

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 July 2017 at 7.00pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair) (*left at 10:07pm*), Graham Hamilton, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Graham Snell and Brian Little (Substitute)

**Apologies:** Councillors Colin Churchman, Roy Jones and Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural Essex Representative

**In attendance:** Andrew Millard, Assistant Director Planning & Growth  
Matthew Ford, Principal Highways Engineer  
Matthew Gallagher, Principal Planner (Major Applications)  
Nadia Houghton, Principal planner (*left at 8:56pm*)  
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner (*left at 8:56pm*)  
Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Team Leader  
Vivien Williams, Planning Lawyer  
Charlotte Raper, 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.

### **10. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 June 2017 were approved as a correct record.

### **11. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **12. Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interests.

### **13. 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**

All Members declared receipt of correspondence regarding Item 11: 17/00548/REM: Land to the east of Euclid Way and South of West Thurrock Way, West Thurrock, Essex.

Councillor Gerard Rice also declared that he had received correspondence regarding Item 8: 17/00470/FUL: 3 Longley Mews, Grays, Essex, RM16 3AG, as it was situated within his ward.

#### **14. Planning Appeals**

The report provided information regarding planning appeals performance.

#### **RESOLVED:**

**The Committee noted the report.**

#### **15. 17/00470/FUL: 3 Longley Mews, Grays, Essex, RM16 3AG**

Councillor B. Little declared that his property neighboured the site of the application. However, as he had not been present at the previous meeting, when the application had been deferred, he would not participate in this item.

The application, which sought permission for an extension and dormer to convert a garage to a self-contained annex, had been deferred at the previous meeting so that Members could attend a site visit.

Councillor Rice asked the Principal Planner for confirmation that there had been no additional weight given to the medical circumstances since the item had been deferred. The Committee was advised that no further medical evidence had been received in relation to the application since it was previously presented to Members.

The Chair expressed that he felt the site visit had been important in allowing Members of the Committee to assess the site of the application. The report was conclusive, and since no additional medical evidence had been received there was the risk of setting an unhelpful precedent.

Councillor Rice interjected that the Committee was often reminded by the Assistant Director for Planning and Growth that each application should be assessed on its own merit and therefore there was no issue around precedent. The Assistant Director of Planning and Growth clarified that while each application was, rightly, assessed on its own merit, previous decisions of the Committee could be a consideration in future.

It was proposed by the Chair and seconded by Councillor Piccolo that the application be refused as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair),  
Graham Hamilton, Terry Piccolo and Graham Snell.

Against: Councillors Tunde Ojetola and Gerard Rice

Abstained: (0)

#### **RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused.**

**16. 16/01625/OUT: Land Adjacent Moore Avenue, Devonshire Road And London Road, South Stifford, Grays, Essex**

The application sought outline planning permissions for redevelopment of the site for the provision of up to 75 dwellings with vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, internal access roads, footpaths, cycle ways, parking, public open space, landscaping and drainage infrastructure. The application had been submitted with all matters reserved except for access, which was for consideration.

The applicant had worked with the Education and Housing officer during the process of the application. A contribution of just under £176,000 had been agreed with the Education Officer. The applicant had also agreed to a policy compliant 35% affordable housing comprising 26 dwellings, with a 50 / 50 split between affordable rented accommodation and intermediate tenures. The Principal Officer confirmed that the report was recommended for approval subject to conditions and the above contributions towards education and provision of affordable housing.

Councillor Hamilton sought clarity that there was to be one vehicular access route and one route for pedestrian / cycle access. This was confirmed to be correct. Councillor Hamilton expressed concern that this would not be adequate. The Principal Highways Engineer advised the Committee that for the proposed number of dwellings 1 access route was acceptable, and would not need to be increased unless there were 200+ dwellings proposed. Devonshire Road was a very high category road and therefore was deemed to be suitable, and preferable to another junction on London Road, given queue lengths at the existing junction.

Councillor Ojetola queried whether the current 40mph speed limit would be reduced to 30 mph with the introduction of a new junction. The Principal Highways Engineer agreed that it would conceivably be appropriate to reduce the speed for the proposed section of Devonshire Road, which was within the single lane per direction stretch.

Councillor Ojetola also queried the provision of green space available. Members were advised that, while the plan at present was indicative and might not be final, the Planning department was satisfied that the space could fit the proposed number of units with adequate gardens.

Councillor Piccolo highlighted the remaining parcel of green space and asked whether it might be developed at a later stage. Members were advised that the land was in close proximity to the NuStar fuel storage (COMAH) site and for that reason the area could not be developed at this time. However it may be able to be developed in the future. Councillor Hamilton asked if it might be used as parkland. Members were advised that the proximity to the fuel tanks made it unsuitable for public use.

The Chair asked whether trees along the back of the site were existing or to be planted. The Principal Officer advised that some were existing and would be part of landscaping and screening for the development.

Councillor Ojetola queried the catchment schools, which were confirmed to be Hathaway Academy, William Edwards, Grays Convent, Harris Academy and Gateway Academy.

A resident, Michelle Peters, was invited to the Committee to present her statement of objection.

The Ward Councillor, Councillor Gerrish, was invited to present his statement in objection.

The agent, James Lawson, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Hamilton noted comments around badger activity in the vicinity and asked if there was any evidence. The Principal Planner confirmed that there had been ecology and protected species surveys undertaken highlighting badger activity to the north of the site. Methods to protect and provide habitats would be , secured through updates to the ecology reports as part of conditions on any approval.

Councillor Ojetola asked where the rear access to gardens for properties in Moore Avenue was located, and whether overlooking had been taken into consideration. There would be trees and boundary treatments to keep the site separate. In regards to back to back distances these were 45-50m which was well in excess of the Council's minimum standards and thus deemed to be acceptable.

The Chair asked whether traffic issues on London Road could be material considerations. Members were advised that there were air quality management areas along London Road. The revised traffic assessment submitted gave a positive picture but highlighted concerns around cycle and pedestrian access, hence the incorporation of a cycle route onto London Road.

Councillor Piccolo queried the possibility of the proposed new junction on Devonshire Road including a "left turn only" restriction. The Principal Highways Engineer explained that in order to do so, due to the need for physical enforcement measures, it would have to be left in/left out which would force incoming traffic to use London Road and the Lakeside basin. It would also increase the risk of vehicles performing illegal U-turns to avoid this.

Councillor Rice stressed the need to reduce the speed at the junction to 30mph to ensure safety for residents. The Committee was assured that Condition 19 would cover speed reduction measures.

Councillor Ojetola sought clarification around the provision of a play area. The details were to be submitted later however condition 10 regarding public open space included provision of an area for children's play.

The Chair noted that, while the green area was presently too close to the tanks to be developed there was a possibility of more homes on the site in future, but accepted that that would need to be considered on its own merit at a later stage.

The Vice-Chair saw no reason to object to homes being built on site. There was a need for homes in the borough and while there was traffic at peak times, since the A13 works had ended issues were greatly reduced and so he offered support for the application.

Councillor Rice considered that the Committee's hands were somewhat tied. The site had been identified within the Core Strategy and the application was reasonable. His only concern had been addressed within condition 19 and therefore he supported the application, as he could not see grounds otherwise.

Councillor Ojetola expressed his view that, while it was only at outline stage, it was best to do as much as possible to mitigate against any concerns. He therefore urged the applicant and officers to address issues around rear access to gardens, whether anything could be done to improve the situation at the junction of London Road and Devonshire Road, and the crucial reduction of the speed limit to 30mph.

Councillor B. Little agreed that the highways network in the area could use some work, particularly where the 1 lane became 2. Reducing the speed limit to 30mph would be key. He also welcomed the provision of affordable homes and offered support for the application.

Councillor Piccolo admitted he was concerned regarding safety at the egress, however site splays and speed reductions had addressed his concerns. He understood residents' feelings but noted that there had been previous applications approved on other sites where there had been less generous space; he was minded to approve the application.

The Chair was interested to protect the additional parcel of green space where possible. He echoed the Committee's comments; without clear material considerations Members were somewhat restricted however the provision of affordable housing was welcome. The next stage would be for a reserved matters application to be presented for approval by the Committee and the Chair expressed his view that he liked the current proposed design.

It was proposed by the Vice-Chair and seconded by Councillor B. Little that the application be approved, subject to conditions and the completion of a s.106 legal agreement, as per the Officer's recommendation:

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Brian Little

Against: Councillor Graham Hamilton.

Abstained: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions and the completion of a s.106 legal agreement.**

**17. 17/00521/FUL: 6 Tennyson Avenue, Grays, Essex, RM17 5RG**

The application sought planning permission for the conversion of an existing 5 bedroom house to 2 x 1 bedroom flats. An existing building to the rear of the garden of the main house that was built as an ancillary outbuilding would be used as a separate dwelling. A similar recent application for the conversion of the house into 3 flats was refused by Committee and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate in January 2017. The refused application included parking in the rear garden area of the dwelling; that was the sole reason the Planning Inspectorate refused the appeal. The current proposal saw all parking located to the front of the site or in the undercroft and accordingly the sole remaining reason for objection had been removed.

Councillor Ojetola asked for clarification regarding the proposed parking provision. The Officer advised provision was similar to the existing layout.

Councillor Hamilton asked whether cars parked in the undercroft would hinder access; the Officer advised it would be possible to fit past.

The Chair expressed that he was uncomfortable with parking beneath the property and splitting a house up into flats however the applicant had listened to all suggestions made by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore it would be difficult to refuse.

The Vice-Chair agreed that he was not keen but there were no material considerations on which to refuse planning permission.

Councillor Ojetola agreed that as it complied with rules, regulations and policies the Committee's hand had almost been forced.

Councillor Piccolo noted that many properties included garages which formed an integral part of the building. He was also unhappy with the idea of new premises within a back garden; however he could not see any way not to follow the recommendation for approval.

Councillor Hamilton sought confirmation of what was proposed for the space above the undercroft; it was confirmed to be a lounge and bathroom. He asked whether vehicles could use the undercroft as a through route to the back property and it was confirmed that they couldn't go further than the rear wall of the property.

Councillor Rice stated he felt duty-bound to support. People within Thurrock needed homes and if brown-field applications were not supported it risked development of Green Belt land.

It was proposed by Councillor Piccolo and seconded by the Chair that the application be approved, subject to conditions, as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Graham Hamilton, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Brian Little.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions, as per the Officer's recommendation.**

**18. 17/00548/REM: Land To east of Euclid Way and South of West Thurrock Way, West Thurrock, Essex**

The Principal Planner (Major Applications) began by informing Members that the department had received a late letter, which was not included within the agenda. It referenced surface water drainage which was the subject of a condition of the outline approval and therefore not for consideration as part of this reserved matters submission. The application sought approval of the reserved matters, namely layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, for Phase 1 of the outline (residential) part of permission ref. 13/01231/FUL. This application comprised the construction of 214 residential dwellings, new public open space, car parking and associated infrastructure works.

Councillor B. Little queried the provision for affordable housing. The Committee heard that there was no affordable housing included within the proposal, but this had been justified by a viability assessment at the outline stage which had been considered by Committee in 2014.

Councillor Ojetola sought clarification around the point of access. It would be via West Thurrock Way, with minor remodelling of the roundabout nearest KFC. There was also a S106 requirement to ensure a bus link and the service would also be funded via a contribution within the existing S106

agreement. If the proposed supermarket were built there would be another point of access from the same roundabout.

The Agent, Catherine Williams, was invited to the Committee to present her statement of support.

Councillor Ojetola asked what impact the 214 units would have upon the local catchment schools. Members were reminded that this was a reserved matters application and the impact upon local education, GP services etc. had been considered at the outline stage and found acceptable.

Councillor Hamilton asked for further details regarding the proposed bus route. The route would be part of the hopper service and this stretch was one piece of a larger picture, in attempts to create a circular route to encourage more users and visitors to the Lakeside Basin to use bus services. The route had been agreed with operators, and as the residential road would not have heavy traffic it was deemed that there would be no detrimental impact. Everything requested at the outline stage had been provided.

Councillor Piccolo asked if there was any possibility of an updated viability assessment to see if there was any hope of affordable housing provision. He expressed his concern that the residential route could become a 'rat run' during peak traffic. Since the supermarket had been the main driver of the S106 contributions he asked whether it would be phased.

The Principal Planner (Major Applications) confirmed that Officers and Committee Members had been satisfied that the cost of decontamination of the site were high and that this factor influenced the capability of delivering affordable housing. There would be bus control measures such as a bus gate as it would be undesirable for vehicles to cut through. The S106 payments were triggered in part by commercial construction and in part by the residential development.

Councillor Rice welcomed the application which would transform Lakeside into a town. The site was near a railway and there would be a hopper service and would provide much needed residential homes.

Councillor Ojetola agreed that the application, particularly the parking provision, was impressive. Education contributions had been agreed and he was happy to support it.

Councillor Snell agreed that the application would provide much needed homes in a prime location. He was disappointed by the design of the 3 bedroom houses but the development as a whole was good.

It was proposed by Councillor Piccolo and seconded by Councillor Rice that the application be approved, subject to conditions, as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Graham Hamilton, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Brian Little.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions, as per the Officer's recommendation.**

*At 8:55pm the Committee agreed to suspend standing orders until the close of business.*

*The meeting adjourned at 8:56pm and reconvened at 9:04pm.*

**19. 16/00923/FUL: Land to north of Rosebery Road, Castle Road and Belmont Road, Grays**

Councillors Rice and Snell excused themselves from this item, as they sat at Gloriana board meetings.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of 80 dwellings, comprising a variety of one – three storey houses, with associated roads, parking, refuse and bicycle storage and amenity space

The Committee queried the proposed access routes. The application had been accompanied by a transport assessment and the access proposals proposed a one-way route through the new development, entering via Roseberry Road and exiting via Belmont Road. A new road was also proposed along the Southern boundary of the site to maintain the existing rear access to properties, which would also be one-way. The existing residential roads would remain two-way.

It was proposed by Councillor Ojetola and seconded by the Vice-Chair that the application be deferred for a site visit to enable Members to assess the capacity of the existing roads and fully grasp the proposed changes to access.

For: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Graham Hamilton and Tunde Ojetola.

Against: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Terry Piccolo and Brian Little.

Abstained: (0)

As there were equal votes for and against, the Chair exercised the casting vote and the proposal was dismissed.

Councillor B. Little queried the insulation standard and solar panels proposed, and what assurances were in place. Condition 7 ensured roof-mounted photovoltaic panels and energy efficiency measures would be a building regulations matter as opposed to a planning condition, as the Government suspended the Code for Sustainable Homes in 2015.

Councillor Piccolo queried the capacity for parking within the turning heads compared to the additional spaces proposed within the application, to see if it would be sufficient to mitigate the loss of parking. The Principal Highways Engineer advised the Committee that turning heads should not be used for parking. The provision for parking within the application was above the Council's draft parking standard and the applicant had strived to replicate the capacity within the turning heads. The proposed changes also offered improved access for refuse vehicles.

The Chair accepted that there was a recurring "grey area" within Thurrock where turning circles were used as parking, which was understandable given some of the narrow roads. He noted that there was no way to access the relief road from Roseberry Road and therefore its residents were seemingly worst affected.

A resident, Mrs Caramuscia, was invited to the Committee to present her statement of objection.

The agent, Judith Tranter, was invited to the Committee to present her statement of support.

Councillor Hamilton expressed concern at traffic exiting the new estate and joining a 2 way road. The Traffic Assessment had found that accessibility for existing residents would not be impacted materially. The additional traffic movements and queue lengths were not considered to be unacceptable under the Council's policy.

Councillor B. Little asked what could be done to avoid construction traffic using the existing residential roads to access the site. Condition 6(e) required details to be submitted and approved. There would ideally be a separate access point for construction traffic, but this would require discussions with another landowner. The Vice-Chair recalled complaints received around contractors and construction traffic around the previous Gloriana development within his ward. The Chair agreed that getting materials on site would be an issue.

It was proposed by the Vice-Chair and seconded by the Chair that the application be deferred to clarify details address concerns regarding access for construction traffic. Members would also have the opportunity to undertake informal site visits if they so wished.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair),  
Graham Hamilton, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo and Brian Little.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be deferred, to enable discussions with the applicant on access to the site for construction traffic.**

**20. 17/00588/CONDC: Land adj A13, A1306 and to north of nos. 191-235 Purfleet Road, Aveley**

The Principal Planner (Major Applications) advised that items 13 and 14 were related. The application sought approval of amendments to the development parameters of the outline planning permission 12/00862/OUT.

Councillor B. Little asked for clarity around the proposed changes. There were no changes to highways; the matter for consideration was principally the location of unit 2 which would be relocated closer to the southern boundary of the site than the approved parameters..

Councillor Hamilton asked whether traffic entering London Road could turn both left and right. It was confirmed that access was permitted in both directions at a new junction onto the A1306.

The agent, Mark Stitch, was invited to the Committee to present their statement of support.

It was proposed by Councillor Ojetola and seconded by the Chair that the details reserved by condition no.6 (Parameter Plan) be approved, as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Graham Hamilton, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Brian Little.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the details reserved by condition no.6 (Parameter Plan) be approved.**

**21. 17/00587/REM: Land adj A13, A1306 and to north of nos. 191-235  
Purfleet Road, Aveley**

The application sought approval of reserved matters comprising appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission ref. 12/00862/OUT.

The agent, Mark Stitch, was invited to the Committee to present their statement of support.

It was proposed by the Chair and seconded by Councillor B. Little that the details be approved, subject to conditions, as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Graham Hamilton, Tunde Ojetola, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Graham Snell and Brian Little.

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the details be approved subject to conditions.**

**The meeting finished at 10.30 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)