

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE**HELD ON 12 APRIL 2016 AT 6.00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES,
THORPE ROAD, WEELEY**

Present: Councillors Stock (Chairman), Turner (Vice-Chairman), Baker, Bray, G V Guglielmi, Howard, Land, Newton, Platt, Scott, Skeels Snr., Stephenson and Whitmore

Also Present: Councillors M Brown (except item 40), Bucke (except item 40), Coley, Davis (except item 40), Heaney, Hughes, McWilliams and White

In Attendance: Head of Planning Services (Cath Bicknell) (except items 34 -36), Legal Services Manager & Monitoring Officer (Lisa Hastings), Planning and Regulation Manager (Simon Meecham), Planning Officer (Will Fuller) and Senior Democratic Services Officer (Ian Ford) (except items 34 -36)

Also in Attendance: Chief Executive (Ian Davidson) (except item 40), Corporate Director (Corporate Services) (Martyn Knappett) (except item 40), Acting Planning Development Manager (Gary Guiver), Communications and Public Relations Manager (Nigel Brown), Senior Development Technician (Mary Foster), Planning Officer (Consultant) (Michael Narthey)

34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Broderick and Talbot. There were no substitutions.

35. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, held on 21 January 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor G V Guglielmi declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item A.2 – Housing Requirement and Supply insofar as he was a Director of Lawford Housing Enterprise Trust.

Councillor G V Guglielmi also declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item A.3 - Essex County Council and Southend-On-Sea Borough Council's Joint Replacement Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission Document – Consultation Response insofar as, in his capacity as a County Councillor, he was a member of a Panel that assisted Officers in considering the proposed sites.

37. PUBLIC SPEAKING

The Chairman invited the following persons to address the Committee:

Item A.1 – Local Plan Evidence Update

Parish Councillor Peter Dumsday, Chairman of Weeley Parish Council, asked the following question:

“I notice that the only difference between the current Local Plan Evidence Update to that of 2012 Draft of the Local Plan (as amended by the 2014 Focussed Changes) is that

Weeley Heath is being considered separately to Weeley despite there being a local view that both settlements should be classed as one and the same.

Nowhere in the document can I find a reference where this “split” is made. Can we be told exactly where the demarcation between Weeley Heath and Weeley has been assumed? A plan of such a boundary would be useful.”

The Chairman of the Committee replied along the following lines:

“Thank you for your question Mr Dumsday. The Settlement Hierarchy paper clearly states:

‘that Weeley Heath has been considered separately to Weeley (because although there is a local view that both settlements should be classed as one and the same), Weeley Heath is physically separate from the main village and is much more rural in character”.

Whilst the same parish, Weeley and Weeley Heath are different settlements and are clearly separated by the railway line. In addition, both the 2007 and 2012 Local Plan settlement boundaries, separate Weeley Heath from Weeley – these maps are, and have for some time been, available online.”

Sue Jiggins, representing Weeley Residents’ Action Group, made a statement in which she said that the Council had not listened to the people of Weeley and had produced no sound evidence that justified a sustainable development at Weeley especially compared to Thorpe-le-Soken. She felt that the Council’s approach was inconsistent and that the Local Plan was not sound. She urged the Council to work with local communities on Neighbourhood Plans to come up with a sustainable local plan.

Edward Gittins, Planning Consultant, made a statement and urged the Council to make the Local Plan a jobs led strategy to attract a younger demographic to the District. He stated that development should be concentrated along the A120 corridor in the Frating area which would be an attractive site for businesses. He also urged Council to reclassify Weeley from an Expanded Settlement to a Rural Service Settlement and to make Tendring Central a Strategic Urban Settlement.

Item A.2 – Housing Requirement and Supply

Parish Councillor Peter Dumsday, Chairman of Weeley Parish Council, asked the following question:

“Can the reasoning between 304 more houses in Weeley if 550 dwellings per annum (dpa) are required and 1411 more houses if 600 dpa are deemed necessary be explained? How can it be justified that a 9% increase in dpa results in a 364% increase in houses in Weeley? Why is this difference not spread around the District?”

The Chairman of the Committee replied along the following lines:

“Thank you Mr Dumsday, taking your question as one: Weeley is not part of the 6109 homes listed in Table A2 rows C – Q. This means that the majority of the supply is already spread around the District. The shortfall at 304 would represent less 5% of the supply required in the District.”

Hugh Frostick, Vice-Chairman of Great Bromley Parish Council, asked the following question:

"I have here a letter from 'Resolved Developments' of Wolverhampton which I believe has already been circulated to the Committee. This company has written to several landowners in Great Bromley that I know of, and no doubt to farmers in other villages in our region, stating, and I quote:

'At Resolved Developments we are looking to help landowners promote residential development on their land. We believe that due to the current local policy position of Tendring District Council, now is an excellent time to bring forward land in your area.' They go on to propose a "no win, no fee" deal to gain planning permission for developments.

My question is:

"Does the Committee agree that putting a good Local Plan in place, as a matter of urgency, will help to protect us from the unplanned, unwanted and undemocratic growth promoted by 'no win – no fee' touts such as this, and from unscrupulous developers"?

The Chairman of the Committee replied along the following lines:

"Thank you Mr Frostick. The simple answer is yes. Your question is well made. I certainly do agree that the best way to lead the challenges brought by growth is to have a Local Plan in place. Unplanned growth is indeed unwanted and undemocratic. Tonight is a key stage in moving the preparation of our Plan forward so that the policies, including locations for housing supply, can be drafted for public consultation. It is important for this Council to be in control of its own destiny and not have a Local Plan imposed on it by the Government."

Carol Bannister, representing Weeley Residents' Action Group, made a statement in which she said that the Council had manipulated the statistical evidence to reach its desired outcome which was that contrary to national planning policies Weeley north of the railway line would have a 62% increase in housing numbers which would further cripple the local infrastructure especially the road links (B1033). She said that this scale of development would badly affect the rural setting and the setting of listed buildings in the village. She stated that she did not believe that the mixed use development would produce enough employment to justify it.

District Councillor Mike Brown, Ward Member for Little Clacton and Weeley, made a statement questioning the inclusion of The Street, Little Clacton as a proposed site for development when other better 'brownfield' sites were available. He also questioned why Alresford, Elmstead Market and St Osyth had not been allocated any development sites and urged the Council to adopt a 'level playing field'. He urged the Council to place its housing development sites towards large employment areas i.e. Colchester on environmental grounds.

John Smith-Daye, resident of Little Clacton, made a statement in which he urged the Council not to include The Street, Little Clacton as a preferred option.

Little Clacton Parish Councillor Martyn Reed, made a statement in which he questioned why the Council was proposing good quality arable land for development in Little Clacton when 'brownfield' sites were available.

Parish Councillor Martin Rayner, Chairman of Mistley Parish Council, made a statement that the housing allocation figures in the Mistley area appeared to outweigh any demonstrated housing need and he urged the Council to re-examine the evidence.

38. LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE UPDATE

The Committee had before it a report of the Head of Planning Services that updated the Committee on the latest progress of the 'evidence base' that would underpin the content of the new Local Plan and which also sought the Committee's approval of the updated Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016).

Members were aware that The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required Local Plans to be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. The Council's evidence was well developed and the report provided a further update on the latest work.

Those studies included:

- (i) Objectively Assessed Housing Assessment Update;
- (ii) Transport Junction Modelling;
- (iii) Retail Study;
- (iv) Employment Land Review;
- (v) Traveller Needs Definition Review;
- (vi) Sustainability Appraisal; and
- (vii) Settlement Hierarchy

It was reported that the 'settlement hierarchy' for the District had been established through the production of the 2012 draft Local Plan and had now been updated. The settlement hierarchy was attached as the Appendix to item A.1 of the Report of the Head of Planning Services and the Committee was requested to agree the updated settlement hierarchy.

In respect of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Study Update the Committee had before it a series of Tables which provided it with the following information:

- Table 1.1 – Projected Household Population in 2037 by Household Type in Tendring;
- Table 1.2 – Projected Tenure Profile in 2037;
- Table 1.3 – Tenure of new Accommodation required in Tendring over the next 22 years;
- Table 1.4 – Size of new Owner-Occupied Accommodation required in Tendring over the next 22 years;
- Table 1.5 – Size of new Private Rented Accommodation required in Tendring over the next 22 years;
- Table 1.6 – Affordable Housing Completions by Year since 2001/02.

Having discussed the information received, it was moved by Councillor Turner, seconded by Councillor G V Guglielmi and **RESOLVED** that the Committee:

- a) notes the latest progress on the evidence base for the Local Plan, in particular the strategic housing market assessment update; subject to Officers taking on board Members' concerns that the Transport Junction Modelling Survey (which had to be abandoned due to a fatal accident on the day in question on the A133) should be retaken and that the Survey should take into consideration seasonal variations. Further, that the Council's consultants be requested to re-examine the projected housing bedroom numbers [Table 1.4] over the projected life of the Local Plan.

It was further moved by Councillor Turner, seconded by Councillor G V Guglielmi and **RESOLVED** that the Committee:

- b) agrees the Settlement Hierarchy, attached as the Appendix to item A.1 of the Report of the Head of Planning Services.

NOTE: In accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 18.5, Councillors Bray and Stephenson requested that they be recorded in the minutes as having voted against resolution (b) above.

39. **HOUSING REQUIREMENT AND SUPPLY**

Councillor G V Guglielmi reminded the Committee that he had earlier declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of this item and especially Table 2 contained therein insofar as he was a Director of Lawford Housing Enterprise Trust.

Further to Minute 30 (21.1.16), the Committee had before it a report of the Head of Planning Services which recommended the locations for the supply of the Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) of 550 dwellings per annum (dpa) and the location for the supply of the additional potential needs of up to 600 dpa.

The Committee had had circulated to it prior to the commencement of the meeting an update sheet and a revised item A.2. The revised item had updated some figures in the tables as an error had been identified. Numbers and text amended since publication of the original agenda were shown in **bold** text. The error had led to the Harwich and Dovercourt figure being added into that for the Colchester Fringe housing sites. Separating them out again gave a figure of 1164 for the Colchester Fringe.

Officers' recommended that the Local Plan made provision for an increase of between 9,974 and 10,924 new homes over the 17 year period 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2032 in order to meet the objectively assessed housing needs and therefore comply with the requirements of the Government's planning policy. As required by the Planning Practice Guidance the shortfall of supply in the years 2013/14 and 14/15 formed part of that requirement.

The report now before the Committee set out the Officers' recommendations for the specific sites to be identified as part of the next consultation on the new Local Plan. The Committee would not be making decisions at this time on which sites would actually be presented to Government as part of the emerging Local Plan but would be solely inviting comments from consultees on the strategy which would best fit Tendring's settlement hierarchy and housing requirements.

Having considered, the current supply of housing planning permissions, the strategic 'Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment', submissions from the recent 'call for sites' and Issues and Options consultation, the locations recommended for inclusion in the consultation were expected to deliver the following housing numbers in different parts of the District:

- Clacton-on-Sea – 2,780
- Harwich & Dovercourt – 819
- Colchester Fringe – 1,164
- Weeley – 304 if 550 dpa was required for the OAN and 1411 if 600 dpa was required for the OAN
- Frinton, Walton & Kirby Cross – 367
- Manningtree, Lawford & Mistley – 520
- Brightlingsea – 100
- Rural Service Centres – 333
- Small 'Windfall' Sites – 1,000

The Committee was made aware that the estimate of new homes expected to be built on 'small windfall sites' recognised that in Tendring, a significant number of new homes were built on smaller sites providing less than 10 homes which were not necessarily allocated for development in the Local Plan but that could come forward through planning applications at any time. This was a projection based on previous trends.

Members were appraised that 2,650 new homes were expected to be built on sites that either already had planning permission or were subject to completion of Section 106 Agreements or were already being built but not completed.

In considering the Officers' recommendations the Committee had regard to Paragraphs 47 to 55 in Chapter 6 in the National Planning Policy Framework that related to the delivery of housing.

In respect of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs the Committee had before it a series of Tables which provided it with the following information:

Table A1 – Housing Requirement for the Period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2032;
 Table A2 – Deliverable Housing Supply for the Period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2032;
 Table A3 – Housing Requirement and Housing Supply – Weeley Options;
 Table A4 – Omission Sites (Appeals/Public Inquiry); and
 Table A5 – Five Year Housing Supply Requirement.

The Committee was informed that, having had regard to the Settlement Hierarchy and having carried out detailed site assessments etc. Officers were recommending that the sites listed in the tables below, each with the potential to deliver 10 or more new homes, be included in the new version of the Local Plan:

Clacton-on-Sea Housing Sites

Site No	Location	No of dwellings	Dwellings in Plan period
1.1	Hartley Garden Village	2500	800
1.2	Oakwood Park	1000	750
1.3	Rouses Farm	875	800
1.4	Land off Cotswold Road Orchard Works site rear of London	12	12
1.5	Road	20	20
1.6	Land off Abigail Gardens Clacton Garden centre St Johns	20	20
1.7	Road	26	20
1.8	Land at Coppins Court Land rear of 522 - 524 St Johns	30	30
1.9	Road	33	33
1.10	Station Gateway development Former Tendring 100 Waterworks	60	60
1.11	Site Land between London Road and	60	60
1.12	Centenary Way	175	175
Total for area		4,811	2,780

There were sites with 476 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Clacton area.

Harwich and Dovercourt Housing Sites

Site No	Location	No. of dwellings	Dwellings in Plan period
----------------	-----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------

2.1	Mayflower Primary School	15	15
2.2	Former Homemaker Store	17	17
2.3	Former Delford Factory Site	70	70
2.4	Land at Harwich and Parkeston Football club	45	45
2.5	Plot 3 Stanton Europark	81	81
2.6	Land off Ramsey Road	112	112
2.7	Land west of Low Road	315	315
2.8	Land at Greenfields Farm	164	164
Total for area		819	819

There were sites with 512 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Harwich area.

Weeley Garden Village Housing Sites

Site No.	Location	No.of dwellings	Dwellings in Plan period
12.1	Land to the south of Tendring Park Services	800	800
12.2	Land off St Andrews Road	14	14
12.3	Land at Weeley Council Offices	24	24
12.4	Land south and north of Council offices	587	587
Total for area		1425	1425

There were sites with 20 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Weeley area. On 7 July 2015 Council resolved that a petition regarding Weeley would be considered by the Local Plan Committee during the preparation of preferred options:

The petition stated: *"We the undersigned object to such a huge increase in housing for our village over the next 17 years on the grounds that it will destroy our community, ruin the character of our rural environment and take up agricultural land in a farming area."*

The Committee was requested to consider this amongst the evidence supporting Weeley for a share of Tendring's housing supply requirements.

Colchester Fringe Housing Sites

It was reported that the 2016 Settlement Hierarchy paper defined the Colchester Fringe as a 'strategic urban settlement'.

Members were made aware that in order to help meet the Council's objectively assessed need, Officers from Tendring District Council and Colchester Borough Council were working together to explore the possibility of major development on land around the eastern fringe of Colchester, crossing the Colchester/Tendring boundary which could help to bring high-tech and high-paid job opportunities associated with the expansion of Essex University along with new transport infrastructure and new homes that could help address the needs of both Colchester and Tendring.

Following further, more detailed, assessment of sites around the Colchester Fringe, Officers would recommend that the overall proposal would deliver around 1,900 homes within the Tendring District area between now and 2032.. However, whether development was allocated on this land, elsewhere in the Colchester/Tendring border area or not at all, would depend on the outcome of work currently underway to explore the feasibility of garden community developments in north east Essex and also on the decision of Colchester Borough Council in relation to its land allocations. The amount of housing that could be gained from any allocation was subject to further refinement and agreement. The particular area of land shown on the plan attached to the report was part of a wider area being considered and might not be the area finally chosen as an allocation.

The Committee was advised that the garden communities feasibility work might recommend the land currently identified for development, but equally it might conclude that a different location or extent of land was more suitable for a garden community development. The feasibility work was looking at a number of potential areas for garden community development in north east Essex including others within/partially within Colchester Borough and an allocation in the location shown might only be feasible if Colchester Borough Council decided to allocate the part of the proposal that lay within its area. Should this element of development not be feasible to progress, the Committee would need to consider an alternative allocation for inclusion in the 'Preferred Options Local Plan' at its meeting in June 2016, either in the same broad area or in another part of the District.

At this stage therefore a cautious approach was recommended that assumed 1,164 dwellings would be delivered in the Colchester Fringe within Tendring. Should the work currently underway provide evidence that a higher number could be delivered, this allocation could be revised upwards.

Site No.	Location	No. of dwellings	Dwellings in Plan period
13.1	Colchester Fringe	2,952	1,164
Total for area		2,952	1,164

There were sites with 200 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the East Colchester area.

Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross Housing Sites

Site No.	Location	No. of dwellings	Dwellings in Plan period
3.1	Turpins Farm	250	250
3.2	Old town Hall site	15	15
3.3	Southcliff Theatre	15	15
3.4	Station Yard	40	40
3.5	Land at the Farm Kirby Road Walton	47	47
Total for area		367	367

There were sites with 384 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross area.

Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley Housing Sites

Site No.	Location	No. of dwelling	Dwellings in Plan period
4.1	Land east of Bromley Road Lawford	360	360
4.4	Land South of Harwich Road Mistley	135	135
4.6	Land South of Pound Corner	25	25
Total for area		520	520

There were sites with 230 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Manningtree, Mistley and Lawford area.

Brightlingsea Housing Sites

Site No.	Location	No. of swellings	Dwellings in Plan period
5.1	Robinson Road	100	100
Total for area		100	100

There were sites with 132 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Brightlingsea area.

Housing Sites in Rural Service Centres

Site No.	Location	No. of dwellings	Dwellings in Plan period
Great Bentley			
8.1	Land west of Heckfords Road	50	50
8.2	Land at Admirals Farm	50	50
Total for area		100	100
Thorpe-le-Soken			
11.1	Land east of Landmere Road	100	100
Total for area			
Little Clacton			
9.1	Land at the Street	98	98
9.2	Montana Roundabout	35	35
Total for area		133	133

Alresford, Elmstead Market and St. Osyth all had no proposed housing allocations within the Plan period.

There were sites with 778 dwellings approved or awaiting a legal agreement in the Rural Service Centres.

The growth option at Central Tendring (Frating) was not considered a sustainable option when compared to development at Clacton, Weeley and the Colchester Fringe locations..

Having considered all of the information provided, it was moved by Councillor Turner, seconded by Councillor Platt and:

RESOLVED that the Committee, for the Preferred Options consultation:

- 1) Agrees the housing supply requirements in Table A1;
- 2) Agrees the housing supply locations in Table 2;
- 3) Agrees the housing supply options in Table 3 on line T – column 2 for the Council's OAN remaining at 550 dwellings per annum and line W – column 2 in case the Council's OAN increases to 600 dwellings per annum;
- 4) Agrees that the sites in table A4 are omitted from consideration for housing supply as they are subject to appeal or inquiry;
- 5) Agrees the five year housing supply requirement in Table A5 for development management purposes; and
- 6) Agrees that further work be undertaken to explore in more detail the appropriate capacity of sites identified for housing. This work to be reported to the Local Plan Committee to inform the Submission Draft of the Local Plan.

NOTE: (a) each of the above six resolutions were put to the vote individually;

(b) in respect of resolution 2) above the resolution was passed on the Chairman's casting vote;

(c) in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 18.5, Councillors Bray and Stephenson requested that they be recorded in the minutes as having voted against resolution 2) above and Councillor G V Guglielmi requested that he be recorded in the minutes as having abstained from voting on that same resolution.

40. ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL AND SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL'S JOINT REPLACEMENT WASTE LOCAL PLAN PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT – CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Councillor G V Guglielmi reminded the Committee that he had earlier declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of this item insofar as, in his capacity as a County Councillor, he was a member of a Panel that assisted Officers in considering the proposed sites.

The Committee's agreement was sought to submit a response to Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council's Joint Replacement Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission (RWLP) Document which was the subject of public consultation.

Members were informed that, on 3 March 2016, Essex County Council and Southend-On-Sea Borough Council had published their RWLP for six weeks public consultation and had invited Tendring District Council (TDC) to respond to its soundness and legal compliance.

The Committee was made aware that the RWLP consultation provided the final opportunity for TDC to respond to the Waste Local Plan and supporting documents before it was submitted to the Government for an Examination-in-Public.

Members were reminded that the Publication of this RWLP followed the previous Preferred Options consultation in June 2015. At its meeting held on 14 July 2015, the Committee had been broadly supportive of the Preferred Options document. However, it

was felt that the Municipal Waste site at Ardleigh off the A120 would be a poor location and would require appropriate transport access.

It was reported that, for the Tendring District, the RWLP would progress three out of the five waste sites proposed at the Preferred Options Stage. Those were as follows:

- Sunnymead, Elmstead & Heath Farms - Inert landfilling (a landfill use for non-biodegradable waste e.g sand and concrete);
- Slough Farm, Ardleigh - Area 1- Inert waste recycling and inert landfilling (Inert waste recycling was recycling of waste materials arising mainly from construction, demolition and excavation activities); and
- Morses Lane, Brightlingsea - Inert waste recycling.

The following two sites had been discounted in the RWLP:

- Ardleigh, off the A120 - Municipal waste; and
- Wellwick, Martins Farm, St Osyth - Inert waste recycling.

Members were informed that Officers had noted that the Morses Lane site might have issues with regards to its proximity to residential properties. However, it was considered that the site would be suitable for waste development in other respects. All other sites in Tendring passed the assessment criteria and Officers had therefore considered them acceptable for allocation in the RWLP.

The Committee was made aware that the RWLP also included an 'Area of Search' which looked at employment sites throughout Essex to consider if they could be used for waste facilities. For Tendring, two sites had progressed to the RWLP. Those were:

- Martell's Industrial Area, and
- Oakwood - Crusader Business Park

Members were advised that Officers were broadly in support of the identification of Martell's employment site as having the potential to include enclosed waste uses. Officers considered that the employment site at Oakwood - Crusader Business Park would not be acceptable as it would conflict with housing allocations. Therefore, in general, Officers recommended that for the RWLP to be sound and legally compliant it should exclude the northern part of the Oakwood - Crusader Business Park site.

The Committee had before it, contained within the Appendix to the report, the Officers' recommended answers to the questions contained within the consultation document.

The Committee had had circulated to it prior to the commencement of the meeting an update sheet which informed it that the Council had received a copy of a letter sent by Brightlingsea Town Council to Essex County Council. The Town Council had made representations explaining that it considered the Morses Lane, Brightlingsea site (W31), to be totally unsuitable as an allocation in the Waste Local Plan. Its concerns related to the movement of heavy goods vehicles to and from the site and their impact on existing and proposed residential properties. It was recommended by the Officers that the Town Council's objections be reflected in this Council's response to Essex County Council.

Having considered the RWLP Consultation Document and the Officers' proposed formal responses thereto, it was moved by Councillor Turner, seconded by Councillor Scott and:

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the Committee agrees the recommended responses, together with the grave concerns raised by Members of the Committee in respect of the manner of lorry movements, failing to comply with monitoring obligations and environmental responsibilities (for example, sheeted cargo); and
- (b) the Planning and Regulation Manager be authorised to submit the agreed response, with a covering letter, as the formal response of Tendring District Council, to Essex County Council before the end of the consultation period, including the supporting representations submitted by Brightlingsea Town Council).

The meeting was declared closed at 9.20 p.m.

Chairman