

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1 December 2022 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Terry Piccolo, James Thandi, Sue Shinnick and Lee Watson

Apologies: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair)

In attendance:
Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner
Jonathan Keen, Principal Planner
Linda Saunders, Locum Solicitor
Rhiannon Whiteley, 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.

48. Minutes

To approve the minutes of 20 October 2022 and 16 November 2022

Councillor Watson requested two changes to the minutes of 16 November 2022. On page 14 of the agenda the minutes state that there was a statement of support from Councillor Massey and this should have stated that Councillor Massey objected. On page 15 paragraph 3 it should state that 70% would be of market value rent and not 70% of the whole entire development.

Councillor Watson also raised that Councillor Thandi stated that there should be more developments like this coming forward. The Chair was not present at the last meeting and therefore she responded that the recording would have to be looked at and a verbatim statement provided of what was said.

49. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

50. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Little confirmed that although she would not be voting on the application tonight with regard to The Hollies, Rectory Road she stated that she does know the resident and has received correspondence from him.

51. 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 asked if any members had received any lobbying from the sites being considered at the meeting tonight. The Chair confirmed she had received correspondence in relation to Purfleet Road. Councillor Piccolo confirmed he had also received the correspondence. The Chair stated that she had forwarded it on to the monitoring officer.

52. Planning Appeals

The Chair queried the table on page 19 of the agenda which states there has been 1 appeal in December and 1 appeal not allowed. Jonathan Keen responded that they are in the wrong column and should have been added to the November column which should read 12 and 5 instead of 11 and 4.

53. 22/01241/FUL: The Hollies Rectory Road Orsett Essex RM16 3EH (Deferred)

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer. She confirmed that the item was deferred at the previous meeting in November to enable a member's Site Visit to take place. This visit occurred on 23rd November 2022 and Councillors Piccolo, Arnold, Thandi and Shinnick attended the site along with officers. The applicant was also in attendance and welcomed Members to view the site.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal would continue to be considered to be contrary to Green Belt policy with respect to its overall size, footprint, and volume and would be considered inappropriate development harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. Secondly, there continue to be concerns regarding the layout, footprint, scale and use of materials for the proposed replacement dwelling and its poor relation to the existing character and appearance of development in the Orsett Conservation Area.

Clarity was sought as to whether the mature trees on the back boundary had been there prior to the current landowner moving into the property. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed the lawful development certificate from 2006 did identify the extent of the site as falling within the red line curtilage of the property as seen on site.

Councillor Watson queried if any of the trees would be removed if the development went ahead. The Officer confirmed they would not, the majority of the trees and shrubs lying on the eastern and southern boundary would remain.

The Chair clarified that Councillors Arnold, Carter, Piccolo, Watson and Shinnick are the members of the Committee who can ask questions, enter into debate and vote on the application.

During the debate Councillor Watson stated that she had no problem with the application as it was such a small piece of Green Belt land that was affected, it would not cause traffic problems and the neighbours have no objections. Councillor Shinnick stated that it would be beneficial to the neighbours for the property to be pushed back. Councillor Arnold commented that he objected to the application as the current property was substantial already and it was development on the Green Belt. Councillor Carter commented that the property is in a conservation area and the Green Belt and therefore he was minded to refuse the application. Councillor Piccolo commented that he felt it was not going to impact on the Green Belt any more than the existing building.

The Chair noted the Officer's recommendation is for refusal however the Chair could not give a casting vote and therefore the item will be deferred to the next meeting where Councillor Kelly can provide a casting vote.

For: (3) Councillors Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, James Thandi

Against: (3) Councillors Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick, Lee Watson

54. 22/00921/FUL: 43 Purfleet Road, Aveley, South Ockendon, Essex, RM15 4DR

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report. She confirmed there were two updates for members since the agenda was published. Two additional letters of objection have been received in relation to the proposal, one of which is from the ward Councillor M Pearce. The objections raised in both letters are similar to the reasons raised in the report.

The Planning Officer summarised that the application site comprises of a detached bungalow and garage building on a corner plot located within a residential area in Aveley. The proposal seeks the redevelopment of the site to provide 5 dwellings, comprising 2x pairs semi-detached two storey dwellings, and 1 detached dwelling. The proposal would provide 12 parking spaces on a car dominated frontage which is a concern and is included as a reason for refusal. The applicant has been asked to provide additional swept path analyses to demonstrate that all car parking spaces could be safely and practicably accessed and egressed. The applicant has provided this, however, the Highways Officer is concerned that the layout would be

particularly awkward and tight resulting in some spaces not being realistically usable and there is concern that parking could migrate on the surrounding roads which would be unacceptable. The application is recommended for refusal for three reasons which are set out on page 56 of the agenda

Councillor Watson raised concerns as to turning points and how an ambulance, waste collection vehicle or fire truck would access the properties. The Highways Officer confirmed these vehicles would probably service the properties from the front entrance which has a width of 4.8 metres wide so it would be big enough. It might be tricky for them to get right into the site particularly to the end house depending on how people had parked. Councillor Carter raised the issue of parking for visitors. The Planning officer confirmed it is a medium accessibility area and they would be comfortable with two spaces per property and two visitor spaces overall. The layout and accessibility of the spaces is the concern.

Councillor Thandi asked how long the property had been vacant. The Planning Officer confirmed it had been vacant for approximately 18 months but they did not have an exact date.

- Statement of Support: Rakesh Kainth, Montague TSK Limited

During the debate Councillor Arnold noted there remained problems with the number of properties proposed, the site layout and problems with parking. Councillor Piccolo, Councillor Watson, Councillor Shinnick, Councillor Little and Councillor Carter echoed Councillor Arnold's concerns that the layout is too cramped.

The Chair proposed the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was upheld.

For: (7) Councillors Georgette Polley (Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Terry Piccolo, Lee Watson, Sue Shinnick, Susan Little

Against: (1) Councillor James Thandi

55. 22/01074/FUL: Land Adjoining Fobbing Acres And Mill Lane, Fobbing, Essex

The Principal Planning Officer outlined that the application is for planning permission of a residential gypsy traveller site and for associated operational development comprising the stationing of a static caravan and formation of a gravel driveway. The application site is part of the grazing land within the Green Belt. Some of the local objections refer to the presence of protected species on the site such as bats and badgers. No survey has been provided by the application as to the harm to ecology on the site. There are concerns the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area

Councillor Arnold stated that he had visited the site and noted it was incredibly hard to find and access and recommended an aerial photograph would be of assistance. During the debate Councillor Piccolo commented that it was a large site and he was concerned it was out of character for the area. Councillor Carter stated he was concerned that no survey had been provided regarding the ecological impact on the site.

The Chair proposed the officer recommendation to refuse the application and this was upheld.

For: (8) Councillors Georgette Polley (Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Terry Piccolo, Lee Watson, James Thandi, Sue Shinnick, Susan Little

Against: (0)

56. 22/01363/FUL: Footbridge And Car Park, Orchard Road, South Ockendon, Essex

The Principal Planning Officer summarised that the application was for planning permission to remove the existing pedestrian footbridge and to erect a new pedestrian footbridge and ramped access across the railway line between Orchard Road and Ardmore Road in South Ockendon. The Principal Planning Officer stated that the present bridge is in poor condition and requires refurbishment and it doesn't comply with modern accessibility standards. It would cost more to repair the bridge than to build a new one.

Councillor Little asked if there would be improved lighting and queried the effect this may have on neighbours. The Principal Planning Officer responded that anti-social behaviour does take part on the bridge and therefore improved lighting has been fully considered and this will be down lighting so as not to affect neighbouring properties.

Councillor Watson raised concern for the loss of trees. The Principal Planning Officer responded that there is a condition that the soft landscaping scheme will include replacement trees to compensate for the loss of trees.

The Chair raised that there are artist panels on the current bridge and suggested that the applicant contacts the Belhus Community forum about what will happen to these panels.

The Chair proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application and this was seconded by Councillor Watson.

For: (8) Councillors Georgette Polley (Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Terry Piccolo, Lee Watson, James Thandi, Sue Shinnick, Susan Little

Against: (0)

The meeting finished at 7.40 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**