

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22 November 2018 at 7.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies, Angela Lawrence, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Shinnick

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England  
Representative

**Apologies:** Councillors Sue Sammons

**In attendance:**

Andrew Millard, Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection  
Leigh Nicholson, Strategic Lead - Development Services  
Bob Capstick, Locum Solicitor  
Comfort Onipede, Trainee Solicitor  
Keith Andrews, Housing Development Manager  
Julian Howes, Senior Engineer  
Genna Henry, Senior Planning Officer  
Chris Purvis, Principal Planner (Major Applications)  
Nadia Houghton, Principal planner  
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner  
Tom Scriven, Principal Planner  
Tisha Sutcliffe, Democratic Service 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.

**60. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 October 2018 were approved as a correct record, with a slight amendment on item 18/00887/FUL as Councillor Lawrence had been recorded as abstaining and voting for the application. The correct vote was noted as abstained.

**61. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business

**62. Declaration of Interests**

There were no interests declared.

**63. 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**

The Chair declared on behalf of all Committee Members that he received correspondence in regards to the following applications: 15/00234/FUL Land off and Adjacent to School, Manor Road (Deferred) and 18/00994/FUL Former Harrow Inn, Harrow Lane, Bulphan (Deferred). The correspondence was circulated in favour of the applications.

**64. Planning Appeals**

The report provided information regarding Planning appeal performance.

**RESOLVED:**

**The Committee noted the report.**

**65. 18/00811/OUT - Land Adjacent Gunning Road, Newburgh Road and Globe Industrial Estate Towers Road, Grays Essex**

The Chair explained to the Committee that as applications 15/00234/FUL, 18/00811/OUT and 18/01405/FUL were the most popular items on the agenda with the members of public these applications would be discussed first.

This application sought planning permission for 4 semi-detached 3 bedroom houses, detached garages, access route, associated hardstanding, improved sports pitch and play equipment. The site would be located in the Grays urban area outside of the designated town centre.

There had been 87 letters of objections received in relation to this application covering the main areas summarised below:

- Overdevelopment of the estate
- Housing should be provided on more suitable brownfield sites.
- Existing houses on the estate are for sale
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Disturbance/traffic from the construction work
- Pedestrian safety
- Pollution/noise
- Traffic/parking spaces
- Damage to existing properties
- Ownership of land
- Restrictive covenants
- Residents pay towards upkeep of the park and there are funds available to invest in new equipment
- Play area/Park is regularly used
- Park used for community events

- Area is maintained and is not in a state of disrepair
- Statements that park is underused is inaccurate
- Park would be unavailable to use for duration of work
- New developments elsewhere refused
- Impact upon SSSI and ecology
- TPO trees
- Impact on acoustic bank
- Comments submitted to management company not passed on
- Impact upon property value
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Loss of view
- Appendixes not available
- Impact on sewers

The replacement of the play area would provide a larger number of different play equipment parts for the residents and the existing football goals would be changed with multi-sport goals.

There is a section 106 agreement in place on the land to protect the use of open space.

The Ward Councillor, Robert Gledhill, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of objection.

The Agent, Mr Kieran Lilley, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of support.

Councillor Piccolo sought clarification on the availability of industrial land in the Borough. The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection advised that there is adequate availability of employment land elsewhere in the Borough.

Councillor Rice expressed that he was happy to refuse this application as per the Officers recommendation.

The Chair added that as one of the Ward Councillors for this area he has visited on a number of occasions and said it was a lovely estate which is used regularly by the residents. The Chair underlined the number of complaints received from the residents against this application and it would be worrying that in years to come the equipment could fall in to disrepair.

The Chair agreed with the Officers recommendation for refusal on this application along with all the Committee Members.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies, Angela Lawrence, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Shinnick.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused as per recommendations.**

**66. 15/00234/FUL - Land Off and Adjacent to School, Manor Road, Grays Essex (Deferred)**

This application was originally considered at the Planning Committee on 12 July 2018 where it was deferred to allow the applicant time to resolve the design issues by taking the scheme through a CABE design review process and working closely with Officers. Since the Committee in July the applicant decided not to engage with the CABE design review, though they have worked positively with the Officers including the Council's Urban Design Advisor to address the design issues.

The proposal is for the same number of dwellings although there was a slight change in the housing mix with the applicant offering 55 flats instead of 48 and 38 houses instead of 45. The access route onto the site would remain the same as the previous application but the layout would differ, with all the dwellings located on one side of the site.

The site is currently undeveloped and covered in vegetation including small trees and scrubs and located near to the site is a scrap metal business which will continue to operate. There had been no other applications for employment development on this site since its allocation in the "LDF Core Strategy".

The Principal Planner (Major Applications) said there were significant improvements made to the proposed development since the application was brought to Committee in July and this is considered alongside the need for housing within the borough.

The Principal Planner (Major Applications) has made some minor amendments to some of the conditions within the report following legal advice. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) went through these changes with members.

The Chair wanted clarification on the restrictions, as when he made a visit to the site a yellow gate was restricting the public which raised slight concern. He also wanted confirmation as to whether the road surface would be re-laid as it was very uneven. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) explained that there is an ongoing enforcement investigation in relation to the fencing which could not be discussed but confirmed that the existing road surface would be upgraded as part of the proposals, if the application was approved.

The Chair asked if there was any landscaping on the road and if this could be explored. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) advised that if the road is to be tarmacked the scrap metal business on site would continue to use the

access route to enter, as the roads were wide enough for lorries and other vehicles.

The Chair asked if the open space adjacent to the application site would be upgraded for the residents of the new dwellings. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) explained the route into the site and explained that future residents would have access to the existing park as well as the proposed public open space within the application site. In regards to the funding the independent Viability Assessment report identifies that there's no additional contribution to be made for the park area.

Mr Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative said having read the report, he felt concerned with the drainage ditch on the eastern side of the site and queried if this was going to be rectified. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) confirmed, as part of the conditions, there would be boundaries including an ecology fence to prevent people accessing the ditch. The Chair asked for this to be monitored.

Councillor Lawrence questioned why the applicant failed to engage with the CABE design review. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) explained there were no specific reasons given as to why they did not engage with the CABE design review though they engaged positively with the Officers.

Councillor Lawrence felt concerned with the lack of engagement from the applicant with the CABE design review as it would give other developers an idea to not engage with the review. The Principal Planner (Major Applications) explained that this was always something that's encouraged by the Officers although the applicants do not always use it. The revised design of the development has been designed in agreement with the applicant's own urban designer and proposes a higher quality development.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection said it was very unusual for the applicant to not engage with a CABE design review but added that the cost of the Review is met by the applicant.

Councillor Lawrence had visited the site and felt it was extremely dangerous, and there would be a need for a new access route to the dwellings. She said although the borough is in need of new dwellings, new surface should be considered before approving this application.

Councillor Rice on the other hand was very pleased with the application and the improvement that the applicant had made and said the dwellings were exactly what the borough needs. He stated that it was positive to hear, the applicant had worked closely with the Officers to come up with a good design. Councillor Rice was happy to support this application as there are 8,000 people on the housing waiting list and the new dwellings would give them an opportunity to buy homes.

Councillor Lawrence voiced that she would not be supporting this application as she felt the applicant was trying to make more money and the residents already living in the area were not in favour.

The Chair felt it was a positive application, and although there was a lot of substance to what Councillor Lawrence was expressing, highways had given their approval on the application. He stated he felt slightly torn with the decision as there were concerns with the site and positives with the new design.

It was proposed by Councillor Liddiard (Vice-Chair) and seconded by Councillor Rice that the application be approved, subject to conditions [as amended], as per the Officer's recommendation.

For: (6) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo, and Gerard Rice.

Against: (1) Councillor Angela Lawrence

Abstain: (1) Councillor Sue Shinnick

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be approved, subject to conditions and a s106 agreement**

**67. 18/00994/FUL - Former Harrow Inn, Harrow Lane, Bulphan Essex RM14 3RL (Deferred)**

This application sought planning permission for the proposed ancillary Manager's accommodation with a double garage and was presented at the Planning Committee in October for refusal based on the following reasons:

1. The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful by definition. Further harm is also identified through the loss of openness due to the sitting and substantial increase in the scale of the buildings proposed on the site.
2. The proposal would have a detrimental impact to visual amenity and the openness and character of the flat, fenland area.
3. The information submitted did not demonstrate that the proposal would not result in flood risk.

The site is currently located within the Greenbelt and the PMD6 states that this will only be granted for development in Green Belt where it meets the requirements of the NPPF, and the specific restrictions within the PMD6 policy. The proposed development does not fall in any of the categories for acceptable development in the Green Belt and therefore is harmful by definition. Very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated which would need to clearly outweigh the harm caused prior to justifying an

exception to local and national Green Belt policies. The very special circumstances put forward by the applicant had been fully re-considered and it has been concluded that no very special circumstances have been demonstrated and therefore the development should not be granted planning permission.

In the few days leading up to the Committee, the applicant confirmed the fencing had been reduced from 3 metres to 2 metres. Despite this, there were still concerns in relation to the harmful impact to the openness of the location and the impact to visual amenities and landscape in relation to the proposed dwelling.

The variations to the design details and layout of the Wellness Centre was approved at October's Planning Committee, which would be a large enough building to facilitate a Manager's private accommodation. The applicant advised that the insurance would not cover the Wellness Centre unless an extended property was built for a Manager to be onsite 24/7. However, the insurance letter submitted with the application did not state that a three bedroom dwelling would need to be provided as a separate property, and, therefore there was no insurance reasons provided that would prevent the accommodation being provided within the approved Wellness Centre.

The Principal Planner said, following the previous discussions around the flood risk zone of the dwelling, the Environment Agency had confirmed that the site for the dwelling was located primarily in flood risk zone 2, with the far eastern end of the rear garden being located in flood risk zone 1. As a consequence, the Environment Agency confirmed that the site should be assessed on the basis of it being located within flood zone 2.

The Chair felt the application was very unique and was in favour. Although the Officers had done extra work to explain the refusal of this application, the Chair highlighted that there continues to be a number of derelict pubs and buildings in Thurrock and this building would still be a derelict building if the applicant did not request the Wellness Centre.

The Chair moved a motion to approve the application against Officers recommendation, and this was seconded by Councillor Rice.

Mr Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative referred to the report on page 70 point 2.13. He agreed that a Manager would be needed onsite 24/7, however there would be no need for an external building.

Councillor Liddiard felt it was misleading for the applicant to say they are in need of another building on site for the Management, and he expressed the concerns this additional dwelling would have on the openness of the Green Belt.

Councillor Piccolo assumed the applicant would have included the additional dwelling in the original application, and it was concerning they later decided the need for this dwelling after the application for the Wellness Centre was

approved. This has been submitted as an afterthought, continued Cllr Piccolo, stating that he was not happy with someone piggy-backing on to this previously approved scheme.

Councillor Rice pointed out that the applicant had gone a long way with this application, and felt it should be agreed by Members. He also recommended for a part of the conditions to specifically state that the dwelling would be tied to the use of the main centre.

Councillor Rice advised that all Committee Members received correspondence from the Environment Agency confirming that the development was in flood risk zone 1 and 2 and there were no objections. He felt positive about this application, and explained that without someone being on site 24/7 the insurance would not be valid and he wanted to witness this project succeed. Councillor Rice went on to state that the applicant said they need the development and should not have to keep reiterating it.

The Chair agreed that if the management were needed on site, it would be suitable for them to have a separate area. Referring to the flood risk zone the Chair explained the original application for the Wellness Centre was also located in flood risk zone 2, and he felt strongly about approving this application as it gives confidence and there were no objections received. All applications are decided on their own merits and he does not feel the building would impact on the openness.

Mr Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative, praised the Officers for looking at the application, and explained that if the application was to be approved it would show acceptance in the Greenbelt which is a concern. The insurance for the Wellness Centre does not stipulate that there needs to be a separate building for management. He reinforced to the Committee Members the dangers that may be caused when a property is built within the Green Belt and that this proposal would set a precedent.

The Chair agreed there were risks for the dwelling, however he felt the applicant should be applauded for creating a business in a derelict building.

Councillor Piccolo did not approve of the application for the additional dwelling as the applicant would have known they was in need for a separate building for management when they originally put in their application for the Wellness Centre, and because of this he would not be in support of this application.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection referred to relevant part of the Council's Constitution and advised Members of the Committee that if they were minded to approve the application then it would need to be referred to the Secretary of State because of the significant impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. He asked for clarification from the legal representative.

The Chair wanted confirmation as to why similar applications that are contrary to Officers' recommendation, had not been referred to the Secretary of State.



It was advised by Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection that due to the uniqueness of the application it would need to be referred.

Councillor Rice asked if the original application for the Wellness Centre was referred to the Secretary of State. It was confirmed by the Principal Planner due to it being contrary to the development plan and affecting the Green Belt it was referred to the Secretary of State.

Councillor Rice stated the application went through the relevant tests and was agreed by the Government to go ahead, and every application is based on its own merits.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection stated that he always tries to remind the Committee that all applications are heard on their merits in accordance of the policy containing the development plan, and new dwellings are not acceptable although a Wellness Centre is unique in the borough, there are other businesses in the Green belt notably small farm buildings that the Planning Committee had turned down for residential accommodation.

The Legal representative stated that in relation to the analysis from the Planning Officer on the application it seems clear that this is both a departure from the development plan and the Green Belt policy. Members' difficulties are by statutory law, they are required to have regards to the development plan and to any other material consideration, and the Green Belt policy is a material consideration. The Green Belt policy is tightly confined and is a code of what can be granted in the Green Belt. As the analysis shows it is very difficult to find any aspect of this scheme which passes the Greenbelt test, if Members were to approve this they would be acting contrary to the Green Belt policy and their own development plan. In relation to referring the application to the Secretary of State, the 2009 Direction is still valid and it would need to be referred for determination.

The Chair asked if there was an element of protection if what they are doing was increasingly dangerous. The Planning Inspectorate will consider that the Planning Committee are a democratically elected chamber and will support them, but if they look at the proposal and it is dangerous they will refuse it. The Chair stated that the Planning Committee are democratically elected to represent the residents, and asked if the views of Members are at risk, then Members should look at giving the decisions to officers and for the proposal not be brought to Committee. The applications are put in front of the Committee and Members are asked to make decisions on them. The Chair asked if there were any element of protection or issues for the Members of Planning Committee.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection explained the original application was referred to the Secretary of State and agreed it was unusual for this to happen, but it was a process point and the Legal

Representative has also agreed on the application to be referred to the Secretary of State.

Councillor Rice stated he was happy with the legal advice given and agreed that if it was to be approved then it should be taken to the Secretary of State, just like the DP World application as it was within the Greenbelt and the application had been returned within 24 hours. He wanted Members to continue to vote on the item and a decision should then be made.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection advised, if Members vote to approve this application, it would be subject to conditions with agreement by the Chair. Once this has been completed the application would be referred to the Secretary of State. He quoted point 7 of the Council's Constitution page 133 "Decisions contrary to Officers recommendations and/or the Development Plan" and reminded Members that it was a requirement to follow.

Councillor Rice requested for a condition to be added to ensure the additional dwelling is not sold separately and needs to be used by the Wellness Centre. He referred to a letter received from a Barrister in regards to this.

The Locum Lawyer pointed out that it would be very easy for a Barrister to give advice but it would need to reference the Manager and not staff members. Councillor Rice asked for it to be amended to explain this.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection explained there would need to be reasonable planning grounds before the conditions are amended. He asked for the Chair and Councillor Rice to share the planning grounds to the Committee for it to be noted.

The Chair asked for Councillor Rice to share the following:-

1. The flood risk zone, environment agency have stated the flood risk would not be a problem on this particular section of this site and they had no objections to the flood risk of development,
2. The original application went to the Secretary of State which was in Flood risk zone 2 and this was accepted.
3. A letter was received from Gallagher's clearly stating that a manager should be on site and to be on site they would need accommodation for health and safety reasons.
4. If it went to the Secretary of State the openness of Green Belt has been blighted by the original building.

Councillor Piccolo also added that, if this application was to be approved, it would need to specifically state that the management needs to be on site not including regular staff members.

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection said this can be added into the conditions. He shared his concerns with the position the Committee had found itself.

The Chair said by voting for approval on this application it would be going against Officers recommendations which are a departure of Green Belt policy. He highlighted Councillor Rice's earlier statement as there would not be a significant concern with the flood risk zone as the Secretary of State had accepted the Wellness Centre which is also located in flood risk zone 2. Although it would not be ideal for this application to be taken to the Secretary of State, it will give the developed site and the business the best chance to succeed. Therefore he would be happy to vote in favour of this application and if there were concerns with the Members decisions, the Council should look at removing the Planning Committee completely.

For: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Colin Churchman, Angela Lawrence, Gerard Rice and Sue Shinnick

Against: (3) Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Andrew Jefferies and Terry Piccolo

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be deferred to the National Planning Casework Unit as a Departure from the Local Plan**

**68. 18/01041/FUL - Dahlia Cottage Kirkham Shaw, Horndon On The Hill Essex SS17 8QE (Deferred)**

This application sought the planning permission for the construction of a two bedroom bungalow with amenity space together with two hard surfaced parking spaces with access taken from Kirkham Shaw. The access to the site would be through a gated entrance located to the northern corner of the site.

This application was presented at the previous Planning Committee in October and was recommended for refusal due to the impact on the Greenbelt. This item was deferred to allow Members a chance to visit the site which took place in October.

The Chair said he, and a number of other Councillors, attended the site visit which he felt was a positive application and one which he would be in favour of. Councillor Lawrence said since visiting the site she agrees with Officers recommendations.

Mr Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative explained to the Members that the proposal would be a departure from the planning regulations on the Green Belt, and suggested for the Greenbelt policy to be followed.

Councillor Piccolo shared his concerns as some of the other properties on the site were also owned by the applicant and he felt that if this application was approved it would allow the applicant to make further application to build on this land.

Councillor Rice said this type of application was a reason for a new Local Plan to be put in place as it leaves the Committee vulnerable. He would be happy to support Officers recommendations to refuse the application.

The Chair expressed his support on this application as he did not feel the new dwelling would impact on the Green Belt.

It was proposed by Councillor Piccolo and seconded by Councillor Liddiard to refuse the application, as per Officers recommendation.

For: 4) Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Angela Lawrence, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice

Against: (3) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies

Abstain: (1) Councillor Sue Shinnick

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused as per recommendation.**

**69. 18/00984/FUL - Land to North East of St Cleres Hall, Stanford Le Hope Essex (Deferred)**

This application was considered at the Planning Committee in October and was deferred to enable a site visit to take place following the October Committee. This application sought planning permission for the erection of a terrace of four residential dwellings with associated hardstanding and landscaping following demolition of the existing building.

The Principal Planner highlighted a change to the wording of the third reason for refusal in order to align more closely with the wording of the NPPF.

Councillor Lawrence explained, when the site visit took place it was concerning to see the lack of care taken on St Cleres Hall by the applicant, and it did not give the Committee any confidence in the application. She also pointed out that the back gardens of the dwellings already built are extremely small.

Councillor Piccolo said he had concerns initially as not only is the applicant trying to build on land that should not be built on, the location was a concern as the end building would be 2-3 feet away from the pavement. He felt

disappointed that the applicant did not make this request with the original application.

Mr Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative highlighted that he had visited the site on two separate occasions and originally the land was to be retained as open space, instead they are requesting to build houses.

The Chair agreed, the site was extremely close to the road side and said he would not be in favour of this application.

It was proposed by Councillor Liddiard (Vice-Chair) and seconded by Councillor Churchman to refuse the application, as per Officers recommendation.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies, Angela Lawrence, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Shinnick.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused as per recommendation.**

**70. 18/01302/HHA - The Lodge, Fen Lane, Bulphan Essex RM14 3RL**

This application sought planning permission for a side and rear extension. The site is within the Green Belt and the recommendation was for refusal. The property had Permitted Development rights removed when the dwelling was rebuilt in 2003, which meant planning permission would be required for any extensions to the property.

Councillor Rice proposed a site visit as it was someone's home on which the extension would be needed. It would not be unreasonable for a resident to request for an extension he stated. He considered that the property is hidden away behind an 8 foot wall with a garage.

Councillor Piccolo sought clarification on when the Permitted Development rights were removed. The Principal Planner explained, when the property was rebuilt in 2003 they used the entire allowance of extensions allowed under the then, Local Plan policy and permitted development rights were therefore removed.

Councillor Lawrence felt there was no reason for a site visit as it was not a manor house, the applicant just wanted to make their property bigger.

The Chair said this application was similar to a previous one and it would need to be heard on its own merits although it was concerning that the Permitted Development rights had been removed.

Members voted on a site visit, which was proposed by Councillor Rice and seconded by Councillor Shinnick.

As the vote was equal, the Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection wanted clarification from Democratic Services as to what the outcome would be on the vote.

Democratic Services agreed that the Chair's vote would have a second or casting vote and there would be no restriction on how the Chair chooses to exercise a casting vote. This was noted in the Council's Constitution Chapter 5 Part 2 – page 125. The Chair voted against the site visit, accordingly the motion fell.

The Chair explained it was not that an excessive application, and although the Permitted Development rights were important it was something that should be reviewed through the new Local Plan process.

Councillor Rice advised that the Permitted Development rights were removed in 2003 and the applicant was requesting an extension he did not understand why this was being refused as it would not be affecting anyone, and additionally there was an 8 foot wall to outside the property. He did not see any great problem with this extension being proposed as it was a reasonable request, although the Green Belt needed to be protected, it also needs to be proactive and the Borough is in need for of larger properties.

Councillor Rice advised that he would be supporting this application as the Permitted Development rights were removed around 15 years ago.

The Chair sought clarification on the Local Plan and asked if this issue could be explored to protect the Green Belt. The Assistant Director - Planning, Transport and Public Protection wanted Members to be aware of the openness, as the property already had two reasonably sized rooms and the applicant was requesting for a significantly bigger extension with no very special circumstances. He referred back to the questions asked by the Chair and confirmed that all the policies would be reviewed within due course.

Mr Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative stated that the property was in the Green Belt and the property will already have open space around. He was concerned that if this application was to be approved it would be difficult to refuse this or other applications in the future.

It was proposed by Councillor Liddiard (Vice-Chair) and seconded by Councillor Piccolo for the application to be refused, as per the Officers recommendations.

For: (4) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Angela Lawrence and Terry Piccolo

Against: (3) Councillors Andrew Jefferies, Gerard Rice and Sue Shinnick.

Abstain: (0)

Councillor Churchman did not vote on this item.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused as per recommendation.**

**71. 18/01405/FUL - VNV Stores and Post Office, 27 Corringham Road, Stanford Le Hope Essex SS17 0AQ**

The application sought planning permission for the change of use from A1 shop to D1 Education and Training Centre with associated parking spaces. The Education and Training Centre would provide training for both adults and young people with literature; language; cultural learning; health and safety; life skills; business and finance and the applicant expects around 15-20 people visiting the centre every day.

The site is a detached building located within the central area of the local centre in Stanford Le Hope. The side access for parking is a very narrow access route to the back of the building and highways have shared their concerns and recommended for refusal. There have been 47 neighbour comments made raising concerns with this application.

Mr Michael Chilton, resident, was invited to the Committee to present his statement of objection.

The Committee had nothing to add to the debate although there were concerns raised with how narrow the access road would be for the parking spaces located at the back of the building.

It was proposed by Councillor Churchman and seconded by Councillor Jefferies that the application is refused, as per Officers recommendation.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Colin Churchman, Andrew Jefferies, Angela Lawrence, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice and Sue Shinnick.

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

**RESOLVED:**

**That the application be refused as per recommendation.**

**The meeting finished at 9.30 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)**