

<p>Reference: 21/01548/FUL</p>	<p>Site: 2 Morant Road Chadwell St Mary Grays Essex RM16 4UA</p>
<p>Ward: Chadwell St Mary</p>	<p>Proposal: Demolition of existing 1no. residential dwelling to be replaced with a contemporary building containing 3no. self-contained apartments with associated parking and landscaping.</p>

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
DAPA_1533_3 03_02	Proposed Plans	5th November 2021
DAPA_1533_3 04_00	Proposed Parking Plans	28th September 2021
DAPA_1533_3 05-00	Proposed Parking Tracking	28th September 2021
DAPA_1533_1 01_00	Site Location Plan	4th September 2021
DAPA_1533_1 02_01	Existing Site Layout	4th September 2021
DAPA_1533_3 00_01	Proposed Site Layout	5th November 2021
DAPA_1533_3 01_00	Proposed Floor Plans	4th September 2021
DAPA_1533_3 02_00	Proposed Elevations	4th September 2021

The application is also accompanied by:

- Covering letter dated 29.09.2021
- Design and Access Statement dated 29.08.2021
- Email in relation to vehicle sight splays dated 03.11.2021

Applicant:

Validated:

Mr Smith	6 September 2021 Date of expiry: 10 December 2021 (Extension of time agreed with applicant)
Recommendation: REFUSE	

This application is scheduled for determination by the Council’s Planning Committee because it has been called in by Cllrs A Mayes, A Carter and T Kelly (in accordance with the Constitution Chapter 5, Part 3 (b), 2.1 (d) (ii)) to examine the impact upon the character of the area, privacy and loss of light upon neighbouring properties and parking.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

1.1 Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing end of terrace dwelling and the erection of a two storey building providing three flats (1x 2 bed and 2x 1 bed) with associated parking and landscaping. The existing property benefits from a side garden in which the proposal would cover much of this site.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application site is located within a residential area which features a mixture of semi-detached and terraced properties. The application site is a corner plot and features a two storey dwelling that adjoins No.17 Longhouse Road but has its principal elevation facing Morant Road.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Pre-Application Reference	Description	Decision
21/30072/PMIN	Demolition of the existing 1no. residential dwelling to be replaced with a contemporary building containing 4no. self-contained apartments. Proposal includes the provision of 4no. new parking spaces and includes landscaping and ancillary works.	Advice Given

4.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council's website via public access at the following link: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

4.2 PUBLICITY:

This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters and public site notice which has been displayed nearby. There were 10 comments received objecting to the proposal. A petition of objection was also received which has 129 signatures.

4.3 The matters raised in the objections are summarised as:

- Morant Road is already at its capacity of dwellings;
- The appearance of the proposal is out of character within the street scene;
- Unacceptable use of materials;
- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Loss of light to neighbouring properties;
- Loss of amenity;
- Overlooking;
- Noise;
- Unacceptable impacts upon the adjoining property ;
- The proposal could cause damage to the adjoining property;
- Additional traffic;
- Access to site;
- Potential parking on the surrounding footpaths and highway;
- Existing parking on the street currently obstructs refuse and emergency vehicles, the proposal would exacerbate this ;
- Obstruction to vehicle and pedestrian visibility;
- The alley located to the rear of the site is current use as through road for school children;
- There has already been much development within the surrounding area, this scheme would result in overdevelopment of the area ;
- Environmental Pollution;

- Litter/Smells.

4.4 HIGHWAYS:

Further information required in relation to pedestrian and vehicular visibility plays and access to the proposed visitor parking bay.

4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

No Objection subject to conditions addressing noise mitigation measures, a pre-demolition crack survey, methods of controlling dust and the submission and agreement of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).

4.6 LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGY:

No objection, subject to landscaping condition and RAMS mitigation

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 5.1 The revised NPPF was published on 20 July 2021 and sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 2 of the Framework confirms the tests in s.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and s.70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 11 states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration the current proposals:

2. Achieving sustainable development
4. Decision making
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well-designed places
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Planning Practice Guidance

- 5.2 In March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched its planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the

previous planning policy guidance documents cancelled when the NPPF was launched. PPG contains a number of subject areas, with each area containing several subtopics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application comprise:

- Air Quality
- Before submitting an application
- Appropriate Assessment
- Consultation and pre-decision matters
- Design
- Determining a planning application
- Housing supply and delivery
- Effective use of land
- Housing needs of different groups
- Housing: optional technical standards
- Making an application
- Noise
- Use of planning conditions

Local Planning Policy

Thurrock Local Development Framework (as amended) 2015

- 5.3 The Council adopted the “Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development Plan Document” in 2015. The following Core Strategy policies apply to the proposals:

Overarching Sustainable Development Policy:

- OSDP1: Promotion of Sustainable Growth and Regeneration in Thurrock.

Spatial Policies:

- CSSP1: Sustainable Housing and Locations

Thematic Policies:

- CSTP1: Strategic Housing Provision
- CSTP22: Thurrock Design
- CSTP23: Thurrock Character and Distinctiveness

Policies for the Management of Development

- PMD1: Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity
- PMD2: Design and Layout
- PMD8: Parking Standards
- PMD9: Road Network Hierarchy
- PMD10: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
- PMD12: Sustainable Buildings
- PMD13: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation
- PMD14: Carbon Neutral Development

Thurrock Local Development Framework 1997

- Annex 1 – Criteria relating to the control of development in residential areas

Thurrock Design Guide – Residential Alterations and Extensions (RAE): September 2017 - SPD

Thurrock Local Plan

- 5.4 In February 2014 the Council embarked on the preparation of a new Local Plan for the Borough. Between February and April 2016 the Council consulted formally on an 'Issues and Options (Stage 1)' document and simultaneously undertook a 'Call for Sites' exercise. In December 2018 the Council began consultation on an Issues and Options [Stage 2 Spatial Options and Sites] document, this consultation has now closed and the responses have been considered and reported to Council. On 23 October 2019 the Council agreed the publication of the Issues and Options 2 Report of Consultation on the Council's website and agreed the approach to preparing a new Local Plan.

Thurrock Design Strategy

- 5.5 In March 2017 the Council launched the Thurrock Design Strategy. The Design Strategy sets out the main design principles to be used by applicants for all new development in Thurrock. The Design Strategy is a supplementary planning document (SPD) which supports policies in the adopted Core Strategy.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The assessment below covers the following areas:

- I. Principle of the development
- II. Design, Layout and Impact Upon the Surrounding Area
- III. Provision of a Suitable Residential Living Environment

- IV. Effect on Neighbouring Properties
- V. Traffic Impact, Access and Car Parking
- VI. Other Matters
- VII. Balancing Exercise

I. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 6.2 The site includes the dwelling and gardens of the residential property of 2 Morant Road. The application site lies within a residential area and there are no specific land use constraints; the Council's Core Strategy seeks to direct development to the existing urban area.
- 6.3 Therefore, it is considered that the principle of residential development within the urban area is acceptable subject to compliance with relevant development management policies and any other material considerations. Moreover, it is noted that the Council is not presently able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and, therefore, the NPPF advises that planning permission for the development should be granted unless the harm caused clearly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the proposal.

II. DESIGN, LAYOUT AND IMPACT UPON THE SURROUNDING AREA

- 6.4 The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment as a key part of sustainable development. Although planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes, they should seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy 2015 accord with the NPPF in requiring development to have high quality design and to be well related to its surroundings.
- 6.5 The properties within the area are generally uniform in scale, layout and design, with the majority of the surrounding development comprising of terraces and semi-detached dwellings with gabled roofs. Moreover, due to the dwellings surrounding the site appearing to be of similar age, the materials and overall character of the built form in the area is largely consistent. A distinct characteristic of the area is that properties located on corner plots within both the immediate and wider locality maintain a large side garden such that the dwelling is set back from the both road frontages. In addition, the properties located within Morant Road which are to the west of the site, benefit from large front gardens, this provides a sense of openness along the road and creates a notional building line, which the side elevation of the dwelling house forms at the application site forms a part of. In comparison to the existing situation, the proposed built form would be located much closer to the boundary of the site that abuts the footpath of Morant Road.

- 6.6 The proposal seeks to replace the book-ended terrace with an attached building that would feature a cross gabled roof with two storey elements projecting forward of the existing terrace fronting Longhouse Road and Morant Road. Whilst the part of the building that would attach to the terrace would be the same height, the cross-wing would be taller and would feature a two-storey parapet feature around the entrance at the south elevation. As a result of the scale and positioning of the proposed development, the building would project forward of the notional building line of the properties located to the west of the site in Morant Road and be of such substantial bulk and mass that it would cause the proposed building to be of substantially increased visual prominence within the street scene in comparison to the existing building.
- 6.7 The height of the cross-wing element would cause that part of the building to be entirely out-of-keeping with the scale, proportions and form of the existing terrace and the other built form of the area. As a result of this, and the building being of wholly different appearance, the proposal would be jarringly at odds with the character and appearance of the other buildings within the locality. The building would show minimal regard to the scale or appearance of the surrounding built form and would not show adequate regard to the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.8 Furthermore, as a result of the building extending close to the boundary of the plot that abuts Morant Road, and the provision of a substantial two storey projection to the front, the building would disrupt the notional building line that exists within both Longhouse Road and Morant Road. This would cause the development to be at odds with the pattern and rhythm of development within the locality. Moreover, as a result of this and the positioning at a corner plot, the building would be of significant prominence in views along both Longhouse Road and Morant Road and this prominence would exaggerate the effect of the building being of a scale and appearance that is wholly at odds with the character of the area. Whilst it is not necessarily essential for development to replicate the existing built form of an area, in this case it is considered that the proposal would represent such a variation to the pattern and character of the built form in the area that it would be visually disruptive, incongruous and discordant.
- 6.9 The effect of the development would also be exacerbated by the site featuring a substantially reduced area of soft landscaping as opposed to the existing situation. The building and the footpaths and parking area of the proposal would result in hardsurfacing and built form dominating the site to a far greater extent than the existing situation. The loss of soft landscaping along with the loss of a sense of spaciousness at the corner plot would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the street and detract from the visually amenities of the locality.

- 6.10 The provision of a single storey extension with a balcony and glazed screen at one side would also be an alien feature in the context of the surrounding area.
- 6.11 The proposed layout, due to the retention of the front garden area, would provide some scope to provide new planting which would lessen the adverse effect upon the streetscape. However, this is not considered substantial enough to outweigh the adverse impact of the proposal, as discussed previously within the report.
- 6.12 For these reasons, the proposal would have an unacceptable visual effect on the character and appearance of the site, the street scenes of Morant Road and Longhouse Road and the locality in general. The scale, appearance and prominence of the built form at the site would fail to reflect the surroundings and would not be sympathetic to the pattern of development that is an important characteristic of the locality. Therefore, the proposal would be unacceptable and contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance contained within the NPPF and the Council's Design Guidance SPD.

III. PROVISION OF A SUITABLE RESIDENTIAL LIVING ENVIRONMENT

- 6.13 The plans submitted detail the three proposed flats (comprising of 1 x2 bed and 2 x1 bed units) would be of a reasonable size in line with the Council's adopted standards of 45 sq.m minimum floor area for one bedroom units and 55 sq.m minimum floor area for two bedroom flats, and the national technical space standards. Therefore, the proposal would provide adequate internal residential environment for the future occupiers and would provide sufficient light and outlook to habitable rooms.
- 6.14 Whilst the development would retain some landscaped setting to the east and south of the site, it is considered that this level of amenity area is limited in size and would be unusable as private amenity space given its layout and due to the lack of screening or privacy to this area. The minimum requirement stipulated within the 'saved' Annex 1 and 2 of the Borough Local Plan [1997] seeks a provision of 25sq.m of amenity space for a one bedroom unit and 50sq.m for a two bedroom unit. Whilst one-bed schemes can in some circumstances provide landscaped setting in lieu of any meaningful private amenity space, the fact that the proposal includes 2 bed units, which could be occupied by families, means that the proposal would provide inadequate private amenity space for future occupiers of the building. The first floor balcony is not, in itself, a reason to reach a different conclusion in this respect.

- 6.15 Therefore, it is considered that the limited amenity space and the overall massing of the development, as discussed previously, is indicative of the overdevelopment and the cramped and contrived nature of the site would be to the detriment of future occupants of the site. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to PMD1 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy.
- 6.16 The Council's Environmental Health Officer was consulted in relation to the proposal and advised that the internal layout places the kitchen and living room above a ground floor bedroom, which is not an ideal layout due to the level of noise that could arise. However, given that any approved building would need to comply with Building Control Approved Document Part E "Resistance to the passage of sound," it is considered that this other legislation provides ample reassurance that the living conditions of future occupiers would be acceptable in this respect.

IV. EFFECT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

- 6.17 Whilst the Council's Residential Alterations and Extension (RAE) guidance primarily relates to residential extensions, it is considered that the guidance should also be applicable to this development which affects the relationship between proposed and existing residential properties and the assessment of the impact on living conditions can be expected to take the same approach.
- 6.18 The proposed building would be attached to the south west elevation of 17 Longhouse Road and would project 5.7m further to the rear than that of the existing dwelling. It is noted that No.17 has three outbuildings located upon the shared boundary with the application site, however, these are considered to be modest in both their mass and scale.
- 6.19 The proposal would not result in a breach of the 45 degree maximum height, when taken from the closest ground floor kitchen window located at No.17. However, the proposed dwelling would significantly exceed the 60 degrees maximum depth when taken from the centre of the closest ground floor window located at No.17. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that this room is served by another window which is set away from this shared boundary and, as such, the affected window is not the only source of light. Therefore, on balance, given that the proposal would not result in a breach of the 45 degree maximum height or 60 degree maximum depth to the primary light source to this room, it is not considered that the proposal would have an unacceptably detrimental impact on the light received within the habitable rooms located within No.17.
- 6.20 However, it is considered that due to the height of the proposal, rearward projection beyond the rear elevation of No.17 and proximity to the shared boundary fence, the proposal would have a significant overbearing and imposing impact, creating a

sense of enclosure to the private amenity space of the adjoining property. Whilst the outbuildings located upon the shared boundary are noted, these are not considered to be of a scale that would be comparable and, therefore, their presence does not give reason to find the proposal acceptable in this respect. Whilst the height of the building would not cause an undue loss of light within this neighbouring dwelling at no. 17, the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of that dwelling would be substantial and harmful to an extent that would be contrary to policy PMD1 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015, the RAE and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

- 6.21 A balcony is also proposed at first floor level to be located within the flank elevation, a 1.8m obscure glazed privacy screen is proposed to obscure any direct overlooking into the private amenity space of No.17. The views afforded from the balcony would be directed towards the rear garden of No.17 and therefore, as the proposal is within a residential setting where there is a degree of mutual overlooking, the balcony raises no significant concerns in relation to the loss of privacy to No.17. No windows are located within the flank elevation of the proposal which faces onto No.17, therefore the proposal would result in a limited loss of privacy or overlooking to No.17.
- 6.22 Whilst the proposal would extend across much of the application site, a reasonable distance is retained between the proposal and the other surrounding properties, as such it is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of light or overbearing impact adversely affecting the amenities of other surrounding neighbours.
- 6.23 The proposal would introduce windows within its front and flank elevations that would appear larger than those typically found within the street scene. Eight windows or openings are proposed at ground floor level and nine at first floor level. Therefore, additional views would be afforded compared with the existing position. Although there are more and larger windows facing neighbouring properties at 13 and 15 Longhouse Road, given the separation distance between dwellings and the orientation of those windows, it not considered that the proposal would cause a loss of privacy within any other property to an extent that would be unacceptable or justify the refusal of the application for this reason.
- 6.24 Views would be afforded towards the flank elevation of No 4 Morant Road, and during a visit to the site it was established that a first floor window is located within the flank of the adjacent property. However, upon inspection this window is obscure glazed and appears to serve a hallway. Therefore, whilst the proposed balcony would afford additional views towards this neighbouring property compared with what is existing, the views would be direct towards the flank elevation and away

from the private amenity space of this neighbouring property. It is therefore considered that the balcony would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy to No.4 Morant Road to an unacceptable extent.

- 6.25 Some of the matters relating to the means of constructing the proposed building that have been raised by interested parties and the Council's Environmental Health Officer could be addressed through appropriate condition. However, some relate to matters that fall outside the remit of planning control and could not be controlled. These matters have to be treated as 'non-material' to the planning assessment and could not represent a reason to refuse the application.

V. TRAFFIC IMPACT, ACCESS AND CAR PARKING

- 6.26 The parking to be provided for the three proposed flats is to be located to the rear of the site. The proposed parking block plan details four off street parking spaces and access to these spaces would be obtained via an access road located to the rear of the site.
- 6.27 During the course of the application, the Council's Highway Officer has raised concerns in relation to the adequacy of the visibility splays provided to serve pedestrians and drivers and the potential for conflict to arise between those accessing the site and the users of the surrounding highways, particularly as a result of the reliance on the use of the adjacent road that leads to the rear of the site. Additional details have been provided by the applicant in respect of these matters, but it remains the case that the Highways Officer considers that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety and therefore refusal is recommended.
- 6.28 For these reasons, it is considered that the current layout is likely to result in unsafe visibility for pedestrian and drivers, which is harmful to road safety. The application is therefore contrary to policy PMD2 of the adopted Core Strategy 2015.

VI. OTHER MATTERS

- 6.29 The Council's Landscape and Ecology Advisor has commented that, whilst there are no trees located within the site that are covered by Tree Preservation Orders, a small Cherry tree and other young specimens are located to the rear of the site would require removal to allow for the proposed parking area. Whilst these are not high quality specimens, they do provide some visual amenity in an area with very few trees. However, their removal due to their low quality would not warrant a reason for refusal, but a landscaping scheme would need to be submitted if consent were to be granted.

6.30 The site is within the Essex Coast RAMS Zone of Influence and the proposed development falls within the scope of the RAMS as relevant development. Without mitigation the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on the Thames Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area. To avoid the developer needing to undertake their own individual Habitat Regulations Assessment the Essex Local Planning Authorities within the Zones of Influence have developed a mitigation strategy to deliver the measures to address direct and in-combination effects of recreational disturbance on SPA. A tariff to fund the mitigation, which is payable for all additional new dwellings is currently set at £127.30 per dwelling. Therefore, it is necessary for the LPA to apply a tariff of £254.60 given that the proposal would result in a net increase of two units. This would be secured via legal agreement in the event permission were to be granted and has been confirmed by the planning agent through email.

VII. BALANCING EXERCISE

6.31 As set out above, the NPPF indicates that residential development should be supported unless any harm caused clearly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the proposal. In this case, whilst the shortfall of housing is noted and is acknowledged to be significant, it is considered that the benefit of providing two flats would be limited. Conversely, substantial weight should be afforded to the harm caused in relation to the visual effect of the development, the detrimental impacts upon No.17 Longhouse Road and the effect on highway safety. The harm in each of these respects, when considered both separately and cumulatively, clearly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the proposal. As such, the NPPF does not indicate that the proposal should be approved and does not outweigh the development plan which also indicates that planning permission should be refused.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR REFUSAL

7.1 The proposal would result in a feature that is excessive in its scale, bulk and footprint when viewed within the context of not only its site, but within its terrace and wider area. The reduction in the side garden is considered to be to the detriment of the character of the area. Due to the overall mass of the proposal, the provided amenity area is considered to be less than adequate which is not only to the detriment of the future occupiers but also represents an overdevelopment of the site contrary to policies PMD1, PMD2, CSTP22, the RAE and the NPPF.

7.2 The proposal due to its height, rearward projection beyond the rear elevation of No.17 and proximity to the shared boundary fence, would be likely to result in a significant overbearing and imposing impact, creating a sense of enclosure to the direct private amenity space of the adjoining property. The effect on the living

conditions of the occupiers of that dwelling would be substantial and harmful to an extent that would be contrary to policy PMD1 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015, the RAE and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

- 7.3 The proposed parking provision within its current layout raises concerns in relation to both pedestrian and vehicle safety due to the lack of sufficient visibility splays, when viewed in conjunction of the potential awkward manoeuvres from the proposed parking and that access to plot 1 is located adjacent to this parking. The proposal would unacceptably impact upon highway and pedestrian safety and therefore it is considered the proposal would be contrary to Policies PMD2, PMD8 and PMD9.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by virtue of its scale, bulk, design, prominent positioning and forward projection beyond both notional building lines located upon Longhouse Road and Morant Road would not contribute positively to the appearance of the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. In addition, by reason of the extent of development across the site and lack of adequate private amenity space, result in a cramped and contrived form of development that would be indicative of the overdevelopment of the site which would adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is, therefore, unacceptable and contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23, and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015, the Council's Design Guidance SPD and the NPPF.
2. The proposal would, by reason of the siting, height and rearward projection relative to the adjoining property No 17 Longhouse Road, be likely to result in a significant overbearing impact and sense of enclosure that would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the dwelling at 17 Longhouse Road. This is contrary to policy PMD1 of the adopted Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) 2015, the Residential Alterations and Extension SPD 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
3. The proposed development would, by reason of the lack of suitable pedestrian visibility splays, in conjunction with the potential awkward manoeuvring from the proposed parking is likely to result in a detrimental effect on both pedestrian from the pathway, in regard to visibility of oncoming vehicles, and for drivers using the junction which is harmful to road safety, access and visibility. The application is therefore contrary to policy PMD2 of the adopted Core Strategy 2015.

Informative:

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Positive and Proactive Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant/Agent the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to liaise with the Applicant/Agent to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

