

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 26 November 2020 at 6.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Mike Fletcher (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman (left at 6.40pm due to technical issues), Angela Lawrence, David Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England  
Representative

**In attendance:**

Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection  
Jonathan Keen, Interim Strategic Lead of Development Services  
Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager  
Chris Purvis, Major Applications Manager  
Nadia Houghton, Principal planner  
Lucy Mannion, Senior Planning Officer  
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer  
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor  
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.

### **65. Minutes**

Referring to the Little Thurrock Marshes application, Councillor Rice said that he had mentioned accessibility to residents within the site and outside of the site that would make the area accessible within the list of the reasons given (*Clerk's note – added within the minutes of 22 October 2020*). He said that he had also mentioned the Council's five year housing supply with no 20% buffer and that the Council was failing the Government's targets for new housing (*Clerk's note – was not added within the minutes as this was not mentioned*).

Referring to the Little Thurrock Marshes application, Cllr Lawrence said that she had mentioned that the development would provide a health and wellbeing benefit as it would enable people to walk and cycle to work and to the shops nearby (*Clerk's note – within the minutes*).

Subject to those amendments, the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 October 2020 were approved as a true and correct record.

### **66. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chair announced that item 11 - 20/00342/FUL Land Adjacent 43 and to rear of 45 to 47, River View, Chadwell St Mary, Essex, was withdrawn from the Agenda as the call-in had been withdrawn.

**67. Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

**68. 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 Committee declared receiving correspondence from Nick Westlake in regards to application 20/01051/FUL.

The Committee declared receiving correspondence from Jamie McArthur in relation to application 20/00623/FUL.

Councillor Churchman declared receiving an objection letter in relation to 20/00985/FUL.

**69. Planning Appeals**

There were no questions or comments from the Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the report was noted.**

**70. 20/01051/FUL 40 High Road, Fobbing, Essex, SS17 9HN (deferred)**

The report on pages 27 – 60 was presented by Lucy Mannion.

Councillor Byrne questioned whether labelling properties for over 55's made a difference in planning laws; and in the example of an inheritance, whether someone under 55 could move into the property if the owner (over 55) passed away. Officers explained that the label of over 55's made no difference in planning law and that a planning condition or s106 agreement (if Members were minded to approve the application) could be included to stipulate that properties were for over 55's only. This restriction could be brought in under planning conditions but planning conditions could be changed.

Councillor Lawrence said that planning conditions would govern the proposal. She said that the bungalows proposed within the development were different to other bungalows as these were adapted for over 55's. Councillor Potter said that McCarthy and Stone were a nationwide supplier of over 55's accommodation buildings and had large complex on Crammavill Street, Stifford Clays and were strict on the age restriction. The Chair highlighted that

the issue of over 55's age restriction had already been debated at the last hearing of the application (22 October 2020) and said that clear planning reasons were needed if Members were minded to approve the application.

*(Councillor Churchman left the meeting at 6.40pm due to technical issues.)*

Councillor Rice highlighted that a report from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG – now known as Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) had researched and identified a need for age related housing especially bungalows which added to the reasons for departing (from the Green Belt (GB)). He went on to say that Thurrock did not have a five year housing supply or a 20% buffer and was failing each year on its housing delivery targets which were more reasons for departure (from the GB). Councillor Byrne pointed out that the report did not highlight building on the GB for housing.

Steve Taylor pointed out that there were a number of bungalows available for sale in Thurrock as of the morning of that day. He went on to say that (in relation to Councillor Potter's comment) McCarthy and Stone leased their properties so were not owned. The proposed bungalows in the proposal would be sold and would be harder to enforce conditions.

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

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

**AGAINST:** (5) Councillors Angela Lawrence, David Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

The Officer's recommendation was rejected.

Leigh Nicholson referred Members to the Constitution Chapter 5, Part 3, paragraph 7.4 and stated that any harm to the GB, as a point of law, must be given substantial weight and any reasons put forward to overcome this harm must clearly tip the balance the other way to overcome the harm by definition and any other harm identified from the proposal. He added that an appeal decision from a year ago for refusal of four dwellings on the same site should be taken as a material consideration when Members considered the application that was before them. The Inspectorate in that appeal did weigh the need for housing in the balance but did not feel that it clearly outweighed the harm to the GB. He went on to say that Members had to acknowledge that there would be substantial harm arising from an inappropriate development on the GB and any other harm arising from the proposal. Members had to give weight to the factors identified for approving the application and must clearly outweigh the harm to the GB.

Councillor Rice referred to the five reasons on page 28 of the Agenda which were:

1. Tailored Bungalows – Specialist and limited height (so they could only be bungalows)
2. Sustainable village location – (as there were 2 bus stops nearby with an hourly service)
3. Innovative Internal Design – (Lend to be adapted and adapt to own need)
4. Employment in Construction Phase
5. Shovel Ready (The applicant had stated they would start as soon as they could)

Councillor Rice stated that he maintained the above reasons as given at the last hearing of the application and added the additional reasons for approval which were:

6. The Council did not have a five year housing supply or a 20% buffer and was failing on its housing delivery targets every year.
7. That the DCLG recognised that almost 48% of householders of over 65 years old would represent household growth up to 2026 which suggested a need for age related housing especially bungalows in response to the rapidly growing older population.
8. There would be less stress on the NHS as the bungalows would be on one level and there would be less accidents of falls or trips down the stairs.

Councillor Byrne pointed out that there were chairlifts that could be installed for going up/downstairs. Steve Taylor said that the site was not a sustainable village location as it was close to the Five Bells roundabout and the nearest village was over a mile away with shops being a further mile away from there. He went on to say that the Government's 'shovel ready' projects referred to large infrastructure projects..

Councillor Potter supported Councillor Rice's reasons for approving the application and said that the 1960s had been the baby boom era and those born from that time were now over 55 and needed bungalows. Councillor Rice pointed out that the site had two bus stops nearby which would enable residents within the proposed development travel into the village if they did not have access to a car.

Leigh Nicholson stated that no clear weight and rationale had been given to each reason that Members had given for approving the application. He referred Members to pages 31 – 35 of the Agenda and highlighted that the previous reasons given at the last hearing of the application had been assessed by Officers. He explained that any harm to the GB must be given substantial weight and that the two reasons that Officers had given for refusing the application had to be addressed by Members.

Councillor Rice referred to reasons given before and said that there was significant weight for tailored bungalows and that it was fundamental to take into account the DCLG's report as mentioned earlier. He said that Thurrock was lacking in the supply of bungalows and that it was recognised that there

would be harm to the GB. He highlighted that the reasons given earlier were substantial reasons and that the site was a village location which was 'village infilling'. Councillor Lawrence added that the bungalows were specialist homes as they would be built with extra wide door openings which would be suitable for wheelchair users and kitchens had been adapted as well. These were not normal bungalows and would be built for over 55s.

Leigh Nicholson noted that Members had acknowledged harm to the GB; significant weight had been attributed to the proposed bungalows for over 55s; that local employment opportunities had been attributed some weight; that the Council not having a five year housing supply or a 20% buffer and was failing on its housing delivery targets every year had been given significant weight. He noted that there had been no further clarification on the village location which had been provided as a reason by Members for approving the application at the first hearing of the application. He referred Members back to the appeal decision in 2019 for the same site for the proposal of four dwellings in which the Inspector had dismissed as it had not been considered infilling within a village and that the site was not a sustainable village location. Officers had also covered this within the report on page 32 of the Agenda. He went on to explain that clear evidence and weighting was needed to support the reason provided on the site being a village location and sustainable. He also highlighted that the two reasons that Officers had given for refusing the application on page 38 of the Agenda had to be addressed and highlighted the issues of the introduction of significant built form into open areas and urban designs.

The Vice-Chair commented that there could be potential similar developments to the proposal that had been built. Councillor Rice agreed and said that the Committee would be considering the Waterworks application later that evening which was in the same area of the current proposal which was in Fobbing. He made the comparison that the Waterworks application had 180 proposed dwellings and the current application before the Committee had five proposed bungalows and pointed out that Waterworks was a GB site.

The Chair pointed out that the Waterworks site differed as it was previously developed land whereas the site of the current proposed development had no built form since the war. Leigh Nicholson said that the Waterworks application was previously developed land with a different set of circumstances to the current application. He highlighted that Members needed to address Officer's refusal reason number two and read the refusal reason out. He went on to say that Members had to give rational reasons to address this in approving the application.

Councillor Lawrence felt that the proposed bungalows would not be out of character with the area as houses around the site were different to each other and there had been a recently built modern development in the area. She pointed out that the proposed dwellings in the Waterworks application would be out of character in the area of Fobbing. In regards to sustainability, she felt the location was ideal for people who did not want to live in a big town and people could walk to the shops. There were also bus stops nearby. She also

said that there was a scrapyard behind the site. Steve Taylor pointed out that the map on page 39 of the Agenda showed that the proposed development would be built entirely within the red line boundary which had no development so would look out of character within the area.

Councillor Rice pointed that another site down the road to the current site had been given planning permission two years ago to demolish one bungalow and for nine dwellings to be built in place of it. He thought this showed a demonstrative need for this current proposal.

In relation to Officer's refusal reason number two, Leigh Nicholson noted that Members had reasoned that the homes along the road of the site were varied in design so the proposed bungalows' modern design was acceptable. He noted that Members had also reasoned that other developments of infilling within a village had been accepted in the past.

Caroline Robins advised Members to address the Officer's two reasons for refusal and attribute weight to factors to show these clearly outweighed the harms as set out in the Officer's report. She stated that Members needed to acknowledge these harms.

The Vice-Chair pointed out that Members had acknowledged the harms in which Councillor Rice agreed and reiterated the approval of the other development of nine dwellings from two years ago as mentioned earlier. He said that these were of a similar style to the current proposed bungalows which was sufficient to address Officer's refusal reason number two and highlighted Councillor Lawrence's earlier point that the homes along the road of the site were a mixture in design.

Leigh Nicholson noted that Members had addressed the Officer's two reasons for refusal but the balancing exercise for refusal reason number two had not been undertaken. He said that Members were able to progress forward constitutionally as they had provided clear reasons for Officer's reasons for refusal. He went on to remind Members of the usual process following a decision which required legal assessment for lawfulness by the Monitoring Officer and then subject to it being found lawful conditions in conjunction with the Chair.

Proposer: Councillor Rice.  
Secunder: Councillor Potter.

**FOR:** (5) Councillors Angela Lawrence, David Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

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

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

71. **19/01800/FUL Medina Farm, Dennises Lane, Upminster, Essex, RM14 2XB**

The report on pages 61 – 88 of the Agenda was presented by Matthew Gallagher.

Steve Taylor noted that the application sought permission for four years and said that the Applicant could appeal to request for a longer period of time to continue the works. Matthew Gallagher explained that there was a condition to limit the operations to four years on page 110 of the Agenda. This would apply from the commencement of works. He went on to explain that some sites may require longer periods of time such as Orsett Quarry because it was a large site but the current site should be quick as it was small and constrained in comparison.

The Chair questioned whether there were other concerns in regards to the application other than the additional vehicle movements in the area. Matthew Gallagher said that the area of the site was fairly isolated and the number of residential receptors were limited in Thurrock and that there were more receptors in London Borough of Havering Council. Noise movement could be noticed on the site from the works but the Environmental Health Officer did not have concerns. He said that HGV movements would be coming in from the west which was on the London Borough of Havering side but there were a limited number of receptors. He went on to say that Thurrock Council was satisfied with the application subject to conditions and that there would be a limited impact to residents.

Democratic Services read out the Agent, Amy McDonagh's statement of support.

Councillor Rice said that to reduce the amount of dirt on the roads from HGVs, the service had to ensure that vehicle wheels were properly cleaned. Matthew Gallagher explained that the condition was that HGVs would travel along London Borough of Havering's roads and the impact would be on those roads.

Proposer: The Chair.

Seconder: Councillor Rice.

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

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**72. 19/01799/FUL Medina Farm, Dennises Lane, Upminster, Essex, RM14 2XB**

The report on pages 89 – 124 of the Agenda was presented by Matthew Gallagher.

Democratic Services read out the Agent, Amy McDonagh's statement of support.

Proposer: The Chair.

Seconder: The Vice-Chair.

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

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**73. 20/00342/FUL Land Adjacent 43 and to rear of 45 to 47, River View, Chadwell St Mary, Essex**

This item was withdrawn from the Agenda as the call-in had been withdrawn.

**74. 20/00957/FUL Barmoor House, Farm Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex, RM16 3AH**

The report on pages 135 – 152 of the Agenda was presented by Nadia Houghton. Since the publication of the Agenda, she stated it had been noted that that the site plan attached to the Committee Report was an inaccurate red line plan but the report and planning application considered included all the correct plans and also referred to all the correct plans.

The Chair sought more detail on the bin stores as he noted Officer's refusal reason number two and that the bins were close to the entrance of the site. Nadia Houghton said that the bins were located along the access road of Farm Road and that the bins were currently collected from the properties fronting Farm Road, from Farm Road. She said that in line with highways compliance, the refuse vehicle should be entering into the site at the back of Farm Road to collect the bins as the development was located to the rear of Farm Road which was a narrow road as shown in the site photos in the Officer's presentation.

Councillor Lawrence mentioned that refuse vehicles in her road reversed back out and questioned whether the refuse vehicles could do the same after collecting other bins in the area. Councillor Sammons also pointed out that refuse vehicles were already collecting bins in the same area. Nadia Houghton explained that there were concerns on the design of the access and not just on refuse collection. There were no visibility splays that would allow for vehicles to move out from the road safely. Julian Howes explained that other service and emergency vehicles would also need to access the site and the Applicant had been asked to demonstrate that there were clear visibility splays at the access point and that there was sufficient turning facility for all vehicles to be able to turn around safely.

*The Committee agreed to suspend standing orders at 8.26pm to enable the Agenda to be completed.*

Democratic Services read out the Agent, Russell Forde's statement of support.

Councillor Rice stated that the site was within his ward and that residents had only objected to the roads. He suggested that a condition be included to ask that the roads be brought up to Council standards and that the application should be approved. He highlighted the DCLG's report which identified a need for age related housing and it was also recognised in the Council's Core Strategy 2015.

Steve Taylor said that the development to the front of the site was originally a single property and the current site before the Committee was the rear/garden of the development's site and was GB. The development to the front of the site was already the maximum permitted development on the site. He highlighted that once the GB was built upon, it would not become a green open space again. The Chair noted that the site had been approved for development in 2018 and was a case of developers requesting for more development on the site. He noted that there were no negative comments from residents but the site was GB.

Councillor Lawrence proposed for a site visit to enable Members to view the access road in regards to the concerns around refuse vehicles and visibility splays. Councillor Byrne seconded this.

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

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

The application was deferred for a site visit.

**75. 20/00985/FUL Land Adjacent Curling Lane Helleborine and Meesons Lane, Grays, Essex**

The report on pages 153 – 174 of the Agenda was presented by Nadia Houghton. Since the publication of the Agenda, there had been two updates. The first update was that the site plan attached to the Committee Report was an inaccurate red line plan but that the application had been considered with the correct red line plan along with all plans submitted with the planning application. The second update related to the Essex Badger Protection Group who had sent their response to the Council stating that they had no objections to the scheme proposed subject to the conditions included in the application.

The Chair questioned whether there was an outcome on the appeal from the previous application for this site yet to which Nadia Houghton confirmed that

there was not an outcome yet as the decision was awaited. He questioned why the Applicant had chosen to submit a new application instead. Nadia Houghton advised it was up to the Applicant as to whether a planning application was submitted, and explained that there may have been potential delays in the appeal process due to the COVID-19 pandemic and that submitting another application was an option to the Applicant.

The Vice-Chair noted that the site was not GB and questioned whether Officers had considered that this site was the only open space in the area that had not been built upon. He also pointed out that Chafford Hundred was overdeveloped but the area of this site was not considered overdeveloped by Officers. He was concerned about over cramping in Badgers Dene. Nadia Houghton explained that the site was designated as residential land so there was no consideration for loss of open space. There was an open space which was a children's recreation play area very close by the site on Meesons Lane. It was considered that the proposal would not result in over cramping with the six proposed dwellings so there were no objections on open space grounds. She also said that each site had to be considered on its own merits and that the current site was on the edge of the estate. The proposal would not be removing any open space in the area and would provide fully compliant garden spaces.

Councillor Lawrence referred to paragraph 6.7 and questioned whether there would be overshadowing. She noted that the design of the proposed dwellings would have 'yellow and red rustic brick cladding' which she questioned whether this would be out of character with the area. She also raised concerns on badgers on the site and asked if this had been checked. She pointed out that badgers could not be seen in the day and highlighted her concerns that planning conditions could be changed.

Nadia Houghton explained that the roofs on the proposed dwellings meant the scheme had high ecological credentials and the development as a whole would provide an almost carbon-free development which was unusual. She referred to paragraph 6.7 and said that it was in relation to overshadowing which related to the panels on the roof that did not require direct sunlight as it functioned on daylight so there were no concerns raised. She explained that the materials for the proposed dwellings were not traditional and that the Applicant had tried to keep these in character with the properties in the area without moving away from their energy efficient credentials and modern construction design. In regards to badgers on the site, she said that the Applicant had produced an updated Ecological Assessment and the Council's Ecology Advisor had undertaken several visits to the site. There were also no objections from the Essex Badger Protection Group.

Steve Taylor noted that there were trees around the site and within the site, he questioned if these would be removed and whether any trees had a Tree Protection Order (TPO). Nadia Houghton answered that there were no TPOs and that many of the trees on the site would be retained.

Tony Fish, Ward Councillor, read out his statement of objection.

Democratic Services read out the Agent, James Wiley's statement of support.

The Chair noted that the appeal from the previous application had not reached an outcome yet. He pointed out that the Applicant had taken Members' comments into consideration at the last application and had put forward a new application with less homes proposed. He thought the development was eco-friendly compared to other recently approved developments and that it had been confirmed that there were no badgers on the site.

Councillor Lawrence said that the Applicant could not compare the site to other recently approved applications as the site was special and treasured by residents living within the area of the site. She noted that the site was not GB but it was not a piece of land that could be built upon now or in a few years' time and she believed there were badgers on the site. The Vice-Chair noted that the application was an improvement to the previous application with the amenity space issues being resolved. However, he was concerned about the appearance of the proposed dwellings that would be out of character with the area and density issues. He felt the proposed development was a 'postage stamped' development that was being shoehorned into the last bit of green space in the area so was against the development. Councillor Shinnick felt the development was small and could still have badgers on the site.

The Chair proposed the Officer's recommendation for approval but there was no seconder so the Officer's recommendation was rejected.

The Vice-Chair suggested an alternative motion to refuse the application on the grounds that the development was not in keeping with the character of the area and there were issues of density and an overdevelopment in the area. Regarding the issue of overdevelopment and density, Nadia Houghton explained that the proposed development fully complied with Council policies with regards layout and amenity space provision and consequently the Vice-Chair removed the reason relating to overdevelopment from the motion put forward to refuse the application.

Councillor Lawrence added that she was concerned over the road condition in the site and that the Applicant had not proposed repairing the road. Officers explained that the road was fully adopted and maintained by the highway and the Applicant proposed to include a new turning head that made the road more policy compliant. There had been no suggestion to upgrade the road.

The Vice-Chair proposed the alternative motion to refuse the application for the following reason:

The proposed development would, by virtue of the siting, mass, appearance, detailed design and choice of materials, be likely to result in an incongruous development which would appear out of character with the appearance of residential development in Helleborine and be likely to be harmful to the character of the area and appearance of the street scene.

This was seconded by Councillor Shinnick.

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

**AGAINST:** (1) Councillor Tom Kelly.

**ABSTAINED:** (1) Councillor Gary Byrne.

The application was refused.

**76. 20/00623/FUL Waterworks, High Road, Fobbing, Essex, SS17 9JW**

The report (which can be found on the Council's website <https://democracy.thurrock.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=136&MId=5884&Ver=4>) was presented by Chris Purvis. Since the publication of the Agenda, there had been some updates:

- The NHS had provided a consultation response that identified the financial amount of £66,400 needed to mitigate the impact on the healthcare sector;
- Updated plans for condition 2.
- Condition 25 had additional text that included surveys in regards to Great Crested Newts and reptiles.
- Paragraph 1.2 should be read as 6 one bed apartments and 15 two bed apartments.
- For the total parking, it should be read as 342 spaces for the allocated/unallocated that was in total and in addition to the visitor spaces which would equate to a total of 388 spaces in the site.
- There were a couple of other minor changes.

Democratic Services read out the Resident, Vicki Barrett's statement of objection.

Catherine Williams, the Agent, read out her statement of support.

Councillor Sammons note the reservoir within the site plans and questioned whether fencing would be placed around it. She went on to ask what type of fencing would be placed there and who would be maintaining that fencing. Referring to the railway barriers in the area of the site, she noted that these were half barriers and raised safety concerns and the dangers over these as her ward area also had half barriers. She noted that there was no response from the railway organisation on the consultation and felt concerned as this would be the near the proposed dwellings of the development and would be their exit route. Chris Purvis answered that there was an existing reservoir on the site that was covered up. He said that the proposal was to remove, infill and build in the location of the reservoir. Regarding the railway barriers, he confirmed that these were currently half barriers that prevented people from crossing over when it was down. He went on to say that the barriers were the responsibility of Network Rail and that Network Rail had been consulted but

had not provided a response which could mean that they had no objections to the proposal.

The Vice-Chair questioned what affordable housing meant for Bellway Homes and how much of the proposed homes were allocated for social housing. The Committee discussed the potential costs of the proposed dwellings. Chris Purvis said that the Applicant's Planning Statement confirmed 59 affordable housing units which was 35% and consisting of a mix of one and two bed apartments; two and three bedroom houses; and four one bed wheelchair units. The tenure of these complied with Council policies in regards to 70% social housing and 30% intermediate housing which complied with NPPF guidelines. There was no detail on the pricing of the proposed properties.

Steve Taylor noted the response to the consultation from Highways in regards to the railway barriers and sought further details. He also highlighted issues in the road after the railway line of traffic queues that could potentially risk cars being trapped on the railway line and questioned whether there was a provision for another lane. Chris Purvis explained that Highways had raised the issue of the railway barriers and that Network Rail were responsible for replacing the barriers. On the road issues, he said that the roads mentioned fell outside the boundary of Thurrock Council so could not insist on a mitigation of a right hand turn lane. Julian Howes explained that the Highways Team had raised an issue in regards to the impact of the barriers on traffic queuing. In terms of traffic queue lengths, the Applicant had shown that the tailbacks at the crossing or towards the crossing were not very significant so the Highways Team had not found issues in traffic generations and queuing in and out of the proposed development.

Councillor Lawrence thought the site was a prime location and was disappointed to hear that the majority of the 35% affordable homes offered would be by the railway tracks. She felt the proposed development was a major project and proposed that a site visit be undertaken which Councillor Rice seconded. The Chair was not in favour of a site visit as he said there were no issues from Highways. The Vice-Chair felt there were issues with the railway barriers that had to be addressed.

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

**AGAINST:** (1) Councillor Tom Kelly.

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

The application was deferred for a site visit.

**The meeting finished at 10.10 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](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)**