

Reference: 22/01370/FUL	Site: Land adjacent Watts Wood including Mardyke Farm, Ship Lane and Broomhill, Arterial Road Purfleet-on-Thames Essex
Aveley and Uplands	Application for full planning permission comprising the demolition of existing buildings / structures and provision of an employment hub comprising of 44,463 sq.m (gross internal area) of general industrial (Use Class B2) / logistics floorspace (Use Class B8) with ancillary development. Creation of a new boardwalk adjacent to the Mardyke; upgrades to Public Footpath 149; a new community and workplace hub; new roundabout junction on Ship Lane; hard and soft landscaping, and outdoor recreational facilities.

Plan Number(s):

Reference	Name	Received
T025-S-DR-001 rev PL1	Location Plan	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-002 rev PL1	Existing Site Plan	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-030 rev PL1	Demolition Plan	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-100 rev PL1	Proposed Wider Site Plan	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-101 rev PL1	Proposed Site Plan	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-250 rev PL1	Proposed Site Sections Sheet 1	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-251 rev PL1	Proposed Site Sections Sheet 2	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-252 rev PL1	Proposed Site Sections Sheet 3	05.10.2022
T025-S-DR-800 rev PL1	Typical Fence Details	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-100 rev PL1	Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-101 rev PL1	Proposed First Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-102 rev PL1	Proposed Roof Plan	05.10.2022

T025-U1-DR-103 rev PL1	Proposed Service Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-150 rev PL1	Proposed Ground Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-151 rev PL1	Proposed First Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-200 rev PL1	Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2)	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-201 rev PL1	Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2)	05.10.2022
T025-U1-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 1 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-101 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed First Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-102 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Plant Desk Level GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-102 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Roof Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-104 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Service Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-150 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Ground Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-151 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed First Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-152 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Plant Desk Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2)	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-201 rev PL1	Unit 2 Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2)	05.10.2022
T025-U2-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 2 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U3A-DR-103 rev PL1	Unit 3A Proposed Service Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3A-DR-150 rev PL1	Unit 3A Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3A-DR-151 rev PL1	Unit 3A Proposed First Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022

T025-U3B-DR-100 rev PL1	Unit 3B Proposed Ground Floor & Service Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3B-DR-101 rev PL1	Unit 3B Proposed First Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3B-DR-102 rev PL1	Unit 3B Proposed Roof Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3B-DR-150 rev PL1	Unit 3B Proposed Ground Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3B-DR-151 rev PL1	Unit 3B Proposed First Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U3B-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 3 Proposed Elevations	05.10.2022
T025-U3B-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 3 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U4-DR-100 rev PL1	Units 4A-E Proposed Ground Floor & Service Yards GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U4-DR-101 rev PL1	Unit 4A-4E Roof Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U4-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 4 Proposed Elevations	05.10.2022
T025-U4-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 4 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-100 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-101 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed First Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-102 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed Roof Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-103 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed Services Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-150 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed Ground Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-151 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed First Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2)	05.10.2022
T025-U5-DR-201 rev PL1	Unit 5 Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2)	05.10.2022

T025-U5-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 5 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-100 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed Ground Floor & Service Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-101 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed First Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-102 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed Plant Deck Level GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-103 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed Roof Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-150 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed Ground Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-151 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed First Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-152 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed Plant Deck Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 6 Proposed Elevations	05.10.2022
T025-U6-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 6 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-100 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-101 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed First Floor Plan GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-102 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Plant Deck Level GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-103 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Roof Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-104 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Service Yard GA Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-150 rev PL1	Unit 7 Ground Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-151 rev PL1	Unit 7 First Floor Core Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-152 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Plan Deck Plan	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2)	05.10.2022

T025-U7-DR-201 rev PL1	Unit 7 Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2)	05.10.2022
T025-U7-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 7 GA Sections	05.10.2022
T025-U8-DR-100 rev PL1	Unit 8 (Community Building) Proposed Ground Floor & Roof GA Plans	05.10.2022
T025-U8-DR-200 rev PL1	Unit 8 (Community Building) Proposed Elevations	05.10.2022
T025-U8-DR-250 rev PL1	Unit 8 (Community Building) GA Sections	05.10.2022

The application is also accompanied by:

- Design & Access Statement, Mardyke Park Purfleet, dated September 2022;
- Drawing Schedule, Mardyke Farm, T025-3-DIR;
- Arboricultural Implications Report, Mardyke Purfleet, by SJA on behalf of MD Star Limited, ref SJA air 21068-01b, dated October 2022;
- Mardyke Park BREEAM Assessment, by sustainable Construction Services on behalf of MD Star Limited, ref 31378, dated 30 September;
- Mardyke Park Construction Design and Management Report, by SkW Consultancy on behalf of MD Star Limited, dated 30 September 2022;
- Mardyke Park Economic Industrial Case, by iceni Projects on behalf of MD Star Limited, dated October 2022
- Mardyke Park Energy and Sustainability Statement, October 2022, Savills on behalf of MD Star Limited, Issue: 30 September 2022, Rev 3;
- Mardyke Park, J31, M25, Environmental Statement (ES), vol. 3, Non-Technical Summary (NTS), September 2022;
- Mardyke Park, J31, M25, Environmental Statement (Contents and Glossary), Icen Projects Limited on behalf of MD Star Ltd;
- Supplementary Flood details
- Supplementary Highways details

Applicant:
Mr Richard Plasek
MD Star Ltd

Validated:
7 October 2022
Date of expiry:
14 July 2023 (Extension of time

	agreed)
Recommendation: Refuse planning permission	

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 6 April 2023 Members of the Planning Committee considered a report assessing the above proposal. The Committee voted to undertake a site visit to better understand the proposal. The site visit took place on 5 July 2023.
- 1.2 The report below summarises the matters which were verbally reported to Committee in April and also provides a summary of any further submissions from the applicant, consultation responses and planning updates.
- 1.3 A copy of the report presented to the April Committee meeting is attached.

2.0 SUMMARY OF VERBAL UPDATES FROM APRIL COMMITTEE

- 2.1 Shortly before the Committee meeting in April the applicant submitted a VISSIM traffic report outlining the results of modelling requested by the local highways authority to further consider the impact of the development on M25 J30 and J31. This traffic report has been circulated to both Highways Officers and National Highways for comment.
- 2.2 At the April Committee Officers reported that a further consultation response had been received from the Environment Agency. This response (dated 23 March 2023) confirms:
- an existing embankment protects the site from flooding in the 1% plus climate change event;
 - upon review of the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment, a previous objection is removed, providing that the local planning authority takes into account the flood risk considerations which are their responsibility.
- 2.3 A verbal update was given at the April Committee confirming that 154 representations had been received, comprising 34 objections and 120 letters of support. In addition to the petition containing 600+ signatures objecting to the development, a petition of support containing 171 signatures has also been received.
- 2.4 Before the April meeting the applicant produced a 'Briefing Pack' which was

circulated to Committee Members. The applicant's covering e-mail referenced publication of the Council's 'Employment Land Availability Assessment' (ELAA) in April 2023. This assessment forms part of the evidence base for the new Thurrock Local Plan and it is currently intended to undertake a formal public consultation on the draft plan (Regulation 18) in the autumn. The Executive Summary for the ELAA confirms the status of the document in determining if sufficient land can be identified to meet quantitative and qualitative employment land needs identified in the 2023 Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA). The EDNA has now also been published on-line. Under the heading of 'Potential Employment Land' paragraph no. xxii of the ELAA states that in order to address the shortfall of general employment land, particularly within the Grays, West Thurrock and Purfleet area, *"the Council should consider "allocating additional land"*. Under the heading of "Potential Sites" paragraph no. 5.5.14 of the ELAA states that:

"Sites well situated to serve the market for employment premises in the Purfleet and West Thurrock areas are listed below. The Council should consider allocating some or all as employment land."

A list of sites potential sites follows, including:

"T101 Mardyke Farm, Ship Lane. An employment scheme is proposed on the eastern end of this area would have good access to the M25. A preliminary site layout shows the site accommodating a range of unit sizes."

The application site is therefore identified as a potential employment site to meet land demand in the Purfleet / West Thurrock area. However, it is a matter for the Council to consider through the Local Plan whether this site should be allocated. As noted by Officers at the April meeting, the ELAA will inform the emerging Local Plan and the reference to this site in the document can only be afforded limited weight in the overall planning balance.

3.0 CONSULTATION UPDATES

3.1 Since the previous Committee report was published, the following consultation responses have been received:

- National Highways (18 April 2023): Holding response recommending that the local planning authority does not determine the application until 13 June 2023. The reasons for the response are noted as:

'We have been involved in recent discussions and have made progress towards the resolution of outstanding issues in relation to the planning application. We are broadly content with the assessment presented to date of the development related impacts on the SRN at M25 Junctions 30 and 31 and additionally the A13/A1306

Wennington Interchange. However this is conditional on two outstanding issues that need resolution prior to making a final recommendation in relation to this application. Outstanding Issues - Firstly, additional transport modelling assessments have now been provided to demonstrate the impacts of the development with a traffic signal mitigation scheme associated with the consented Purfleet Centre at the M25 Junction 31 northbound off slip merge with the M25 Junction 30 northbound off slip. The assessment has shown the change in journey times through the modelled network but additionally needs to demonstrate that with the mitigation there will not be any risk of queueing back from the M25 Junction 31 northbound off slip road to the Junction 31 roundabout. Maximum queue length estimates should be provided for each scenario. Further details showing the total flows in each modelled scenario also need to be provided to ensure that with and without development flows are correct. Secondly, subject to the above requirements we additionally require confirmation from Thurrock Council that they are content with the traffic modelling undertaken for the M25 Junction 31 roundabout and will not be requiring further modelling or modifications to existing modelling work. Should Thurrock Council require further modelling work or modifications to existing modelling work we would need to further assess implications for the SRN as it connects to this roundabout and may be subjected to knock on effects of flow changes. This Updated recommendation takes into account the further information submitted by the applicant.'

- Thurrock Highways (15 May 2023): Further information required - the applicant has provided a rebuttal to previous Highway comments which is not fully accepted. It is still not necessarily agreed as development proposals could be unacceptable if they increase demand for use of a section of the network that is already operating over-capacity or cannot be safely accommodated within the existing infrastructure provision, unless suitable mitigation is agreed. In addition, some further concerns remain regarding the Vissim modelling that have also been reiterated by National Highways. As such there are still a number of issues with the assumptions within the modelling that are still not agreed, particularly in regards impact on junctions on the Thurrock network particularly at Junction 30 and Junction 31. At present, full comments remain reserved subject to additional comments from National Highways as clearly there is a close interaction between the National Highways network and the Thurrock highway network. As previously set out, there still remains concern regarding the traffic impact on Ship Lane and Aveley village particularly if congestion occurs at Junction 31 and the local network.
- National Highways (13 June 2023): Holding response recommending that the local planning authority does not determine the application until 13 September 2023. The reasons for the response are noted as:

'Firstly, following our previous April correspondence we requested additional modelling information from the applicant's consultants. We received and reviewed the additional information and concluded that there was scope to further refine the

underlying trip generation and distribution assumptions. On this basis further evidence arrived yesterday on 12 June. As you will understand, we will be reviewing in the coming days and will provide an update on the acceptability of the evidence.

Secondly, subject to the above requirements we additionally require confirmation from Thurrock Council that they are content with the traffic modelling undertaken for the M25 Junction 31 roundabout and will not be requiring further modelling or modifications to existing modelling work. Should Thurrock Council require further modelling work or modifications to existing modelling work we would need to further assess implications for the SRN as it connects to this roundabout and may be subjected to knock on effects of flow changes.'

4.0 UPDATES, ASSESSMENT & IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Following receipt of the applicant's VISSIM traffic report shortly before the April Committee meeting, an updated version of this traffic report was submitted in May, as well as additional queue length data.
- 4.2 Further modelling updates were submitted following the comments from TC Highways in May 2023 (outlined above). Towards the end of May 2023 National Highways raised points of clarification and, following this, additional VISSIM modelling was received in mid-June.
- 4.3 Following the submission of the June version of VISSIM modelling, National Highways have directed the LPA not to determine the application until 13 September 2023. Therefore, at the time of writing, there have been no further updates regarding the position of Thurrock Council Highways or National Highways. On this basis, the LPA consider that the issues surrounding the impact to the highways network are still unresolved and, in turn, the second Highways reason for refusal remains.
- 4.4 As noted above, an updated consultation response from the Environment Agency (dated 23 March 2023) confirms no objection to the planning application, providing that the local planning authority takes into account the flood risk considerations which are their responsibility. The application is located within an area with a high probability of fluvial flooding (Zone 3a), although the proposed land uses are classified as 'less vulnerable' by Annex 3 of Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Vulnerability Classification). In these circumstances, the application is subject to the Sequential Test and should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA).
- 4.5 Sequential Test:
- As noted by paragraph no. 162 of the NPPF, the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source.

Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. It is the responsibility of the local planning authority to consider whether the test is passed, with reference to the information it holds on land availability. The applicant will need to identify whether there are any other 'reasonably available' sites within the area of search, that have not already been identified by the planning authority in site allocations.

4.6 In support of the application, a 'Sequential Test Report' (February 2023) has been submitted. This document provides an assessment of allocated industrial and commercial sites in the adopted Thurrock Local Plan (1997) and the draft Local Development Framework (LDF) Site Specific Allocations (2013). Progression of the LDF was suspended in preference for a new Local Plan. However, the 2013 Draft Allocations document identified 18 sites as 'Land for Primary Industrial and Commercial Employment' totalling c.379 Ha of land. All of these sites except one are located in the high risk flood zone. The single site at a lower risk of flooding is 0.35Ha in area and is the subject of a live planning application for residential use. This site could not be considered either suitable or reasonably available for development. The adopted Core Strategy (2015) does not include site specific allocations, although the Strategy is accompanied by a spatial 'Policies Map'. This map identifies the existing 'Primary Industrial and Commercial Areas' as well as 'Land for New Development in Primary Areas'. All of these spatial allocations are located in areas with a high probability of flooding (Purfleet / West Thurrock / Tilbury). Accordingly, it can be concluded that there are no suitable and reasonably available sites which could accommodate the proposed development and which are at a lower risk of flooding. In these circumstances, the Sequential Test for flooding is passed.

4.7 The consultation response from the Environment Agency referred to above also makes the following observations on the content of the applicant's FRA:

Actual flood risk:

- the site lies outside the flood extent for a 1% (1 in 100 year) annual probability event, including a 17% allowance for climate change;
- the site benefits from an embankment which acts as a defence. The embankment is above the 1% annual probability flood level (including climate change allowance) – therefore the site is not at actual risk of flooding in this event;
- flood resilience measures are proposed in the FRA;
- as a result of the embankment, on-site flood depth are 0m in the 1% flood event (with climate change);

- therefore the proposal has a safe means of access from all proposed buildings to an area wholly outside the floodplain in the 1% flood event (with climate change); and
- compensatory storage is not required.

4.8 Residual flood risk (in the event of a breach scenario):

- in a worst-case scenario the site could experience breach flood depths up to 0.69m in the northern corner of the site in the 1% flood event (with climate change);
- assuming a flood velocity of 0.5m/second this would pose a danger to most in the 1% event (with climate change);
- flood resilience / resistance measures have been proposed;
- a Flood Evacuation Plan is recommended; and
- the site is at risk from reservoir flooding, although such flooding is extremely unlikely providing the reservoir appropriately managed and maintained.

4.9 The report presented to the April Planning Committee included a reason for refusal (no.3) stating that the site was located in the functional floodplain (Zone 3b) and as such the proposals should not be permitted as the land use was incompatible with the flood risk classification. The updated consultation response from the Environment Agency confirms that the site is located in flood Zone 3a (not 3b). Therefore, subject to the application of the Sequential Test, there is no in-principle objection on flood risk grounds. The Sequential Test has been applied and is passed. Subject to planning conditions securing the measures within the FRA and requiring a flood evacuation plan, this reason for refusal can be removed from the recommendation.

4.10 Reason for refusal no.5 from the April report referred to the loss of 4 no. existing dwellings on-site as being contrary to both Government guidance and Core Strategy policy. To expand upon this matter, Core Strategy policy (CSSP1 – Sustainable Housing and Locations) sets out a housing delivery target of 18,500 dwellings in the period between 2001 and 2021, with an indicative provision of 4,750 dwellings between 2021 and 2026. This policy then goes on to address the allocation, phasing and broad spatial distribution of housing locations. Although it may be implied that the policy would include the retention of existing housing stock as a component of the 'target' for housing delivery, CSSP1 does not specifically mention that loss of existing housing will be resisted.

4.11 Core Strategy policy CSTP2 (Strategic Housing Provision) is clearer in the approach to existing housing and states that:

“For the period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2021, and additional 13,440 dwellings are

required to meet this aim”.

The reference to “additional” implies that existing housing stock should be retained. However, the policy goes on:

“For the 5 year period a April 2021 to 31 March 2026, the Council has made an indicative provision for 4,750 dwellings.” The lack of reference to “*additional dwellings*” in the period between 2021-2026 is perhaps inconsistent with other wording within the Policy.

- 4.12 Paragraph nos. 6.210 and 6.211 of the April report referred to the NPPF in the context of housing supply and the relevant extract from the NPPF is paragraph no. 60 which states the Government objective of “significantly boosting the supply of homes”. Although not specifically mentioned within national guidance, it must be assumed that the retention of existing housing is a key element in the objective of boosting the supply of new housing. Nevertheless, although the loss of 4 no. dwellings is a material planning consideration, this loss should be balanced against the economic benefits of the proposals and in particular the creation of c.700 new jobs.

5.0 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 The recommendation remains one of refusal for the reasons stated in 8.0 of the April Committee report. However, for the reasons cited above, the objection to the proposal on flood risk grounds now falls away.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The Committee is recommended to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:
1. The application site is located within the Green Belt, as identified on the Policies Map accompanying the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (2015). National and local planning policies for the Green Belt set out within the NPPF and Thurrock Local Development Framework set out a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposals are considered to constitute inappropriate development with reference to policy and would by definition be harmful to the Green Belt. It is also considered that the proposals would harm the openness of the Green Belt and would be contrary to purposes a), b), c) and e) of the Green Belt, as set out by paragraph 138 of the NPPF. It is considered that the identified harm to the Green Belt is not clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development. The proposals are therefore contrary to Part 13 of the NPPF and Policies CSSP4 and PMD6 of the

adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (2015).

2. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate the impact of the development proposals on the surrounding highways network. In these circumstances the local planning authority cannot conclude whether impacts would be severe or acceptable, subject to mitigation. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy PMD9 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (2015) and paragraph no. 110 of the NPPF.
3. The development proposals will result in substantial adverse impacts on landscape and visual receptors, particularly users of both Ship Lane and public footpath no. 149, which cannot be adequately mitigated. The proposals would therefore result in residual landscape and visual harm contrary to paragraph nos. 130 and 145 of the NPPF and Policies PMD1 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (2015).
4. The proposal would result in the loss of 4 dwellings which contributes to the housing stock. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a Five-Year Housing Supply. At present a case has not been fully made for the loss of the dwellings, which would have a limited impact on the number of homes in the Borough. The proposal is contrary to the aims of strategic policies CSSP1 and CSTP1 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015 and the guidance set out within National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Informative(s)

1. Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Positive and Proactive Statement:

The local planning authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing with the Applicant/Agent. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

