

## **Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 18 March 2021 at 6.00 pm**

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Mike Fletcher (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, 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  
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer  
Genna Henry, Senior Planning Officer  
Lucy Mannion, Senior Planning Officer  
Sarah Williams, Service Manager, Education Support Service  
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor  
Wendy Le, Senior 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 Youtube channel.

**105. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 February 2021 was approved as a true and correct record.

**106. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

**107. Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

**108. 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**

Members declared that they had received correspondence from Rebecca Darling on 20/1273/FUL; from Matthew Wood on 20/00290/FUL; from a

number of residents on 20/01736/TBC; and from a number of residents on 20/01680/FUL.

#### **109. Planning Appeals**

The report was presented by Leigh Nicholson.

Referring to application 19/00807/OUT, the Chair asked whether the application had been refused on the grounds of open space and if it would now be classified as open space. Leigh Nicholson explained that the service would be looking to reaffirm land designations such as open spaces through the Local Plan process.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**That the report be noted.**

#### **110. 20/00827/FUL Former Ford Motor Company, Arisdale Avenue, South Ockendon, Essex, RM15 5JT (deferred)**

The report was presented by Chris Purvis.

The Chair commented that outline planning permission had been granted in 2011 which the developers did not build from that and was now expired. He went on to say that the developers were now suggesting that Thurrock was not building enough homes which he felt was an unfair assessment as the developers had the opportunity to build on this site 10 years ago. Chris Purvis explained that the applicant had provided a Counsel's opinion and this had assessed the Council's policies. He said that the 2011 outline planning permission had been granted for up to 650 dwellings which had been built over a five phase scheme and one of the earlier phases had built a lower number of dwellings. This enabled the Applicant to increase the number of dwellings in the current application to achieve a figure closer to the 650 dwellings granted in the outline application. He explained that the current application proposed 27 more dwellings over the 650 dwellings and the Council's policies aligned with the NPPF's housing delivery test to commit to high density developments within existing urban areas and brownfield sites to protect the Green Belt from development.

The Chair said that density and parking had been raised as concerns by Members when the application had been heard at previous meetings and questioned if the Council had considered whether this would affect the quality of the site. He noted that there was a lot of emphasis on the site being near Ockendon train station and pointed out that the station had a single track that travelled in two directions so was not a good source of public transport for the site. He commented that a high density and minimal parking build would work in London where there were tube stations that travelled in more directions. Chris Purvis explained that the application showed 70 dwellings per hectare and although it was within the upper threshold of 30 – 70 dwellings per hectare in the CSTP1 policy, it met the terms of the policy . In regards to

parking spaces, the Council's requirement was a minimum of 115 and the proposal was 120 and the parking ratio followed the same parking ratio in the outline planning permission to meet the design code. In regards to quality, he said that the developer was the same developer for phases four and five of the previous planning permission which was considered a high quality designed schemes and the same design approach had been applied to the current application which represented a continuation of that high quality development.

The Vice-Chair commented on the attitude of the Applicant's appeal statements and their reluctance to increase the number of affordable homes. He asked whether the Council was confident that the Applicant would provide the 11 affordable homes that was currently offered. He also sought clarification on 'continuity' as the phases were built out by different developers.

Chris Purvis explained that the Applicant was highlighting the appeal process and that the reasons that Members had given for refusing the application previously had been assessed and met policy requirements. He explained that Officers had to consider whether the application complied with the development plan which it did and in an appeal, the Planning Inspectorate would be looking at this so refusing the application would be a risk. In regards to continuity, he said that this was in regards to the planning permission and design code which developers needed to follow to ensure the quality of the development was achieved. In regards to affordable housing, he said that if the application was approved, the 11 affordable homes would be tied into an s106 which the Applicant would have to comply with as it was a legal agreement alongside the agreement that these be made available for local people.

The Vice-Chair questioned if affordable homes would be reviewed at a future date in terms of feasibility. Chris Purvis answered that this was not expected to change based on the financial viability assessment and a change would need to be subject to a separate application which would need to be brought back to Planning Committee if changes were to occur. Members were advised to consider the application that was before them.

Councillor Churchman sought more detail on the increased number of dwellings and the 14 objections raised against the application. Chris Purvis confirmed that the application proposed 27 more dwellings than the 650 dwellings outlined in the 2011 outline planning permission. He said that there had been no further objections since the update report but that there had been 14 objections with the planning application which remained the same.

In regards to the 70 dwellings per hectare, Councillor Rice questioned whether this was a normal or condensed rate per hectare. He also asked whether Officers were convinced that there was enough car parking spaces. Chris Purvis answered that this complied with policy PMD8 and reiterated his earlier points (in response to the Chair's questions) on density. He also

reiterated earlier points on parking requirements and said that the Council's Highways Officer had raised no objections to the application and parking.

Referring to paragraph 3.6, the Chair highlighted that Members had discussed at the last meeting that there was nowhere else that people could park if all the visitor spaces were taken. He recalled that phases three and four had parking enforcement and that there were double yellow lines along Arisdale Avenue and asked where people could park if all visitor spaces were filled. Chris Purvis said that as part of the application, if it was approved, it would apply the same consistency through planning conditions as other phases where the management company would look at parking enforcement measures. He went on to say that he was unable to advise where people could park if all the visitor spaces were filled. The Chair pointed out that a lack of visitor parking spaces along with the need for a management company to enforce parking did not highlight a good quality development.

Referring to paragraph 3.16, the Chair questioned if piling was required more for flats than homes. He referred back to Steve Taylor's comments in previous meetings on piling and said that building flats led to an excessive cost in piling which resulted in them not being able to provide the 35% affordable homes that was preferred. Members highlighted further concerns with the lack of parking spaces and that there were already parking issues around the area with commuters parking in residential areas surrounding the station. Members felt that blocks of flats would create a ghetto that crammed people in.

There were no proposers for the Officer's recommendation to approve.

Leigh Nicholson referred Members to the Constitution Chapter 5, Part 3, paragraph 7.4 and said that the specific wording would be agreed with the Chair if the application was to be refused by Members.

The Chair noted that the application could go to an appeal and public inquiry if it was to be refused by Members but pointed out that if the application was approved, it was not suitable for the local community. He summarised the points Members had made and said the application was high in density and a commercial venture and that residents needed to be protected from poor quality housing. The Vice-Chair agreed and said that meeting standards did not mean meeting requirements and that the parking statement was false. He said that Members' refusal reasons had not changed and that the issues that Members discussed in regards to the train station should also be considered as a reason for refusal.

Members discussed the lack of spaces at Ockendon station which caused issues of people parking in residential areas around the station which most had Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) implemented as a result. Members commented that the trains at Ockendon was also at high capacity during peak times and that people drove to Upminster to catch the train instead. Members highlighted that the Applicant had used Ockendon station as a mitigation for the lack of parking spaces.

*(The three reasons for refusal given by Members on 11 February 2021 were:*

- 1. The proposed development as a result of its high density is at the absolute limit density of what would be acceptable for this site.*
- 2. The proposal has increased the parking level by 3 parking spaces but the level of parking is not considered enough to be acceptable for this development taking into account the existing situation at the site and is inadequate to achieve sustainable development.*
- 3. The proposal would result in a lack of affordable housing units at the site and therefore would not meet the needs of local people due this shortfall of affordable housing.)*

In addition to the three reasons for refusal that Members had given at the last meeting, the Chair added that the density was on the borderline of what was acceptable. With a high density, it brought more people to the site and within a single bedroom flat, there could be two people living there with two cars. He said that people needed accessibility to open or green spaces and did not consider the green patches on the site to be big enough to be called an open space. He felt that there would be too many people on the site and high density led to poor quality.

The Chair proposed the alternative motion to refuse the application and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

**FOR:** (9) Councillors Tom Kelly, Mike Fletcher, Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**111. 20/01736/TBC 13 Loewen Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex, RM16 4UU**

The report was presented by Nadia Houghton.

Referring to the large trees at the back of the site, the Chair questioned whether these would need to be removed for the proposed dwellings. He commented that trees needed to be replaced with the same type of tree. He also sought more detail on the resident complaints in regards to access and parking. Nadia Houghton answered that the trees on the south western boundary of the site would remain and those on north western boundary would be removed for development. She said that there was a landscaping scheme proposed and conditioned within the recommendation. In regards to the resident complaints, she said that the proposed dwellings were large and wide detached properties which differed to the neighbouring properties on the street. The proposals would provide affordable housing; was fully policy compliant; met all Council standards; and the density was medium. There were no concerns with overlooking as there were no main room first floor windows and no concerns in regards to the neighbour amenity impact.

Councillor Rice said that he had received complaints that highlighted that some of the gardens were smaller than those in a neighbouring road. He asked the sizes of the gardens in the proposed dwellings. He also commented that there would be five houses built into a back garden with only two parking spaces and questioned where visitors would park. He also questioned what the average size of houses and flats were. Nadia Houghton answered that the smallest garden was just under 75 square metres and the largest was 130 square metres so overall, the site provided the appropriate private amenity space. In regards to parking, she said that the proposal was policy compliant and that two parking spaces had been provided for these three bedroom properties which other established properties in the area did not have. In regards to house and flat sizes, she said that the average flat size was 55 square metres and average house size was 100 square metres and that the proposed dwellings were 110 square metre gross internal floor area.

Councillor Lawrence mentioned that she and other Members had received emails from a resident who was disabled and had lived in the house that was currently on the site which had been adapted for his needs. She queried whether this was the same property. She commented that the house was adapted and large enough to house a disabled resident and their family and that the details of the property should be considered before development occurred. Nadia Houghton said that the Planning Department was not given these type of details in an application. She said that she could assume that the approach that the Housing Team had taken was based on housing needs. She went on to say that a new build would comply with building rights that an older property such as the one currently on the site would not so a new build would have wider corridor and hallway widths. Councillor Potter said that he had spoken with local residents who confirmed that the house currently on the site had previously been occupied by the disabled resident that Councillor Lawrence had mentioned.

Councillor Sammons said that she had received emails from residents that had said that the bedroom sizes were smaller than the bedrooms in a flat. She sought clarification on this. Nadia Houghton answered that the properties were three bedroom houses with an internal floor area was 110 square metres and that the third bedroom was in the loft space.

A speaker statement in support of the application was heard from Mark Baggoley, Agent.

The Chair noted the complaints and concerns raised from residents and said that the homes would benefit families that did not live there, some of which could currently be Council tenants. He felt it would provide people with the chance to buy their own homes as these were affordable homes. He noted that the garden sizes were not big but that other properties in the area had similar sized gardens. He said that he had some concerns on parking as there were only two spaces per property but thought there could be room on the site to park. He was minded to support the application.

Councillor Rice commented that five houses on the site was an overdevelopment on the site and that the third bedroom was in the loft space which would be cramped. He said that two or three properties on the site would be better and that there was no parking on the roads and that the site was within a built up residential area. He was minded to refuse the application due to density, parking issues and the small garden sizes. The Chair pointed out that people would have the choice on whether they wanted to buy a house there and said that the houses were of a similar size to the ones that was currently in the area. He also pointed out that the site was next to a green space.

Councillor Lawrence said that the house on the site had been altered for a disabled resident who had not been let back in the property which had been left empty and was now in a bad state. She said that larger homes were needed for disabled users and would also suit big families. Councillor Byrne agreed and said that the proposal was infilling and that building five houses was not eco-friendly in comparison to the one purpose built house on the site. The Vice-Chair commented that similar applications to the current application were usually recommended for refusal and questioned why the current application was recommended for approval. He also highlighted concerns that the house on the site had been for a disabled user but the site was now proposed for developed. He questioned why this had happened and what could be done differently. Councillor Potter said that the proposed dwellings would be out of character with the other houses in the street. Councillor Shinnick said that she was aware of the disabled resident's story. She also felt that five houses on the site was too many and that two or three would be better. The Chair said that the five houses were affordable housing for families that needed it and that it was in a good sustainable location.

The Chair proposed the Officer's recommendation to approve and there was no seconder.

Councillor Rice proposed to refuse the application and highlighted the reasons of overdevelopment with five houses on the site; parking issues with two spaces which was not enough as there was a lack of off street parking available; small gardens; a bedroom in the loft that took away storage spaces; and the development was out of character with the area.

Leigh Nicholson summarised Members earlier points. He said that the wording of the refusal would be agreed with the Chair. He summarised the reasons given and noted the two reasons for refusal were:

1. Overdevelopment due to the amenity space and number of units on the site.
2. The number of parking spaces wasn't considered to be acceptable with no visitor spaces.

The Vice-Chair said that another reason for refusal was that the house on the site was a specially adapted house which the Borough did not have many of and was needed.

Councillor Rice proposed the alternative motion to refuse for the reasons stated and Councillor Byrne seconded.

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

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

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**112. 20/01273/FUL Thames Park School**

The report was presented by Genna Henry.

The Vice-Chair commented that school places were needed in the Borough. He noted that the proposals did not fully meet the requirements of the NPPF and that the design consultant was not '100% happy' with the proposals as well. He questioned if the identified shortfalls would be addressed. Matthew Gallagher answered that design issues usually cropped up with school developments as the NPPF highlighted good designs in developments but new school developments usually had tight budget constraints. The report highlighted this and along with the Green Belt harm, these were balanced against the benefits of the scheme delivering new school places that were needed by September 2022. He explained that the Applicant was using modern methods construction as it was more sustainable and helped to keep costs down.

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

Referring to paragraph 5.15, Councillor Potter sought more detail on the objection raised. Matthew Gallagher explained that the in-house Urban Designer had suggested improvements to the scheme which included the internal layout; teaching environment; and some of the outdoor spaces which would require ground work to be undertaken to enable the site to be in a useable state.

The Chair noted that a lot of excavation work would be required to flatten the back of the site for outdoor sport facilities and questioned whether there would be issues of subsiding. He also highlighted concerns on potential future issues of having the outdoor sports facilities on a steep decline particularly if there were money constraints. Matthew Gallagher mentioned that the report covered HGV movements that would be part of the excavation works and subject to these conditions, Highways England did not object. He also mentioned that due to the changing levels of the site, there was a flood risk and conditions were in place to control surface water drainage. In regards to subsidence, he referred to conditions 21 and 22 that covered issues of ground



conditions. He said that no properties could potentially be affected by subsidence as the playing fields were constrained by the road network.

Councillor Sammons questioned what the school's catchment area was. She commented that students from East Tilbury went to the USP College by buses that were not consistent with school times and questioned how pupils would get to the proposed school if they were travelling from East Tilbury. Matthew Gallagher answered that most schools were now academies that set their own admissions criteria and that distance from the school was included in this so the catchment could potentially be the immediate area of Grays. He referred to page 147 of the Agenda which addressed transport and traffic issues and paragraph 7.80 outlined the bus routes that served the area. It was expected that pupils would walk to school if the catchment was local or take a bus due to the age group of the school but there was an on-site car park that had 18 drop-off and pick-up spaces. He mentioned that the on-site car park was 93 which met the draft standards requirement of 60 for that development. There was also a planning obligation under the s106 that would enable the Council's Highways Team to amend the parking controls locally. He also referred Members to pages 160 - 161 of the Agenda that outlined conditions that addressed transportation and highways.

Councillor Lawrence questioned the application could change in the future to add a sixth form onto the site. She said that if there years 12 and 13, pupils in these years could be driving into the school and was concerned that there would be parking issues. Matthew Gallagher answered that the Applicant had no intention to change the proposals to include a sixth form as secondary schools were needed now. He explained that if the plan was to change, it would be subject to planning permission.

Referring to the Car Parking Allocation Plan, the Chair noted the proposed drop off and pick up points in the car park. He pointed out that people would not necessarily go into the car park to use these as they may not be able to come back out. He stated that the service needed to be aware that people would park up on the side of the road outside to drop pupils off which was already happening with pupils attending the USP College. He felt that this issue would need to be revisited and considered in the future as this was a very busy road. He noted that along the road were a number of grass verges which he said could be turned into lay-bys instead. He asked what mitigation measures could be put in place to prevent a traffic blockage particularly with the recent approval of the development on Woodview. He highlighted that double yellow lines or enforcement was not the desired option.

Julian Howes explained that off street parking along that road was not possible due to the visibility splays through the grass verges. It was also be inappropriate due to the additional vehicle movements outside of the school entrance where vehicles would be manoeuvring into the junction of Woodview and Chadwell Road. He said that Highways had been concerned on potential parking outside the school and had asked for the drop off and pick up spaces in the car park. Highways had also asked for a car parking management plan that showed the school's time management for year groups coming in to avoid

congestion and ensure a one way system around the car park. The Chair referred to the use of lay-bys at the Harris Academy and Julian Howes said that the plan of Harris Academy differed to the current site for Thames Park School. Matthew Gallagher added that a lay-by along the road had a number of safety issues and would require a number of safety measures to be implemented which could become difficult.

A speaker statement in support of the application was heard from Paul Griffiths, Applicant's Representative.

Referring to the site plan, the Chair noted a 'zigzag pathway' in part A and part D and questioned if this was due to the changing levels of the site. He asked whether a solution could be provided to ensure that students did not cross the grass space next to the pathway as people usually did this and it caused an untidy appearance to the grass space. Matthew Gallagher confirmed that it was and that the pathway was for disability users and would need the gradients requirements to be compliant with disability regulations. He said that a planning condition could be considered to ensure people did not use the grass space as a shortcut.

Referring to Marshfoot Road that was at the bottom of the school, the Chair commented that this would be an undesirable drop off point as it was busy road in a residential area. He asked whether traffic measures were anticipated here to ensure the safety of pupils in case they were dropped off here. Julian Howes answered that the access there was for pupils who would be walking in from the local area. He went on to say that parking controls would be implemented at a later date to prevent inappropriate parking there.

Councillor Rice commented that the scheme was welcomed and much needed in the lower part of Grays. The Chair said that he was supportive of the scheme but asked that a planning condition be included to ensure that a traffic management system was in place to monitor the road of Woodview and that if this became a problem, it would be addressed. Leigh Nicholson said that one of the conditions in the report would be amended to reflect the Chair's point. Matthew Gallagher added that the condition on car parking management or the travel plan could be amended to include the clause on traffic monitoring.

Councillor Rice proposed the Officer's recommendation to approve and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

**FOR:** (9) Councillors Tom Kelly, Mike Fletcher, Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (0)

**113. 20/00290/FUL Fiddlers Reach**

The report was presented by Lucy Mannion.

The Chair noted that most of the HGVs travelled through Hedley Avenue with tankers accessing Wouldham Road and said that the address needed to be amended. He questioned whether there would be issues with HGVs using Wouldham Road. Lucy Mannion answered that there was an app-based system in place which required truck drivers to book into the site before arrival and had the correct directions on there. She said that the Applicant would amend the address to Hedley Avenue.

Noting the 'sui generis' use of the site, Councillor Potter sought clarification on this. Lucy Mannion explained that this referred to the use classes of the truck stops and this one was for standard operational use.

Councillor Lawrence questioned if there was a new road joining onto Hedley Avenue and if it would be in place before the site was operational. Lucy Mannion confirmed that the new road was already in place as part of the wider site application from 2018.

Steve Taylor sought clarification on whether HGVs could use Wouldham Road and questioned how this would be monitored. He also asked if the service centre on the site would be built out of containers and commented that a nicer building would be better. Lucy Mannion explained that HGVs were required to leave the site via Hedley Avenue for efficient operational use. She also said that the service centre would be built out of shipping containers in a modern design that was appropriate for the site. Julian Howes added that the site would have two gates to control which gate vehicles would exit out of. Tankers would be exiting onto Wouldham Road and all other vehicles onto Hedley Avenue.

A speaker statement in support of the application was heard from Matthew Wood, Agent.

The Chair commented that the site was the perfect fit for that location and was pleased that the Applicant had worked with the Highways Team to ensure that the proposals worked. Councillor Lawrence said that the work of lorry drivers was appreciated as they had kept the food supply coming into the Borough and that the site would provide them with a place to stop and rest. Councillor Rice said that he welcomed this new facility and it would take the pressure off the Borough's lay-bys and roads.

Councillor Lawrence proposed the Officer's recommendation to approve and was seconded by Councillor Rice.

**FOR:** (9) Councillors Tom Kelly, Mike Fletcher, Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Angela Lawrence, Dave Potter, Gerard Rice, Sue Sammons and Sue Shinnick.

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED: (0)**

**114. 20/01680/FUL Claylands, 186 Branksome Avenue, Stanford Le Hope, Essex, SS17 8DF**

The report was presented by Nadia Houghton.

Councillor Byrne commented that the Applicant had been running their business 'under the radar' for the last two years and questioned whether this had complied with planning laws. He also mentioned that there was an investment into reducing traffic in Branksome Avenue but that the proposal would bring in an additional 60 traffic movements and questioned if this had been considered. He also asked if the minibus on the site had been considered as it took up a parking space and the commercial waste collection.

Nadia Houghton explained that the Applicant ran a childminding business and was looking to expand. She said that the Council had received the first enforcement complaint in September 2020 and noted the neighbour complaints. She highlighted that Members were to consider the application that was before them. In regards to commercial waste, she said that this had been considered in terms of the impact on resident amenity and that the minibus was a SORN vehicle. In regards to traffic movements, Julian Howes said that the Highways Team did not have concerns here as it was not a significant increase. He highlighted that the Highways Team had concerns to the accessibility of the parking and whether the six spaces was feasible for the proposal and to achieve the drop-off and pick-up facilities required.

The Chair commented that it was usual for people to be childminders in their own homes and sought further details in this case. Nadia Houghton explained that a childminding business could operate from home which was informal and usually had a handful of children to look after. She said that in the Applicant's case, this number of children had increased and required expansion into a more formal setting like a nursery.

A speaker statement in support of the application was presented by Dean Hermitage, Applicant's Representative.

Councillor Byrne noted the number of children and staff to be on the site in the proposal and commented on the number of traffic movements which would be dangerous for the cycle route in the area. He also noted that the proposal detailed different play times for children outside and mentioned an existing building that had been closed which was ideal for this proposal. He said that the proposal was good but not in the right location. Nadia Houghton answered that the application generated a need for at least nine parking spaces along with a drop-off and pick-up point to ensure the safe dual use of the site as it only had one formal access point which made manoeuvring and parking difficult. She said that it was not unusual to have a nursery in a residential area but was unusual to have it operating from the use of a dwelling.

The Chair said that the proposal was good but not in the right location given the neighbour complaints. He said that nurseries were important for the local community and much needed and noted Councillor Byrne's mention of an ideal building for this business in the area. Members agreed that the proposal was right but in the wrong location.

Councillor Shinnick questioned whether staggered dropping off times could be implemented to avoid traffic issues. Nadia Houghton explained that this had been considered under parking concerns but that it had to be carefully managed by the Applicant. This would not alter the harm caused to the residential amenity.

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

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

**AGAINST:** (0)

**ABSTAINED:** (1) Councillor Sue Shinnick.

**The meeting finished at 10.33 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)**

This page is intentionally left blank