

Reference: 22/00921/FUL	Site: 43 Purfleet Road Aveley South Ockendon Essex RM15 4DR
Ward: Aveley And Uplands	Proposal: Proposed redevelopment to provide five semi-detached and detached houses (2 no. 3x bedroom and 3 no. 4 bedroom) and new vehicle access and pedestrian access to Purfleet Road.

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
2951-01	Location Plan	30 th June 2022
2951-03B	Proposed Block Plan	31 st October 2022
2951-04B	Proposed Floor Plans Plot 1 and 2	31 st October 2022
2951-05B	Proposed Dwelling Elevations Plots 1 and 2	31 st October 2022
2951-06B	Proposed Floor Plans Plot 3 and 4	31 st October 2022
2951-07B	Proposed Elevations Plots 3 and 4	31 st October 2022
2951-08B	Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – Plot 5	31 st October 2022
2951-09B	Proposed Street Scene	31 st October 2022
2951 10B	Proposed Sections	31 st October 2022
MTSK/PR/01A	Soft Landscape Plan	31 st October 2022

The application is also accompanied by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cover Letter including swept path analysis 27.10.22 - Soft Landscaping and Planting Specification 26.10.22 - Agent response to Urban Design comments 15.11.22 	
Applicant: Montague TSK Limited	Validated: 1 July 2022 Date of expiry: 5 December 2022 (Extension of Time agreed with Applicant)
Recommendation: To Refuse	

This application is scheduled for determination by the Council's Planning Committee because the previously recently refused application (ref. 22/003725/FUL) was Called In by

Cllrs Churchman, Gledhill, Collins, Kelly, Duffin and Mayes in order to consider the proposals on the basis of overdevelopment, character impact, immediate parking concerns and the gradient of the site and its impact on pedestrian traffic. This current revised application has been submitted in direct response to that decision by Members.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The proposal seeks to redevelop the site to provide 5, semi-detached and detached two storey dwellings fronting Purfleet Road with new vehicular and pedestrian accesses from Purfleet Road, (the removal of the existing access from Love Lane) and including off street parking, private amenity areas and soft landscaping.
- 1.2 The table below summarises some of the main points of detail contained within the development proposal:

Site Area	0.14 Ha
Number of Dwellings	Include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four semi- detached houses • One detached house • 3 x 4 beds, and 2 x 3 beds
Building Height	9.2 m
Parking	12 Car Parking spaces, including 2 visitor spaces / Cycle Storage for each dwelling
Density	35.7/Hectare - Medium Density

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is a broadly rectangular piece of land located at the junction of Purfleet Road and Love Lane, Aveley. The site measures 44.5 metres by 33 metres and comprises of a centrally located detached bungalow, and garage outbuilding to the south of the site, in a spacious plot which is served by a single vehicular access from Love Lane and a pedestrian access from Purfleet Road.
- 2.2 There is a ground level difference of approximately 1.4 metres between ground levels on Purfleet Road and the northern half of the site which sits at a higher level. Ground levels within the site level off towards the south and Love Lane.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application Ref.	Description of Proposal	Decision
22/00375/FUL	Proposed redevelopment to provide 6 semi-detached houses (2 no. 3x	Refused 13.06.22 –

	bedroom and 4 no. 4 bedroom) and new vehicle access and pedestrian access to Purfleet Road.	Appeal -in progress
21/30250/PMIN	Redevelopment of site to provide 6 semi-detached houses	Advice Given
54/00377/REM	Two bungalows	Approved

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.

Eighteen (18) written responses have been received, including 2 responses from the same 3 neighbours and 3 responses from the same neighbour, all in objection and raising the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Revised plans for 5 houses is still too many, 2 or 3 houses would be more appropriate;
- Out of Character;
- Loss of Amenity;
- Loss of Privacy/Overlooking;
- Concerns regarding Access to the site – unsafe;
- Additional traffic;
- Parking concerns and still too few parking spaces proposed;
- Loss of landscaping and wildlife.
- The Applicant has appealed the refusal of the 6 houses

4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

No objections, subject to conditions including submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

4.4 HIGHWAYS:

Recommend Refusal

4.5 LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGY ADVISOR:

Unable to support the proposals. The revised proposal has addressed some of the previous landscape concerns, however, still appears overdeveloped with too little landscaping for the scale of the site.

4.6 URBAN DESIGN TEAM:

Unable to support proposal. Recommend refusal.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.1 The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012 with the most recent revision taking place on 20th July 2021. Paragraph 11 of the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This paragraph goes on to state that for decision taking this means:

- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date¹, granting permission unless:
 - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed²; or
 - ii any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

¹ This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites ...

² The policies referred to are those in this Framework relating to: habitats sites and/or SSSIs, land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, AONBs, National Parks, Heritage Coast, irreplaceable habitats, designated heritage assets and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies. Paragraph 2 of the NPPF 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. The following chapter headings and content of the NPPF are particularly relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

2. Achieving sustainable development
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
9. Promoting sustainable transport
11. Making effective use of land
12. Achieving well-designed places

Planning Policy Guidance

5.2 In March 2014 the former 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. NPPG contains a range of subject areas, with each area containing several sub-topics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application include:

- Consultation and pre-decision matters
- Design: process and tools
- Determining a planning application
- Effective use of land
- Fees for planning applications
- Housing needs of different groups
- Housing: optional technical standards
- Making an application
- Planning obligations
- Use of Planning Conditions

Local Planning Policy Thurrock Local Development Framework (2015)

5.3 The statutory development plan for Thurrock is the 'Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended)' which was adopted in 2015. The Policies Map accompanying the Core Strategy allocates this site as a land without notation where broadly the same or similar uses would remain. As the site and the immediately surrounding area is residential it would be acceptable for the site to be used residential purposes. The following adopted Core Strategy policies would apply to any future planning application:

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
- CSTP2: The Provision of Affordable Housing
- 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
- PMD12: Sustainable Buildings
- PMD13: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation
- PMD14: Carbon Neutral Development

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. Background and revised proposals
- II. Principle of the development
- III. Design and layout and impact upon the area
- IV. Amenity provision and neighbour amenity impact of the development
- V. Traffic impact, access and car parking
- VI. Landscape
- VII. Other matters

I. BACKGROUND AND REVISED PROPOSALS

6.2 At the 11th June 2022 Planning Committee, Members considered and refused a planning application for 6 semi-detached houses (2 no. 3x bedroom and 4 no. 4 bedroom) for the following reasons:

1. *The proposed development, by virtue of the short rear garden depths of the dwellings proposed, would be likely to lead to overlooking and thereby an unacceptable loss of privacy and amenity to the neighbour to the immediate south of the site on Love Lane contrary to policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) (2015) and the NPPF 2021.*
2. *The proposals would, by virtue of the limited private amenity space provision, the short rear garden depths and the layout and access arrangements proposed within the site, be indicative of a cramped and contrived form of development and be likely to result in the overdevelopment of the site, detrimental to the character of the area and appearance of the street scene contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) (2015) and the NPPF.*
3. *The proposed development would, if permitted, fail to contribute positively to the local environment as it would result in excessive areas of hardstanding, providing limited opportunity for meaningful landscaping, resulting in a car dominated streetscape to the detriment of the development and wider locality in general. The development would fail to positively contribute to the character of the area contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) (2015) and the NPPF.*

6.3 The current application is a new submission which seeks to overcome the reasons for refusal and the applicant has:

- Reduced the number of dwellings from 6 semi-detached dwellings to 5 dwellings comprising 4 semi-detached dwellings and 1 detached dwelling;
- Increased the overlooking distance from the proposal to the neighbouring property to the south on Love Lane by increasing the rear garden depths from 10ms to 12ms;
- Increased the level of soft landscaping to the parking area on the frontage of the site.

This report will assess whether the applicant has made sufficient revisions to overcome the previous reason for refusal.

II. PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

- 6.4 The application site is located within a residential area and in a locality predominantly characterised by residential development. There are no in principle objections to the proposed development of the site for residential use subject to compliance with all development management policies.
- 6.5 Policy CSSP1 (Sustainable Housing and Locations) refers to the target for the delivery of new housing in the Borough over the period of the Development Plan. The application site is within the urban area and comprises a 'brownfield' site.
- 6.6 Paragraph 12 of the NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and given that the Local Planning Authority is not able to demonstrate that a five year house land supply exists, this indicates that planning permission for residential development should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole. As such, the provision of additional residential units would weigh in favour of the purpose.

III. DESIGN AND LAYOUT AND IMPACT UPON THE AREA

- 6.7 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.
- 6.8 The site is mostly rectangular in shape and comprises of a detached bungalow located centrally within the site and positioned so that it broadly follows the notional building line of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings running westwards on Purfleet

Road. The site is served by a single width vehicle access via Love Lane which leads to a detached garage outbuilding to the southwestern corner of the site. There is hardsurfacing leading to this garage block and the remainder of the site is laid to lawn and includes some overgrown shrubbery and the previously well-established trees along the boundaries with Love Lane and Purfleet Road have been removed (the trees were not protected). Ground levels are higher by approximately 1.4 metre at the Purfleet Road end of the site and the boundary treatment along this northern boundary comprises of low brick walling atop the raised ground levels. The pedestrian access to the site is via a series of steps from Purfleet Road.

- 6.9 The existing dwelling is a single storey property and the immediate context on Purfleet Road comprises primarily of inter-war period, well-spaced semi-detached two storey dwellings with hipped roofs. The applicant has recently submitted further revised proposals to provide 5 dwellings comprising of 4 semi-detached and 1 detached dwelling. These most recent revised proposals show some improvement in design due to the use of hipped roofs closer matching the more prevalent character style of semi-detached dwellings; the revised plans also show car parking located adjacent to the dwellings. However, the Urban Design Team has commented that the proposals continue to show an expansive area of hardstanding with little contribution to local character. There are also concerns with the layout relating to the siting and proximity of car parking spaces to the dwellings and its impact on access to cycle stores in the rear gardens (pinch points being created between parked cars and bay windows particularly on the three units to the west). The siting of the parking spaces in such close proximity to the front doors of the dwellings would fail to provide a proper transition space between the shared parking space and the dwellings. The Highways Officer raises similar concerns regarding the layout later in this report.
- 6.10 Overall, the revised proposals continue to show a layout that would be somewhat restricted and constrained and the Urban Design team has raised concerns about these concerns and the 'tightness' to the design. The layout would not appear to have been given the space needed to allow for comfortable access and opportunities for good transitions between public / shared and private spaces. Notwithstanding the amenity space provision, these concern are symptomatic of overdevelopment of the site, with the intended capacity restricting the ability to deliver a well-designed environment. The applicant has responded to the Urban Design team comments advising that while further changes could be made to improve the planting and boundary treatment along the boundary lines of the dwellings, such improvements would come at the cost of losing a turning area within the frontage. Furthermore, the applicant also responded that improved transition could be achieved by way of using contrasting hard surfacing materials to provide more legibility, for example. While changes such as those suggested by

the applicant would be possible and may go some way to overcome the concerns regarding the transition from the front of the private dwellings to the start of shared parking spaces, the amendments would not address the concerns regarding the tightness to the design and layout. As a consequence the revised proposal is considered contrary to Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy for this reason.

- 6.11 The proposed siting of the dwellings is broadly the same as the previous refusal, the main difference in the scheme emanates from the change in house design and type to a mix of semi-detached and detached properties with hipped roofs. The two pairs of semi-detached dwellings and the detached dwelling would be shorter than the previously proposed pairs, resulting in increased rear garden depths. The parking area has also been moved slightly further into the site and closer to the proposed dwellings. This has enabled a slight increase in the level of soft landscaping provided on the frontage.
- 6.12 The revised proposal continues to introduce a proposed parking arrangement along Purfleet Road, and even with some modest additional soft landscaping that has been introduced, would continue to create a car-dominated frontage directly adjacent to the footpath on Purfleet Road. Other properties on the street have front parking areas, but the cars themselves are by the dwellings, not adjacent to the pavement. The hard landscaped frontage of the site when viewed from Love Lane would be particularly visually prominent given the site previously had significant vegetation along this edge. The slight increase in soft landscaping provision would not be of significant benefit to the appearance of the frontage to reduce the negative impact of that dominant hard landscaped appearance of the site. The Council's Landscape and Ecology Advisor has continued to raise concerns regarding the likelihood of the proposal being able to retain the proposed soft landscaping identified in the scheme given the parking dominated frontage. It is considered that the detailed design of the predominantly hard-landscaped frontage would not be considered to contribute positively to the local environment and the site layout as proposed would result in excessive areas of hardstanding, providing limited opportunity for meaningful landscaping, resulting in a car dominated streetscape to the detriment of the development and wider locality in general. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the policy PMD2 and is recommended for refusal for this reason.
- 6.13 The proposed choice of materials indicated would be likely to be considered appropriate as in keeping with the existing neighbouring dwellings on Purfleet Road. The overall approach to main fenestration, width and proportion of the dwellings would also be considered appropriate.
- 6.14 The overall proposal for 5 dwellings would continue make the site appear

somewhat cramped and overdeveloped; however, it is considered that given the increase in the provision of rear private amenity space for each dwelling a recommendation to refuse the application on the basis of overdevelopment would be unsustainable.

- 6.15 In conclusion to the assessment of the design and layout impact of the proposals, while it is acknowledged that the number of dwellings proposed has been reduced, and the proposals include the introduction of semi-detached pairs as well as the use of hipped roofs, it is considered that there are concerns regarding the layout, namely, the amount of hard landscaping and the close proximity of the parking spaces to the dwellings and the design and appearance of the frontage of this corner plot; the amount of hard frontage, and likelihood of the non-retention of the proposed soft landscaping to the frontage due to the tightly packed car parking spaces. As a consequence the detailed design and layout of the proposals would be considered contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 and the NPPF for this reason.

IV. AMENITY PROVISION AND NEIGHBOUR AMENITY IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT

- 6.16 Policy PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity) states that development will not be permitted where it would cause unacceptable effects on:
- i. the amenities of the area;
 - ii. the amenity of neighbouring occupants; or
 - iii. the amenity of future occupiers of the site.
- 6.17 The proposal would provide 3 x 4 bedroom dwellings, and 2 x 3 bedroom dwellings. The proposals would provide a reasonable amount of floorarea in line with the Council's adopted standards, therefore, within its current layout the proposal provides adequate residential environment for the future occupiers.
- 6.18 The proposal would provide between 96 sq.m and 111 sq.m of private amenity space for the dwellings; Council policy would seek 4 bedroom dwellings of the size proposed to provide a minimum of 125 sq.m of private amenity space per dwelling; however, the rear garden depths have also been increased from 10m to 12m and the level of private amenity space provision for each dwelling would not be considered a sustainable reason to refuse the application given the location of the site to the nearby Aveley recreation ground. The level of private amenity space proposed would therefore be considered acceptable in this instance.
- 6.19 The increase in the depth of the rear gardens to 12m is an improvement and would result in an overlooking distance of 18m from the first floor rear windows of the

proposed dwellings to the immediate rear private amenity area for the occupier of 14 Love Lane to the immediate south and to a lesser degree the rear private garden area of 45 Purfleet Road. A first floor flank window serving a study in the most westerly dwelling would overlook the flank of 45 Purfleet Road which has what appears to be a landing window in its flank. Given the separation distance and the orientation of the proposal it is not considered that any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbours at no. 45 Purfleet Road would occur. The level and degree of overlooking of 14 Love Lane would be considered less harmful as a result of the increase in overall depth of the rear gardens and given the orientation of the rear garden to the immediate private area of no. 14 Love Lane alongside the 18m depth, it is considered that the revised proposals would not warrant a recommendation to refuse on the basis of neighbour amenity impact by way of overlooking.

- 6.20 In conclusion to this section, it is considered that the proposals would provide an acceptable level of private amenity area for each of the occupiers of the proposed dwellings overcoming the previous application's first reason for refusal. The proposals would also result in no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy and thereby amenity to neighbours complying with Policy PMD1.

V. TRAFFIC IMPACT, ACCESS AND CAR PARKING

- 6.21 As has been highlighted in many of the neighbour comments received, a key element of the acceptability of the proposal at this site relates to highway matters. The site is located on a junction where there are also double yellow lining restrictions. The Highways Officer initially indicated that there were severe concerns with the proposed development, particularly with regard to the proposed access which had inadequate width and sight visibility on to Purfleet Road. The revised application indicates the proposed vehicular access on to Purfleet Road would be acceptable and measure 4.8m in width and includes visibility splays and appropriate gradients. As a consequence, the Highway Officer has commented that there are no objections to the proposed access to the site.
- 6.22 As with the previous scheme, adequate refuse storage provision and cycle storage provision has been incorporated into the current proposals. The revised scheme could incorporate consideration for electric vehicle parking spaces too, if being considered favourably. The development site is located in an area that has reasonable accessibility to public transport and local amenities. The minimum parking standards for a development of this size in this location is between 1.5 and 2 spaces for three bedroom properties and an additional space for four bedroom properties. In addition 0.25 spaces per dwelling for visitor parking is required. Thus a minimum of 14 spaces should be provided. The proposal seeks to provide 12 parking spaces, 2 per dwelling plus 2 visitor spaces. The Highway Officer has previously advised that while the number of parking spaces proposed would be 2

short of what would be expected to comply with adopted standards, the provision of 12 spaces would be, on balance, acceptable provided those 12 spaces would be safely accessible and usable.

- 6.23 However, the plans are a cause for concern for the Highway Officer who has highlighted that the parking layout, by virtue of the arrangement and layout of spaces, their close proximity to the dwellings and particularly those spaces to the east of the site, would make practical manoeuvring within the site particularly difficult to achieve. The result of which would be a likelihood that fewer than 12 parking spaces would realistically be achieved on the revised layout on the frontage which would likely lead to an overspill of on-street parking on Purfleet Road and Love Lane to the detriment of both highway and pedestrian safety in the locality. This concern is considered to be so harmful as to warrant recommending refusal on highway grounds and the proposed parking layout would be considered contrary to policies PDM2, PMD8 and PMD9.

VI. LANDSCAPE

- 6.24 It is noted that there were several mature trees on the site. While these were not protected via Tree Preservation Order the landscaping formed a part of the existing landscape and character of the plot. The proposal seeks to provide some soft landscaping particularly to the southern boundary of the site. Hard and soft landscaping is proposed to the northern half, breaking up the predominance of the parking area to the north of the site. The existing retaining wall and boundary walls along Purfleet Road and at the junction of the site would be retained.
- 6.25 The Landscape and Ecology Advisor has commented that the proposals indicate an overdevelopment of the site and noted that there have been minor changes to the layout. As the houses have been moved northwards to increase the size of the rear gardens, this has been reduced the parking area. He continues that some planting has been shown on the roadside boundaries, but this is close to the parking bays and would cause issues as it grows. Accordingly, he considers the proposal would be unacceptable and he could not support the scheme on landscape grounds.

VII. OTHER MATTERS

- 6.26 The Environmental Health Officer has recommended that, should a favourable recommendation be forthcoming, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be submitted to the Council to approval prior to works commencing. The CEMP should as a minimum deal with the hours of work, control of dust during demolition and construction and noise mitigation measures having regard to BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control

on construction and open sites.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 The principle of residential development at the site is deemed acceptable. There are however concerns in relation to the layout and design of the frontage, the close proximity of car parking spaces to the front windows and doorways serving the dwellings and the amount of hard landscaping to the front of the site which would be likely to lead to a car-dominated frontage, with limited opportunity for landscaping and an overly cramped appearance.
- 7.2 In addition to the concerns regarding the design and appearance of the layout of the frontage of the site, the proposal generates concerns regarding the layout of the parking spaces and the ability to practically manoeuvre and park within those spaces. The concerns regarding the tight and awkward layout are so significant as to be likely to result in a substandard level of off street parking being available within the site and parking migrating on the nearby highway.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):
1. The proposals would, by virtue of the tight and awkward parking layout, be likely to result in practical difficulties in manoeuvring within the site resulting in an inadequate level of off-street parking provision within the site, and the parking of cars on both Purfleet Road and Love Lane to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies PMD2, PMD8 and PMD9 of the Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) (2015) and the NPPF.
 2. The proposed development would, if permitted, fail to contribute positively to the local environment as it would result in excessive areas of hardstanding, providing limited opportunity for meaningful landscaping, also resulting in a cramped and car parking-dominated streetscape overly close to the proposed dwellings to the detriment of the development and wider locality in general. The development would fail to positively contribute to the character of the area contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) (2015) and the NPPF.

INFORMATIVE:Positive and Proactive Statement

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 discussing those with the Applicant/Agent. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is 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

