Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 5 January 2023 at 6.00 pm

Present:	Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Steve, Liddiard (substitute for Sue Shinnick), Terry Piccolo, James Thandi and Lee Watson
Apologies:	Councillors Sue Shinnick and Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative
In attendance:	Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection Jonathan Keen, Interim Strategic Lead Development Services Nadia Houghton, Principal Planning Officer Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager Julian Howes, Senior Highways Engineer Caroline Robins, Legal Representative (via Microsoft Teams) 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.

57. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

58. Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

59. 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

Councillor Arnold declared he had received an information pack in relation to 22/01513/FUL Thurrock Lawn Tennis Club Montgomery Close Grays Essex RM16 2RL. It was confirmed this was sent to all Planning Committee Members.

Councillors Carter, Piccolo and Polley also declared emails had been received from the agent for planning application 21/01812/FUL Land Adjacent And To The Rear Of The George And Dragon East Tilbury Road Linford Essex.

60. Planning Appeals

The Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection presented the report to Members.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

61. 21/01812/FUL - Land Adjacent And To The Rear Of The George And Dragon East Tilbury Road Linford Essex (Deferred)

The report was presented by the Major Applications Manager, during which he advised Members that should they be minded to approve the application there would need to be a Section 106 Agreement in place, which would be required to secure amongst other things a financial contribution towards education provision to mitigate the impact of the development.

Members queried as to whether the railway line was a clear boundary line and whether this could be defendable as the boundary to the east of the site, as there were concerns if this was not the case it could lead to further or additional development within the area.

It was enquired as to the mitigation in place against flooding on the development. The Major Applications Manager referred Members to the constraints map and highlighted that along the Northern and Northwestern edge of the site was the higher flooding risk zone because there was a water course. He advised that none of the dwellings or the roads of the development be located into that area and so the dwellings themselves would be safe and not at risk of flooding. A planning condition would be required to secure a detailed surface water drainage scheme if planning permission were to be granted.

It was then raised as to the access concerns to the site and it was asked of Officers if they felt the highway could cope with the increase in traffic. The Senior Highways Engineer commented that the level of traffic from the proposed site would be spread out throughout the day, with a model of traffic movements being taken from Princess Margaret Road. He acknowledged there was the possibility of small queues of traffic leaving or entering East Tilbury, however a yellow Keep Clear box would be used at the entrance to the site to ease this and modelling hadn't highlighted any problems or concerns.

During the debate, Councillor Piccolo commented when the application was first presented to the Committee he had a few concerns, however looking at the detail within the report more closely, he felt the development being located close to the Railway Station could assist with decreasing the traffic in the area. He continued by saying he felt there could be an influx in traffic around School collection and pickup times however felt the yellow box would assist in mitigating against long traffic queues. Councillor Piccolo stated he had

concerns as to additional development leading from this application on the Greenbelt however felt there was a natural boundary with the Railway line.

Councillor Watson stated her views on the application hadn't changed since the last Committee and as much as she liked the development, she still felt it was the wrong location. She continued by observing Officers comments that there were no flooding concerns, she still believed that more needed to be done to mitigate the possibility of flooding on the site.

Councillors Carter and Arnold both commented their view hadn't changed since the last Committee and they welcomed the development.

The Chair of the Committee acknowledged that through the debate a number of Members were in support of the application being approved.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection advised the Committee that the Constitution was clear that an alternative recommendation would need to be put forward, which met with council policies, as Members were not in agreement with the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Kelly, Chair of the Committee then put forward the following reasons for approval whilst acknowledging that there was harm to the Green Belt. He stated that there was to be delivery of 100% affordable homes as part of the development and gave this significant weight, there was the upgrades to the existing rail station, which was given limited weight.

He continued by mentioning the development was responding to the five-year housing supply and gave it very significant weight, low carbon development a moderate weight and the accelerated build program to respond to immediate housing short full granted limited weight.

The Chair of the Committee then proposed a recommendation of approval, subject to referral to the Planning Casework Unit, planning conditions and a s106 legal agreement and was seconded by Councillor Piccolo.

For: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Terry Piccolo and James Thandi

Against: (1) Lee Watson

Abstained: (0)

62. 19/01556/OUT - Kings Farm Parkers Farm Road Orsett Essex RM16 3HX

The Chair of the Committee advised Members the application had been withdrawn at the requested of the applicant.

63. 22/01513/FUL - Thurrock Lawn Tennis Club Montgomery Close Grays Essex RM16 2RL

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer, who gave an update to Members in that a total of 56 comments had been received in support of the application and Officers had received 31 objections to the application.

During questions from Members, it was enquired as to when the properties were first built and the history of the club. The Principal Planning Officer advised looking at planning history for the club the first application had been submitted in the early 1950s and some of the properties had already been built at this time.

The Principal Planning Officer further advised following queries from Members that the hours of usage for the lighting would be dependable on the amount of natural daylight, however within the winter months could be used as early as 4:00pm onwards and was limited to 9:00pm during the week and 8:00pm on a Saturday, and until 10pm on one day a week during the season to host home league matches.

It was highlighted there were no other tennis clubs within Thurrock which had floodlight facilities, although there were other sports facilities within the borough which had floodlights such as St Cleres Secondary School.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Statement of Objection: (Joint Resident Statement) Mr Dady, Resident
- Statement of Objection: Councillor Maney, Ward Member
- Statement of Support: Ms Prayle, Applicant

During the debate the Chair of the Committee stated he felt location of the Tennis Club was perhaps not ideal for a club which was growing that being said he felt any impact should the application be approved would be in the winter months to allow for later play.

Councillor Arnold stated he visited the site and as far as he could see there was no signage for the club within the area. He continued by saying he felt clubs of this nature should be supported and that with the right conditions to protect the area against future applications felt this application could be supported.

Councillor Piccolo commented he felt that any residents who had moved into the area or properties after the Tennis Club had been built would have been aware of the club and so it would only be perhaps the summer months which noise could be increased to a later time.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58pm and reconvened at 8:05pm.

Councillor Kelly Chair of the Committee acknowledged five Members had hinted during the debate at approving the application.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection advised the Constitution was clear that an alternative recommendation would need to be put forward, which met with council policies.

Councillor Kelly then continued by putting forward the following reasons for approval, sporting, health benefits and good well-being significant weight, with the use of conditions there would be trackable control of the floodlights and with the resurfacing of the court there should be less noise coming from the club should they hold evening matches.

The Chair of the Committee proposed a recommendation to approve the application and was seconded by Councillor Liddiard.

For: (6) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Steve Liddiard, Terry Piccolo and James Thandi

Against: (2) Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair) and Lee Watson

Abstained: (0)

The Committee agreed to suspend standing orders at 8.17pm to allow the agenda to be completed.

64. 22/01241/FUL - The Hollies Rectory Road Orsett Essex RM16 3EH (Deferred)

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

As the application had been deferred from December meeting Members entered the debate and in doing so Councillor Piccolo expressed concerns as to the boundary of the site, he stated that following the site visit at the end of last year, it was clear to see there was a line of trees along the boundary to the rear of the site which the applicant had previously explained they would not be exceeding this boundary and the trees were not to be removed. This eased some concerns for Member of the possibly of additional Green Belt being used as part of the application.

Councillor Watson commented that the application was not proposing to move the property, it was to be demolished and rebuilt.

Councillor Arnold felt even with the boundary of trees at the rear of the property didn't mean to say additional development wouldn't take place or be applied for. It was for this reason he would be voting with officers' recommendations.

Councillor Carter recapped it was not only Green Belt land which was part of the reason for refusal of the application, it was also that the application was located within the Orsett Conservation Area and although he understood Members comments he felt it was important to remember this is well.

Councillor Carter proposed the officer recommendation to refuse the application and was seconded by Councillor Arnold.

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

Against: (3) Tom Kelly (Chair), Terry Piccolo, and Lee Watson

Abstained: (0)

With the Chair having the casting vote the officer recommendation fell.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection advised the Constitution was clear that an alternative recommendation would need to be put forward, which met with council policies.

Members then put forward the following reasons for approval, the repositioning of the proposal would improve the street scene and the setting of the neighbouring property, there were no objections received and the application was supported by the local Ward Member. The site itself is enclosed and it was felt impact on the Orsett Conservation Area would be limited.

It was also commented that the Planning Committee had recently granted permission for replacement dwellings which were larger than the proposed in similar situations.

Councillor Piccolo then proposed a recommendation of approval and was seconded by Councillor Watson.

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

Against: (3) Tom Kelly (Chair), Terry Piccolo, and Lee Watson

Abstained: (0)

As Members approved the application with the Chair having casting vote, in line with the Council's Constitution, the item was deferred to allow Officers to prepare a report outlining the implications of making a decision contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendation.

65. 22/01402/HHA - 182 Sewell Close Chafford Hundred Grays Thurrock RM16 6BU

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer.

The Chair of the Committee proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application and was seconded by Councillor Polley.

For: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Georgette Polley (Vice-Chair), Paul Arnold, Adam Carter, Steve Liddiard, Terry Piccolo, James Thandi and Lee Watson

Against: (0)

Abstained: (0)

The meeting finished at 8.55 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