
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE25 JANUARY 2011

Present:- Councillors Heaney (Chairman), Chapman (Vice-Chairman), Bragg, Brown, Candy, Casey, Fawcett, G V Guglielmi, Johnson, J King, McLeod, Mitchell, Skeels, Watson, Whitson.

Also Present:- Councillors McWilliams (items 111 (part) and 112 only), Walker.

In Attendance:- Executive Manager (Planning Management and Control), Development Control Team Manager (GP), Senior Planning Officer (RM), Principal Solicitor, Democratic Services Officer.

(7.00 p.m. – 7.55 p.m.)

106. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman welcomed those present in the public area, introduced herself, indicated who were members of the Committee and the officers present, gave a brief outline of procedure and announced the names of the Members present in the public area, for the record.

107. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Powell and Rutson.

108. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 January 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

109. PLANNING APPEALS AND DECISIONS

The Committee noted the contents of a report (submitted for information only) advising them of the details of current planning appeals and decisions and were updated on the current appeal costs decisions.

110. ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Committee had before it a report on the performance of the Enforcement Service over the past three months, which was provided for information.

111. GUNFLEET SANDS 3 OFFSHORE WINDFARM – DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

The Committee, as consultees, was asked to consider and comment on a proposal to site up to two new larger wind turbines adjacent to the existing windfarm at Gunfleet Sands to allow recent improvements in wind turbine technology to be tested and monitored.

The Committee wished a comment to be passed on requesting that noise from the turbines be minimised.

It was moved by Councillor McLeod, seconded by Councillor Mitchell and:-

RESOLVED – (a) That the application for consent made to the Marine Management Organisation be noted.

(b) That the Council raises no objection to the proposed demonstration project.

112. APPLICATION 10/00933/FUL – ANNEXE AT 262 POINT CLEAR ROAD, ST OSYTH – CHANGE OF USE OF SWIMMING POOL CONVERSION FOR RESIDENTIAL USE

The Committee had before it the published officer report containing an appraisal of the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of refusal with reasons. The recently published update sheet was also considered by the Committee and explained by officers at the meeting.

Councillor Walker, one of the Ward Members, spoke in support of the application.

Mr W Parsons, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

It was moved by Councillor Johnson, seconded by Councillor McLeod and:-

RESOLVED – That application 10/00933/FUL be refused for the following reasons:-

It is the policy of the Local Planning Authority, as contained within Policies QL1 and HG1 of the Tendring District Local Plan (2007), that proposals for new residential development outside the defined housing settlement limits will not normally be permitted. Policies QL9 and EN1 seek to ensure that development is appropriate to its locality and does not harm the appearance of the landscape. Policy EN3 requires that new development in the Coastal Protection belt that does not have a compelling functional need to be located there will not be permitted. Policy QL2 states that permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. This approach to countryside protection and sustainability is carried through into policies CP1, CP2, CP4, DP1 and DP5 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy And Development Policies Proposed Submission Document (October 2010) and is further supported by government guidance in PPS1, PPS3 and PPS7.

This proposal presents an unjustified departure from the Development Plan policies restricting residential development to within the defined settlement limits. It erodes the countryside's open character and rural appearance and is harmful to the appearance of the site and to the Coastal Protection Belt. It results in increased dependence on the private motor car and as such is harmful to the interests of sustainability. For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with the requirements of all the afore-mentioned policies.

It was further moved by Councillor Candy, seconded by Councillor McLeod and:-

RESOLVED – That the Chairman write to the Chief Executive to ask for his assurance that the Planning, Housing and Benefits and Revenues Services will share information in future to ensure that the situation which has arisen with regard to application 10/00933/FUL does not occur again.

Chairman