by Members were enough to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

Matthew Gallagher went through the application proposals and highlighted that the reasons that Members had provided for wanting to approve the report were assessed on pages 27 – 31 of the report. The benefits of the scheme and the Members reasons for wanting to depart from the Officer's recommendation in March was not considered to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, therefore a case of Very Special Circumstances (VSC) did not exist and the Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission remained.

Referring to the trees on the site and the Ecology Adviser's notes within the report, Councillor Byrne questioned whether the shade of the trees, if left to grow, would affect the invertebrate interests on the site. Matthew Gallagher explained that the existing habitats on the site were important to invertebrates and that the current site consisted of a mix of vegetation alongside bare grounds. If the vegetation was left to overgrow, there would be increased shading and the interest to invertebrates would diminish. He referred to page 17 of the Agenda and highlighted that the site had been identified as a potential non-statutory Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) which was a material consideration as legislation required the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to take into the interests of biodiversity and wildlife conservation. If the scheme was to be approved, ecological mitigation and compensation would be required.

Councillor Lawrence commented that there had been horses on the site during the site visit and questioned whether the site had been maintained by the land owners or by volunteers. Matthew Gallagher answered that to his

knowledge, the site had not been maintained and that the horses were potentially preventing an overgrowth of vegetation which, as an indirect result, was helping to keep the diversity of the habitat. Without the horses, the vegetation would overgrow and would then become an interest to other biodiversity interests. Although the site was not yet a non-statutory designated LoWS, biodiversity habitats and protected species were material planning considerations which Members needed to consider.

The Chair noted the site was next to Asda and queried, if the application was approved, whether a safe footpath could be provided for pedestrians to walk through the site to access Asda instead of walking along the industrial estate path. It would also be in the interests of potential residents on the proposed development to have a safer footpath. Matthew Gallagher explained that the site did not connect to Asda and the access would be through the pedestrian and cycle links. There was no potential for a footpath to Asda as it involved other private land and it was not within the gift of the Applicant to access that land directly which was fenced off and that the plan was indicative only. He said that the industrial estate footpath followed along the public highway but stopped and to the right was an area with commercial vehicles, in which the Applicant had rights of access for commercial access or potentially footfall. He went on to say that the application was for outline planning permission and that the layout was for reserved matters and that the Applicant was not considering a footpath so was not up for consideration on the application. The suggested footpath as put forward by the Chair was through a strip of land that the Applicant had no control over.

Julian Howes added that pedestrian access was across the north-west of Manor Road and linked to the new cycle and footpath along Thurrock Parkway down to the south-west. The Highways Team had advised the Applicant that a solution would be needed regarding emergency access if the proposed pedestrian and cycle access was to be the main access from the site. Highways were looking to use a bridge to link in the north-west of the site and also a bridge further down where Thurrock Parkway was to form part of the pedestrian and cycle access that linked directly into Tilbury that headed underneath the A1089 bridge.

The Chair summed up the points debated so far and felt that an approval of the application was risky and that the QC's opinion was biased towards their client. He felt the scheme was a big mistake. The Vice-Chair commented that he had voted to approve the scheme initially but given the extra information on ecological impact in the Officer's report and the amount of local objections to the scheme, he was more inclined to vote to refuse planning permission.

Councillor Rice stated that he was still minded to approve the application and raised the following points:

- Referring to local objections highlighting the flood risk, he said that Tilbury benefited from a sewer system that protected them and surrounding areas from flooding; a new Tilbury floodgate would be in place in early 2021; a new barrier would be installed; and that the flood

protection barriers would be raised by at least 3 metres so Tilbury and Little Thurrock Marshes were well protected against floods.

- That the Applicant would be providing the 35% affordable homes from the scheme which equated to 56 homes for Thurrock's residents.
- That there would be 500 jobs from the Tilbury2 port expansion and would indirectly create several thousand more jobs for the work and services involved with Tilbury2. This further supported the need for local homes and the need for employment which was currently high due to the pandemic.
- That the bugs and wildlife on the site could be moved to another site.

Councillor Byrne sought clarification on the number of job opportunities as he had heard figures of 4,000 and 285 jobs that would be available. Matthew Gallagher said that according to the Port of Tilbury's business case accompanying their application for a DCO, there would be 500 jobs available when Tilbury2 was fully operational which it was not yet. He went on to say that when the Port of Tilbury expansion was considered in 2018, the LPA had secured a Skills and Employment Strategy via a s106 agreement to ensure more of those jobs would be accessible for Thurrock's residents and Tilbury residents in particular. The Port of Tilbury's employment census showed that 57% of its existing employees were Thurrock residents. Applying the 57% to the 500 available jobs would give a figure of 285.

Steve Taylor commented that the promoted affordable housing element did not state who would be eligible to purchase these and did not necessarily mean that residents would be taken off the housing waiting list. He referred to the legal implications highlighted within the report and pointed out that the real issue was the Green Belt and this particular strip of land was the last that separated Little Thurrock and Tilbury.

The Chair proposed the Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission which was seconded by Councillor Byrne.

FOR: (3) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher and Tom Kelly.

AGAINST: (4) Councillors Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons.

ABSTAINED: (1) Councillor Sue Shinnick.

The Officer's recommendation was rejected.

Councillor Rice proposed an alternative motion and the reasons were summed up as follows:

1. The opening of Tilbury2 would create new job opportunities so there would be a demand for more homes.
2. There were no flood risk issues as there were flood defences in place along with invested funds as highlighted earlier.

3. Thurrock needed social housing.
4. The Applicant had worked to improve the application to provide more open spaces.
5. There would be connectivity to the site and throughout the site.
6. The site would provide homes for the Port of Tilbury and Amazon employment sites closeby.
7. The development was a 'shovel ready project'.
8. The development would generate employment for construction.

Jonathan Keen pointed out that five of the reasons given had been significantly covered within the Officer's report and were considered not enough to approve the application. Caroline Robins said that each of the given reasons had to be supported with evidence and individually weighed against the harm to the Green Belt. Members had to ensure that the benefits clearly outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

The Committee sought clarification on weighing the benefits against the harm to the Green Belt. Officers explained that substantive evidence was needed to support the reasons that Members had given to approve the application. The previous five reasons given at the first hearing of the application on 19 March 2020 had been assessed in the Officer's report and it had been shown that these did not clearly outweigh the harm. In addition to those five reasons, Members had given three new reasons which they now had to assess and show that these clearly outweighed the harm to the Green Belt to show VSC. Members were reminded of the procedures outlined in the Constitution, Chapter 5, part 3C, 7.5.

Councillor Rice referred to the table on page 88 and felt that the weight attributed to inappropriate development and reduction in the openness of the Green Belt carried no weight and disagreed with the weight attributed by Officers. He pointed out that the site was currently inaccessible and the development would make this accessible to people and improve connectivity so the weight to provision of new public open space should be very significant. The provision of the new employment units should have significant weight for the employment reasons already mentioned. He went on to say that Thurrock had a Core Strategy with a suite of policies but there was no Local Plan or call for sites and that the Committee's decision of approval would be for the Secretary of State to judge whether the decision should be called-in. He felt the reasons given were significant enough for the Committee to approve the application. Referring to the weighting given on the table on page 88, Matthew Gallagher explained that the NPPF (para. 144) stated that 'substantial weight' had to be given to any harm to the Green Belt and that Members had no latitude to ascribe a lesser weight to the harm. However, he said that it was for Members to look at the scheme's benefits and weigh them against the harm to the Green Belt and give substantiated evidence to show the benefits would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. He also reminded Members that the Secretary of State could not be used as a safety net for making decisions on the Green Belt contrary to an Officer's decision.

Councillor Lawrence pointed out that the cycle links proposed within the application would add significant benefits as it would improve health and wellbeing for people. It gave people the opportunity to walk or cycle to work instead.

Jonathan Keen noted the eight reasons given by Members to approve the application and also the comments from Councillor Rice on open space and unemployment issues. Regarding the Core Strategy, he pointed out that the Council had a Development Plan which was the adopted Core Strategy which included policies for the Green Belt. However, putting all these together, it was not enough for the application to be approved and the decision, if Members were still minded to approve, would be referred to the Monitoring Officer to review whether the decision was lawful. If the decision was lawful, the next step would be for the Chair and the Assistant Director to agree the content of the legal agreement and any conditions which would then be referred to the Secretary of State.

With Councillor Rice putting forward the alternative motion as the proposer, Councillor Lawrence seconded this.

FOR: (4) Councillors Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons.

AGAINST: (3) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher and Tom Kelly.

ABSTAINED: (1) Councillor Sue Shinnick.

The application was approved subject to referral to the Monitoring Officer.

55. 20/00983/ELEC Tilbury Green Power, Tilbury Freeport, Tilbury, RM18 7NU

The report on pages 97 – 120 of the Agenda was presented by Matthew Gallagher. Since the publication of the Agenda, there had been one update which was a consultation response from Highways England who had raised no objection in regards to the proposed amendment to exclude the river jetty.

The Vice-Chair questioned whether there was a practical reason for removing the jetty. Matthew Gallagher answered that the Applicant was fairly confident that road transport would continue to be the most economically viable solution for the power station and would not need the jetty although, as explained in the report, there could be a point where river transport could become viable and the jetty would be handy at that time.

Referring to paragraphs 6.3 to 6.7, Steve Taylor sought clarification on whether there was an intention to use the river to diversify routes as that had been the intention when the application first came to Committee. He commented that there could be maintenance costs where there were issues of unauthorised access to the jetty. Matthew Gallagher explained that the jetty was within the port complex which was not easy to access. The original

application was in 2008 and national policy for energy generally encourages sustainable modes of transport, subject to cost effectiveness. The Applicant had submitted a viability statement which concluded that rail and/or river transport was more expensive than road transport. Officers had no reason to dispute the applicant's statement, however a more robust planning condition was required to require review and potential implementation of sustainable transport modes.

Councillor Rice felt use of the river was needed as it helped minimise the transport of waste on the roads. Councillor Potter felt the application to remove the jetty was disgusting as HGVs carrying waste would be used on Thurrock's roads instead and would contaminate the Thurrock's environment and air quality. Matthew Gallagher said that Highways England was the responsible body for the road network (A1089) and had raised no concerns. It would be for the Secretary of State to consider the cost effectiveness of the rail, road and river use and to make the decision. Councillor Rice commented that the Secretary of State needed to be made aware that the Port of Tilbury had a railway track that could be used and that the A1089 was already reaching its capacity which raised concerns of air quality. Matthew Gallagher explained that the nearest Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) to the site was at Calcutta Road, Tilbury but the A1089 to Tilbury Docks was not a designated AQMA.

The Chair proposed the Officer's recommendation and the Vice-Chair seconded this.

FOR: (7) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher, Tom Kelly, Angela Lawrence, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

AGAINST: (1) Councillor Dave Potter.

ABSTAINED: (0)

56. 20/01065/FUL Treetops School, Buxton Road, Grays, Essex, RM16 2WU

The report on pages 121 – 146 of the Agenda was presented by Nadia Houghton. Since the publication of the Agenda, there had been a few updates. A consultation response from Environmental Health Officer who raised no objections subject to a CEMP condition. A consultation response from Essex Police with guidance regarding the development following the Secured by Design guidance with particular reference to the community use. This approach had been taken within the recommendation and conditions relating to the community use and it was considered that there were no objections arising as a result. A letter of support had also been received from the CEO of the Treetops Learning Community.

The Chair referred to a previous planning application near the current application's site where there had been traffic issues along Buxton Road. There had been a discussion of a potential roundabout at Treetops School that would link to the new rugby clubs nearby and he sought more detail on

this. Nadia Houghton explained that the current access arrangements via Buxton Road had been considered to be acceptable for the recently approved new school given the school's size and existing capacity. There had been discussions regarding the proposal of a new roundabout off to the north of Stanford Road which had been ongoing for a year and the Council was still considering its options regarding this. The Chair felt road infrastructures were important as most roads in Thurrock were at capacity and needed to be considered to avoid potential problems in the future.

The statement of support from Paul Smith, CEO of Treetops Learning Community, was read out by Democratic Services.

Councillor proposed the Officer's recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Shinnick.

FOR: (8) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher, Tom Kelly, Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAINED: (0)

The application was approved, subject to conditions.

(Suspending orders were agreed at 8.10pm to allow the Committee to continue until the end of the Agenda).

(The Chair announced that item 12 would be heard before item 11.)

57. 20/01053/FUL 63 Wharf Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex, SS17 0DZ

The report on pages 167 – 178 of the Agenda was presented by Nadia Houghton.

The Vice-Chair questioned what local amenity would be lost as the site was overgrown and could not be accessed. Nadia Houghton explained that there was a small path around the back of existing homes that allowed residents to access their bins. The new development would be built very close to existing homes and there would be a poor outlook for the proposed bungalows as it would face directly into the back of those existing homes. She explained that the proposed development was a particular form of backland development that would be out of character with the area.

Councillor Rice asked whether two cars could pass in the proposed 4.8m access. Julian Howes confirmed that two cars would be able to pass in the proposed 4.8m access but that there would be pedestrian access issues. He explained that it was not just a matter of pedestrian visibility but the Applicant had also not shown the potential visibility splays for vehicles either. The junction would have several cars coming out and there were also issues regarding stagger on Cabbons Crescent.

Steve Taylor questioned whether there were trees and shrubbery around the area where the proposed 4.8m access would be. Nadia Houghton answered that the actual access would be just over half the width of bungalow no.63 as the Applicant also proposed four parking spaces adjacent to the access along with a pedestrian footpath; a landscaped strip between the four parking spaces and bungalow no. 61 so the width would not be the full 4.8m mentioned.

The statement of objection from Keith Mager, a resident, was read out by Democratic Services.

The statement of objection from Ward Councillor, Terry Piccolo, was read out by Democratic Services.

The statement of support from Gary Coxall, the Agent, was read out by Democratic Services.

Councillor Rice questioned the difference between the current application and the previous application 08/01054/FUL that had been approved at Committee in 2009. Nadia Houghton explained that the 2009 application had proposed for eight dwellings and had sought to remove bungalow no. 57. The layout was very similar to the current application and the 2009 application had also been recommended for refusal with almost identical reasons to the current application particularly relating to the overdevelopment cramped nature of the site and layout; the amenity impacts; concerns about the access; and the backland development and its impact on the character of the area. Members at the consideration of the 2009 application had resolved to grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement that the eight bungalows would be secured for over 55's. No such agreement had been secured and there were also issues in relation to the red line plan so no planning permission had ever been issued and the Applicant withdrew the 2009 planning application. With the current application and since the 2009 application, new planning policies had been introduced in the NPPF in 2012 and in Chapter 12 in particular and the PPG in 2014, that highlighted layout designs and character which further supported the justifiable national and local planning policy reasons to refuse the current application.

The Chair commented that the proposed development was cramped and dense and noted the habitat that had been mentioned in the speaker statements. He mentioned the need to secure the bungalows for over 55's. Councillor Rice commented that the previous application had been approved for eight dwellings and the current application was for seven dwellings. He mentioned an application in Orsett Heath with proposed bungalows that had been approved at Committee a few years ago even though that development had been cramped and said that Thurrock had a lack of bungalows. He felt the proposed development was well situated, close to local shops and that Stanford Le Hope needed regeneration. He mentioned that he had also seen the site. The Chair did not feel the comparison between the current

application and the Orsett Heath application was fair as the Orsett Heath application had been recommended for approval.

Nadia Houghton explained that the Orsett Heath application was different to the current application as those dwellings had larger front and rear gardens was accessed on a private road and had been recommended for approval. The site on the Orsett Heath application had also had some built form on site already. She highlighted that each application had to be judged on its own merits.

Steve Taylor questioned whether the tree line along the school playing field would be removed; where the proposed properties in that area would face and if the school would be overlooked by the proposed properties. Nadia Houghton answered that the proposed properties would overlook the primary school playing field. The trees would not be removed as it belonged on the site of the school.

The Chair proposed the Officer's recommendation and Councillor Byrne seconded this.

FOR: (3) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher and Tom Kelly.

AGAINST: (3) Councillors Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, and Sue Shinnick

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

In line with the Constitution, the Chair used his casting vote to vote for the Officer's recommendation and the application was refused planning permission.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8.55pm and recommenced at 9pm).

58. 20/01051/FUL 40 High Road, Fobbing, Essex, SS17 9HN

The report on pages 147 – 166 of the Agenda was presented by Lucy Mannion.

Steve Taylor mentioned that the dropped kerb shown in the Officer's presentation used to have a gate behind the hedge row that was used to hay from there to the farm across the road.

The statement of support from Nick Westlake, the Agent, was read out by Democratic Services.

Councillor Byrne questioned what features of the proposed dwellings indicated that it was designed for over 55's such as a ramp. Lucy Mannion answered that there were no specific features indicating that the dwellings were for over 55's and that anyone could live there.

Councillor Rice questioned if the proposed dwellings were secured for over 55's. Lucy Mannion answered that the location was not suitable for over 55's and that an agreement could be secured for over 55's to purchase the homes but this could potentially be overcome by future buyers.

Steve Taylor noted that the previous application for four proposed dwellings had been refused and the current application now proposed five dwellings. He questioned whether the Applicant had discussed the application with the LPA before submitting it. Lucy Mannion said that the Applicant had not approached the LPA for advice or discussion before submitting the application since the refusal of the first application.

Councillor Lawrence thought that the location of the proposed development was ideal as it was not in a busy area. She also pointed out that there would be changes to the Green Belt soon through the Development Plan and that Thurrock needed to be more forward thinking before other bigger companies took these opportunities of developments. The Vice-Chair noted the speaker statement and thought there was a local need for homes for older people and that there was not a good supply of homes for over 55's. He felt more weight should have been attached to specialist older people's home need and that some of the case of VSC put forward by the Applicant should be considered again.

Councillor Rice pointed out that the Applicant, as part of the s106 agreement, would remove the Permitted Development Rights (PDR) to ensure the proposed bungalows would remain bungalows forever. He stated that there was a lack of bungalows in Fobbing and that there was a planning application down the road that was for 180 homes. He referred to the correspondence from Gillian Sanders who had given a history of the site in that a home had been on that site but had been bombed in the war and had never been replaced. He said the site was not within the Fobbing Conservation area; the proposed development was well connected to the central village with bus stops nearby that arrived every hour and that the internal designs of the proposed dwellings were good as they were single storey with rear gardens.

The Chair did not feel that the comments regarding the previous building on site in 1939 was relevant to the application. Officers explained that there had been no remains of the home from 1939 on the site and that if the remains had moulded into the landscape, leaving no built form on land behind, it would not constitute as Previously Developed Land (PDL). This was highlighted within the NPPF and the Planning Inspector in the previous application that was refused had clarified that the site was not PDL.

Regarding changes to the Green Belt, Jonathan Keen highlighted that permission should not be given through small planning applications such as the one before Committee and release of Green Belt sites had to be considered on a strategic level taking into local infrastructure. In regards to Green Belt spatial designations, he said that even though these could not be seen, it did not mean that it would not be harmful. He highlighted the appeal decision for the previous refused application from August 2019 in that the

Planning Inspector had raised harm to the Green Belt refused on those grounds; and had raised concern about the design and appearance of the buildings which was the same as in the current scheme. Matthew Gallagher added that the Green Belt was primarily intended to keep land open although openness could have a visual aspect, the Green Belt was a primarily a spatial designation. Noting the comments regarding the Fobbing Waterworks application, he said that each case should be judged on its own merits.

Councillor Lawrence thought the designs of the bungalows were innovative as old bungalows required a lot of work. She felt the open plan design in the proposed dwellings would work out better for over 55's. Steve Taylor commented that the farmland was not public land but gave a visual openness. Referring to the PDR mentioned in the speaker statement, he commented that the bungalow could be passed down to a younger person who would be able to appeal the PDR in the future. Councillor Byrne pointed out that Members needed to look at the plan and not the age the proposed dwellings were for. He thought the location was too far from local amenities.

The Chair proposed the Officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Byrne.

FOR: (2) Councillors Gary Byrne and Tom Kelly.

AGAINST: (6) Councillors Mike Fletcher, Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

ABSTAINED: (0)

The Vice-Chair proposed an alternative motion and the reasons were summed up as follows:

1. The bungalows were of a tailored and specialist design for over 55's to enable these to be adapted to their needs.
2. The location was sustainable as there were two bus stops nearby.
3. There was a merit in the design as it was innovative and adaptable.
4. The site was not within the Fobbing Conservation area.
5. There would be employment opportunities through the construction phase.
6. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one.
7. The development was a 'shovel ready project'.

There was a debate over the sixth reason as the earlier approval of 19/01058/OUT had merged the towns of Tilbury and Little Thurrock together. Councillor Rice pointed out that the development would not result in unrestricted sprawl and prevent build up within the area. Jonathan Keen said that the application would be deferred to the next Committee meeting as Officers would need to assess the reasons provided by Members and the impacts of approving the application.

The Chair noted that the Applicant had stated that they would commence works within a year if the application was approved, instead of the usual three years. Matthew Gallagher explained that the wording 'commencement' did not necessarily mean that construction work of the site would be completed but instead, a trench, for example, could be dug as 'commencement' of works.

With the Vice-Chair proposing the alternative recommendation to approve, Councillor Rice seconded this.

FOR: (6) Councillors Mike Fletcher, Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

AGAINST: (2) Councillors Gary Byrne and Tom Kelly.

ABSTAINED: (0)

The application was deferred to enable Officers to assess the impacts of approving the application. The report would be brought back to the next Committee.

59. 20/00905/FUL Land Part of St Cleres Hall Adjacent to James Court, Stanford Road, Stanford Le Hope, Essex

The report on pages 179 – 198 was presented by Lucy Mannion. There had been one update to the report which was from the Applicant highlighted their dismay at the objections raised in the speaker statement.

Councillor Lawrence raised concerns on the entrance to the site from Stanford Road as it was dangerous where cars cut across houses to get to the other side of the road. She felt these concerns had a knock on effect and should be resolved before approving the current application. Lucy Mannion said that the Council was aware of the issues but that these were outside the remit of the current application before the Committee. Julian Howes explained that the original application had access through St Cleres Golf Club access and barriers had been erected to prevent cars from cutting across London Road to the houses and going over the kerbs. Recently, a vehicle was grounded at the site trying to avoid the barriers but the on-going issue of parking would be a planning enforcement issue.

The Committee noted the incomplete works of the car park on the site and questioned whether the failure of the incomplete works could be incorporated as a condition within the current planning application. Officers explained that the car park was outside of the red line boundary of the site application and could not add as a condition to the current application. The development of the current site would enable better access to the existing residents. However, the car park issue could be looked at as an enforcement case where concerns would be actioned.

The statement of objection from Ward Councillor, Terry Piccolo, was read out by Democratic Services.

The Chair sought clarification on the number of car park visitor spaces. Julian Howes explained that there was 1 car park visitor space between the proposed five dwellings as the proposed development was in a medium accessibility area so was close to local amenities and transport.

The Vice-Chair proposed a site visit to see the issues of the incomplete car park works that had been raised in the speaker statement and the development of the first site. Councillor Rice seconded the site visit.

FOR: (6) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

AGAINST: (2) Councillors Tom Kelly and Angela Lawrence.

ABSTAINED: (0)

The application was deferred for a site visit.

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