

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 9 June 2022 at 6.00 pm

---

- Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Terry Piccolo, James Thandi, Sue Shinnick and Lee Watson
- Apologies:** Councillors James Halden
- In attendance:** Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection  
Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner  
Ian Harrison, Principal Planner  
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner  
Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager  
Matthew Ford, Transport Development Manager  
Navtej Tung, Strategic Transport Manager  
Simon Speller, Transport Planning, STANTEC  
Lucy Mannion, Senior Planner  
Chris Purvis, Major Applications Manager  
Sarah Williams, Strategic Lead Education Support Services  
Kenna-Victoria Healey, Senior Democratic Services Officer
- 

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being live streamed to the Council's website.

### **1. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 April 2022 and 21 April 2022 were approved as a true and correct record.

### **2. Item of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chair advised planning application 22/00312/FUL Woodlands Koi Farm South Avenue Langdon Hills had been withdrawn by the application. He continued by furthering advising planning application 21/02004/FUL Kipling Avenue Land Adjacent 13 To 29 Kipling Avenue Tilbury, was to be brought forward and heard first.

### **3. Declaration of Interests**

The Chair of the Committee declared an interest in planning application 18/01404/OUT Thames Enterprise Park, The Manorway, Coryton, Essex, as he worked for DP World and would therefore remove himself from the meeting for this item.

**4. 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 the following correspondence:

- Planning Application 21/02004/FUL– an email from Ward Member Councillor Allen in objection to the application
- Planning Application 22/00077/FULPSI — an email from the Aveley and Kennington community forum, Ward Member Councillor Panjala and Ms Sisterson in objection to the application
- Planning Application 18/01404/OUT – an email from a resident in support of the application.

**5. Planning Appeals and 2021/2022 Planning Performance Report**

The Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection presented the reports to Members.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the reports be noted.**

**6. 21/02004/FUL: Kipling Avenue Land Adjacent 13 To 29 Kipling Avenue Tilbury**

Councillor Polley proposed a site visit be taken and was seconded by Councillor Watson.

For: (7) Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

**7. 22/00077/FULPSI: Harrier Primary School Land adjacent A13 and Love Lane Aveley Essex (Deferred)**

At the start of the item the Chair advised as this was a deferred item only the four Members who had heard the application at the last meeting were able to take part in the discussion and vote.

The report was then presented by the Senior Planner.

The Chair of the Committee commented when the application was first heard Members had a number of concerns which included the suggested pick up and drop off area and the design of the overall application. The Senior Planner advised the applicant had looked at the design and had improved the design quality of the overall application.

Members heard the Council had an obligation to provide additional Primary Schools, with the proposed school to be two from entry and would assist with the mitigation of primary schools and early years provision.

Councillor Watson raised concerns to the location of site and queried as to how traffic was to be mitigated, she gave an example of the Chafford Hundred schools and the traffic in the area around the Schools at drop off and pick up times. Planning Officers advised with regards to the location of the site, the application had been given special circumstances. They continued to advise the applicant had looked for alternative available land within the borough however this location was the best place for the proposed school. The Transport Development Manager commented the drop off point would mitigate the traffic impact within the area with the schools location being safe walking distance for those children living locally and if required school transport could be applied for. He continued by saying he understood Members concerns however based on Council policy the application met highway requirements.

During the debate Councillor Piccolo stated he understood the concerns with regards to traffic in the area, however there was also a requirement for additional school places within the borough and he felt it would be more effective to have additional school places now then to have no places in the future. He further stated he appreciated the concerns of local residents.

Councillor Polley commented the application was well questioned when presented at last meeting Members raised concerns such as the design of the application. She continued by stating it was important to not only build new homes within the borough but also the infrastructure such as schools to go with these developments and therefore to allow the growth.

The Chair stated he felt deferring the item at the last meeting due to the number of questions and concerns was the right thing to do. He mentioned he hoped the drop off and pick up points would reduce the traffic pressure within the area.

Councillor Watson agreed with the provision of new schools, however she felt the location was not the right place, as with a new primary school they would also be the need for new secondary schools. She continued by mentioning although it was expected that children would walk to school this was not always doable. The Strategic Lead Education Support Services explained to Members the Pupil Place Plan was used when looking at where new schools were most required. At present there were children being transported across the borough. This application would allow children to attend a local school.

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

For: (3) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair) and Terry Piccolo

Against: (1) Councillor Lee Watson

Abstained: (0)

**8. 18/01404/OUT: Thames Enterprise Park, The Manorway, Coryton, Essex**

*The Chair left the meeting at 6.45pm.*

The report was presented by the Major Applications Manager, during which he advised conditions C5 and D16 had been updated.

The Vice-Chair thanked officers for the report, commenting it was clear to see a lot of work had been undertaken on this application given the application reference number.

Members sought if a travel plan had been looked at such as alternative exits from site officers confirmed it had. Councillor Piccolo enquired as to the number of HGV to use the site have looking at the report there was to be an increase of up to 250 HGV using the site.

During discussions Members asked if it was possible for other road links such as whether the A130 could be used other than using the Manorway. It was explained there were no other road links feasible to access the site. Councillor Piccolo commented he liked the idea of cycle paths, however he had concerns with the increase of HGV movements within the area. Officers commented at present there were no planned works for the junctions leading off of the Manorway. The Major Applications Manager continued by advising cycle routes were to be upgraded to and from the site, however at this time there were no plans to update the local road network other than the works to the key junctions identified (Sorrells roundabout and A13/Manorway roundabout).

The Vice-Chair echoed Members concerns with regards to an increase in traffic on local roads and whether the local road network could cope with this. She continued by querying as to whether the site in addition to cycle paths had the facilities to support electric vehicles such as charging points. Officers confirmed there were to be docking stations for bikes (at the site and Stanford Le Hope railway station) and car parking would include charging points for electric vehicles.

Following the suggestion of river usage as the site was close to the River Thames Officers commented that although the jetty was within the redline boundary of the site, the Major Applications Manager was unsure as to whether it was able to be used at present, however there is potential to use the jetties in the future and there a specific planning conditions to promote and secure such usage.

Members heard that as part of the Section 106 funding for highway improvements had been subject to the Council's Highways Officers assessment work.. Members further raised concerns, that should the Local Thames Crossing go ahead the local road network would not cope. The Transport Development Manager commented the Local Thames crossing this was not as yet a permitted development and assured Members, Officers were looking at the road network and different options for HGVs within the area and any possible solutions were being scrutinised.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Statement of Objection: Francis Tyrrell, London Gateway
- Statement of Support: Rupert Wood, Thames Enterprise Park, Applicant

During the debate Councillor Watson thanked officers for their report and continued by stating if it was possible to find another exit from the site other than the Manorway that would be welcomed given the HGV concern and mitigation for residents.

Councillor Arnold welcome the report stating it would provide a boost for the borough, he continued by mentioning his only concern was the impact to the local area when HGVs entering and leaving the site

Councillor Piccolo enquired as to whether there were cameras on the site to monitor the HGV movements. He commented on the potential of using the River Thames which would assist in limiting the HGV movements.

Councillor Shinnick stated she felt the application was a great opportunity for the Borough and once the Section 106 funding was resolved it was pleasing to see jobs created for local people.

The Vice-Chair proposed the officer's recommendation A and was seconded by Councillor Watson

For: (5) Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Sue Shinnick, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Against: (1) Terry Piccolo

Abstained: (0)

The Vice-Chair proposed the officer's recommendation B and was seconded by Councillor Watson

For: (5) Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Sue Shinnick, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Against: (1) Terry Piccolo

Abstained: (0)

*The Committee adjourned at 7.51pm and reconvened at 7.56pm (The Chair of the Committee returned to the meeting during this time)*

**9. 22/00210/FUL: High Fields Lower Dunton Road, Bulphan**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

Councillor Arnold enquired as to the proposed elevation of the site. Officers explained the footprint was to be like for like with a two-storey extension.

Councillor Polley enquired as to whether the dwelling had any development prior to this application. The Principal Planning Officer advised the site might have had development in the past, however the proposed development was double the size of the current dwelling.

During discussions Members heard the application to officers' knowledge was not situated within a permitted development site. Officers further advised they had not received any objections from local residents.

Speaker statement was heard from:

- Statement of Support - Councillor Johnson, Ward Member

The Chair advised the statement in support from the agent had been circulated to all Members within the speaker statements booklet, however they were unable to attend the meeting.

During the debate Chair suggested given the size of the development and its footprint a site visit may be worth the committee attending.

Councillor Arnold commented he would like to see the site, he mentioned knew the area with the properties being mixed match however he felt a site visit would be worthwhile.

Councillor Watson agreed with the Chair that site visit would be worth doing as she did not know the area very well.

The Chair proposed that a site visit be undertaken and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

For: (7) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained (0)

*At 8:25pm, the committee agreed to suspend standing orders until the end of the agenda.*

**10. 22/00181/HHA: 22 Bridge Road, Grays**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

The Chair of the Committee enquired as to whether any pre-application advice had been given to the applicant. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed advice was given to the applicant and a suggested revision on application was suggested, which the applicant elected not to accept.

Councillor Arnold enquired whether the proposed extension was right up to the boundary of the site, the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that it was.

During discussions Members heard there had been no objections from residents or the Highways Department the application had been proposed for refusal due to its poor design and visual impact on the area. Following a question on parking, Members were notified there were no objections from Highways as the site had on street parking. The Principal Planning Officer advised Members as part of the preapplication advice process, a revised design of the application was presented to the applicant which was refused.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Statement of Support: Guv Sehmbi, Applicant

During the debate the Chair thank the applicant for his statement, agreeing looking at the plans the property appeared to be out of the way and was unique.

Councillor Polley commented she did not like the design of the application, however, could understand the applicants reasons. She felt that perhaps the advice from officers at the preapplication stage should have been accepted.

Councillor Watson stated she was not overly concerned with the design of the application and as there had been no objections from neighbours and the property was tucked away, she could not find any issues with this application.

Councillor Thandi echoed Councillor Watson's thoughts in that although the application was deemed to be of poor design it was out of sight in the area and there had been no objections from neighbours.

The Chair proposed the officers recommendation and was seconded by the Councillor Arnold.

For: (4) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold and Terry Piccolo,

Against: (3) Councillors Sue Shinnick, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Abstained (0)

**11. 22/00375/FUL: 43 Purfleet Road, Aveley**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

The Chair of the Committee enquired as to whether any preapplication advice had been given on the two trees located on site. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed preapplication advice had been given. The officer confirmed that the trees outside the application site would not be removed.

During discussions Members were notified there were two parking spaces allocated for each dwelling plus visitor parking, with parking spaces being located outside the front door. It was confirmed by officers although the layout was tight for vehicles to move, it had been deemed acceptable given the scale of the development. The Transport Development Manager advised it would be difficult to reverse on site, that being said the conditions within the application site would not conflict with the Council's policy. He continued by commenting the emergency services and refuse collection would have to perhaps pull up outside of the site as there was not much room for manoeuvring.

Speak statements were heard from:

- Statement of Support: Rakesh Kainth, Montague TSK Limited, Applicant

Statements in objection had been received from a Ward Member and Resident, these were circulated to Members as part of the speaker booklet.

During the debate Councillor Arnold mentioned he felt the number of dwellings were too many for this site.

Councillor Watson agreed with Councillor Arnold she too felt there were too many dwellings proposed for the site. She continued by stating she had concerns with the proposed parking and access for the emergency services.

Councillor Polley echoed Members comments she stated she had concerns with regards to emergency services access as well as access for refuse trucks. She thanked officers for the work put into this application.

The Chair proposed the officers recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Shinnick.

For: (7) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Against: (0)



Abstained (0)

**12. 21/01883/FUL: Coach Park Pilgrims Lane**

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

The Chair enquired as to the basis on HGVs as the last application had been deferred. The Principal Planner advised the previous application did not affect the one in front of Members, he advised the current application proposed a 25% reduction of HGV movements.

Councillor Polley queried how the impact would be different than the previous application, as would car movement as well as HGVs also be reduced given the location. The Transport Development Manager mentioned officers were aware of Members concerns around the use of Pilgrim Roundabout and this was something they were working on.

Councillor Polley enquired as to whether the five years the applicant had to develop the site started when the application was submitted. Officers advised the time scale would begin from when the application was granted rather than when the application was submitted.

Members queried as to whether officers had received a travel plan. The Principal Planning Officer commented that there were to be a maximum of 501 movements as a worst-case scenario. Members heard there were to be 200 people employed with 80 people in total on site on a day-to-day basis. Officers notified the Committee there was a condition as part of the application meaning staff could move on and off the site between 6.30am and 7.00pm.

Statements well received and heard from:

- Statement of Objection: Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group

During the debate Councillor Polley mentioned she was interested to see if there were any other sites which had been looked at. She further commented she felt it was distasteful that the five year condition started from when the application was approved rather than when the application was admitted, with this she felt the condition should be brought down three years.

Councillor Watson echoed Councillor Polley's comment. She commented on the travel plan and the fact that the development was within the Green Belt.

Councillor Piccolo commented that somewhere was needed which was central in the borough for this work to be undertaken. He further stated as long as officers were sure the figures were correct with regards to HGV

movements of 108 per day, and there was no big impact on the road network he felt location suited the purpose. He further suggested if not already within the travel plan perhaps a booking system could be included to monitor the number of HGVs using the site in line with the proposed conditions.

The Chair proposed the officers recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Piccolo.

For: (4) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Paul Arnold, Terry Piccolo and James Thandi

Against: (3) Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Sue Shinnick and Lee Watson

Abstained: (0)

**The meeting finished at 10.13 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)**