

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 19 August 2021 at 6.00 pm

- Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher, James Halden, Susan Little (substitute for Colin Churchman), Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson
- Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative
- Apologies:** Councillors Colin Churchman
- In attendance:** Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Matthew Ford, Chief Highways Engineer
Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager
Chris Purvis, Major Applications Manager
Genna Henry, Senior Planning Officer
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor
Kenna-Victoria Healey, Senior Democratic Services Officer
-

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

26. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2021 was approved as a true and correct record.

27. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

28. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Halden declared that he was pre-determined on 20/01761/FUL. He stated that he would remove himself from participating on this item and would be speaking as the Ward Councillor.

29. 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

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair declared that correspondence had been received from all three of the Aveley and Upland Councillors, Julian

Sutton (agent) and a number of residents of Ship Lane on application 21/00931/FUL.

Councillor Byrne declared that correspondence had been received from a CEO of a Football team #United on application 21/00931/FUL.

Councillor Halden declared that correspondence had been received from a resident addressing him as the Deputy Mayor on application 21/00931/FUL.

Councillor Liddiard declared a telephone call had been received from Andy Ansell on application 21/00931/FUL.

Councillor Fletcher declared that telephone calls had been received from Ward Councillors for Aveley and Uplands and the agent's communications team on application 21/00931/FUL.

30. Planning Appeals

The Committee was satisfied with the report.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted

31. 20/00592/OUT The Springhouse, Springhouse Road, Corringham, Essex, SS17 7QT (deferred)

The report was presented by the Major Applications Manager.

The Chair commented on the podium parking, suggesting that the lower car would go down underground. Officers explained the photo within the presentation was an example of how the podium parking could look. The Chair continued by enquiring as to who was managed parking on the site the Major Applications Manager explain the on-site manager from the management company would be responsible for parking on the site and further explained it would be for residents to use the podium parking with additional visitors parking being provided.

The Chair further enquired as to the football pitches, although they were not part of the application if Members were minded to approve the application whether they include a condition that the field be used for football. The Major Applications Manager explained to Members this had been raised with the applicant, who had explained that the football pitches had last been used 4/5 years ago and at present there was not an interest in using the pitches. He continued to advise that the applicant was happy to work with the Council in the future and if the sports pitches were to be re-used again.

Councillor Byrne commented when the application was last presented to the committee he felt he would support it, now he was not sure. He continued by commenting the application was close to town centre impacting on parking in

the area, although he could see the merit of the podium parking. He further enquired if there was any future prospect for development of the football pitches.. The Major Applications Manager advised that it was just the application before Members which they were to make a decision on, however at present there were no plans or live planning applications to redevelop the football team pitches which were protected by the planning policy.

Councillor Fletcher commented on the list of conditions on the recommendation for approval. He further stated the construction of the podium parking was a good idea however he was concerned it may be difficult to fix should something go wrong such as a power cut, and sought as to whether there was somewhere else within the country this car parking system has been used and was working efficiently. The Major Applications Manager referred the Committee to condition 18 within the report which related to the podium parking and confirmed there were other applications for other sites around the country which has used the podium parking system.

The Chair of the Committee stated this was the first time podium parking was to be used within the borough and mentioned it would be interesting to see it up and running in a few months' time.

During debate the Chair stated he felt it was the right action for the Committee to have deferred this application and he would be interested to visit the site in a few months' time to see how the development was getting on. Councillor Byrne commented that the application stated sports provision was included however he did not feel that a bowls club represented sports facilities.

The Chair proposed recommendation A of the officer's recommendation and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

FOR: (6) Councillor Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Mike Fletcher and Lee Watson

AGAINST: (1) Councillor Gary Byrne

ABSTAINED: (0)

The Chair proposed recommendation B of the officer's recommendation and was seconded by the Vice-Chair. Councillor Watson asked that this also be in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

FOR: (7) Councillor Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Mike Fletcher and Lee Watson

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAINED: (0)

The Committee also agreed the following informatives as suggested by the Chair:

1. For the applicant to work with the Council's leisure and sports officers to encourage use of the sports pitches to the rear of the site to help meet local needs for sports pitches in the Borough with a particular emphasis on the need for football pitches for existing football clubs.
2. For the applicant to provide the Council with the opportunity to revisit the site in 18 months or when occupied to see the development as built out and to see how the podium car parking spaces operate.

(Councillors Halden and Little did not participate in this application due to not present at the June meeting when this application was first presented)

32. 21/00931/FUL Thurrock Football Club, Ship Lane, Aveley, Essex RM19 1YN

The report was presented by the Major Applications Manager, who started by updating Members with the following housekeeping items which included:

- One additional objection from a member of the public who raised concerns about traffic pollution, excessive noise
- There was letter received from one of the Aveley Ward Councillors, Councillor Pearce. Although it was noted that the site was actually within the West Thurrock and South Stifford Ward.
- Email from Councillor Churchman who agreed with the raised by Councillor Pearce.
- Emails regarding concerns of traffic, Green belt flood risk and HGV movements
- A letter from the Planning Agent

The Chair sought clarification that when comparing to a similar application like Tilbury football club, officers were saying because the Ship Lane Stadium was previously developed there could be a scenario where developers could reapply with a PDI centre and on the basis the application could be up for approval.

The Major Applications Manager commented when Members were presented with an application back in January which was for the consideration for Tilbury football club and which was judged on its merits, that too was a Green Belt site for refusal, however it proposed residential development and a new stadium with a 3G pitch. He continued to explain the current applicant had said they could have a fallback position whereby if the application were unsuccessful they could make a new application in the form of a PDI facility on the site of the existing stadium and as long as there would be no greater impact on the existing site it could be policy compliant with paragraph no. 149 of the NPPF.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.24pm for technology issues to be resolved. The meeting recommenced at 7.37pm.

Following questions from Councillor Little Members heard how the applicant had provided officers a plan showing an idea of how the proposed width restriction and bus lane would work. In relation to the highway the plan did show some localised widening of Ship Lane to facilitate the bus lane, however this would be subject to further detailed design, and the applicant entering into a section 278 agreement with the Council to facilitate those works. The Chief Highways Engineer commented that Members should be confident that if agreed the layout of the bus lane and width restriction would be to the Councils design standards, and the applicant would then have to offer it up for adoption with the council as it would form part of the Highway. The Chief Highways Engineer continued to advise with regards to the route and vehicles entering into Aveley village, as part of officer's comments they had recommended subject to a section 106 agreement there would be no material impact in the village.

The Committee heard there was quite a substantial amount of PDI and car storage which had been permitted at Purfleet and as suggested there were new access arrangements as part of that package of schemes. Works had started in terms of diversion works on the network, although as yet section 278 agreement which was required to facilitate the roundabout was yet to be finalised. Members were advised in respect of the Purfleet port there didn't appear to be any long-standing issues with regard to the PDI operations on that site.

The Committee agreed to suspend standing orders at 8.28pm to allow the agenda to be completed.

Councillor Halden remarked there was a huge amount of weight on the argument of Green Belt land which he understood, however the weight he felt was not being attributed for things like stopping the HGVs running through Ship Lane and to restore the football club back to be used by the local community. He continued he felt the weight to be attached to the creation of jobs was a subjective judgement and any form of employment growth whether it was one job or 1000 jobs was good for local residents.

Councillor Piccolo sought clarification on the turnaround facility as to whether HGVs wouldn't be able to pass through it. He continued by commenting he thought there had been a consultation with local residents and the outcome was they would prefer a roundabout to allow easy flow of traffic.

The Chief Highways Engineer confirmed that the Council undertook a consultation in 2019 where there were five options to try and mitigate the harm of HGV movement on Ship Lane. The one scheme that came out on top in terms of the most resident support was for a roundabout option at the junction but that did incorporate a bus lane within it, so the idea was to have a width restriction with a suitable turnaround facility for HGVs to be able to turn

round and go back should they still come off junction 31 and progress up Ship Lane which was one of the overriding problems.

Speaker Statements were heard from:

- Teresa Webster, Resident – in objection
- Julian Sutton, Agent– in support.

During the debate the Chair of the Committee stated he felt if Members were minded to vote to reject the application, it could be a lost opportunity for sports provision in the borough. He continued that in terms of HGV's, realistically, a bus lane with camera could solve the problem and if it was the case then it could potentially save the Council up to £1million.

Councillor Kelly observed the application was £7 million of private investment from American firm who could deliver jobs for local people and although he understood the concerns over the environment he felt he could support the application.

Councillor Halden stated he was happy to second the application for approval. He said listening to the debate, he didn't see employment development on the site as particularly harmful. He continued by mentioning HGVs were a known problem but there was a solution in place and it was known there was problem with the lack of sports clubs again a solution was presented. Councillor Halden commented he felt the application provided tremendous benefits which out weighted the negative.

Steve Taylor commented he had heard Members comments but overall the application was inappropriate in the Green Belt. He reminded the Committee of officers commented about the risk of flooding from the Thames and the impact it could have on the site.

Councillor Fletcher mentioned he felt it was important that Members remembered the indisputable downside of the application which was the loss of Green Belt land, which couldn't be retrieved. As far as the discussion of HGV he was left neutral as he wasn't convinced the suggested mitigation would stop the clogging up of Ship Lane.

Councillor Little remarked she had listened to all the debate and she didn't feel the application was acceptable on Green Belt land and she agreed with other Members that there would be other areas better suited for need of the application.

Councillor Watson stated she was not going to support the application. She continued by commenting she felt the fact the site was located in the Green Belt outweighed so much more of losing it to an industrial company. Councillor Watson further commented that in terms of the HGV's, she thought it would be too much going through a small area of the borough.

The Vice-Chair proposed officers recommendation to refuse planning permission and was seconded by Councillor Piccolo.

FOR: (7) Councillor Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Terry Piccolo, Gary Byrne, Georgette Polley, Mike Fletcher, Sue Little and Lee Watson

AGAINST: (2) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair) and James Halden

ABSTAINED: (0)

33. 20/01761/FUL - Windy Ridge, 251 Branksome Avenue, Stanford Le Hope, Essex, SS17 8DF

The report was presented by the Senior Planning Officer.

Councillor Byrne enquired as to how many dwellings were required for Section 106 money to be required. The Senior Planning Officer explained Section 106 funding was generally captured for a minimum of 10 dwellings, however this site was proposing 9 dwellings. Councillor Byrne followed up his query by stating residents of the Homesteads felt they were protected from infilling on sites and sought clarification from officers as to whether this was the case. The Senior Planning Officer explained there were some areas within the Homesteads which were protected from development however this site was not one of them and therefore planning permission had been identified as acceptable development.

Councillor Fletcher raised concerns at to policy CSTP23 and whether this would be unsustainable at appeal. The Senior Planning Officer responded explaining when the application was presented at the January 2020 meeting it was refused planning permission relating to the issue of character, most of which was in relation to the existing bungalow outside mainly because the bungalow was single storey and this was adjacent to a two storey property. She further commented that the applicant had taken on officers and committee Member comments and therefore the application in front of Members was for approval.

Members enquired as to whether there would be an impact of traffic in the area due to the new housing. The Senior Planning Officer explained on the site there was resident parking spaces as well as visitor parking. She continued by stating Highway Officers had been consulted and they had no objections to the application commenting the application was in line with the draft parking standard. Councillor Little continued by seeking as to the effects of the increased traffic in the surrounding areas. Councillor Byrne stated there were 4000 car movements a day along Branksome Road including vehicles speeding. The Chief Highways Engineer commented that the current speed data and volume data on Branksome Avenue of two-way traffic flow was nearer to 4000 movements a day, and the peak hour flows were around 200-300 movements in the morning peak times.

Speaker Statements were heard from:

- James Halden, Ward Councillor – in objection.
- Mr Jolins, Resident – in objection
- Michael OConnell, Applicant– in support.

During the debate Councillor Byrne stated that nine dwellings being developed on the site was just under the recommended amount before an applicant would have to pay the funds toward the Council and would produce daily issues for the residents living on the site as it was for current residents who lived in new infilled sites for services such as bins collections. In addition the area was already trying to cope with up to 4000 car movements a day.

Councillor Fletcher stated he felt the application was over development within the area with the quantity of homes been too many, he also felt it was changing the character of the area which they were seeking permission to develop.

The Chair commented by reminding Members if they were mindful to refuse the application then they would need clear and concise material considerations. He continued to state that if the application was refused and put in front of an appeal inspector he was pretty certain that the appeal could be approved.

Councillor Piccolo remarked that section 106 funding could be captured in the case of 10 dwellings, however this development was under this and although he didn't like in filling of areas, he felt on occasion his could support this application.

(Councillor Halden did not participate in this application due to his declaration of interest.)

The Chair proposed officers recommendations to approve planning permission and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

FOR: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson

AGAINST: (3) Councillors Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher and Sue Little.

ABSTAINED: (0)

The meeting finished at 10.25 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**

This page is intentionally left blank