



PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE:	Tuesday, 9 June 2026
TIME:	5.00 pm
VENUE:	Committee Room, Town Hall, Station Road, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 1SE

MEMBERSHIP:

Councillor Fowler (Chairman)
Councillor White (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Alexander
Councillor Bray
Councillor Codling

Councillor Goldman
Councillor Land
Councillor Sudra
Councillor Wiggins

Most Council meetings are open to the public and press. The space for the public and press will be made available on a first come first served basis. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date and the Council aims to publish Minutes within five working days of the meeting. Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, or on disc, tape, or in other languages.

This meeting will be filmed by the Council for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website. The whole of the meeting will be filmed, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for up to 24 months (the Council retains one full year of recordings and the relevant proportion of the current Municipal Year). The Council will seek to avoid/minimise footage of members of the public in attendance at, or participating in, the meeting. In addition, the Council is obliged by law to allow members of the public to take photographs, film, audio record and report on the proceedings at public meetings. The Council will only seek to prevent this should it be undertaken in a disruptive or otherwise inappropriate manner.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting or the recording of meetings by the public, please contact Bethany Jones or Ian Ford Email: democraticservices@tendringdc.gov.uk or Telephone on 01255 686587 / 686584

DATE OF PUBLICATION: Monday, 1 June 2026

AGENDA

5 Report of the Corporate Director (Planning & Community) - A.1 - 26-00112-FUL - 1
Wellesley Road, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 3PP (Pages 5 - 8)

Change of use to Temporary Emergency Accommodation (Use Sui Generis).

Date of the Next Scheduled Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Committee is to be held in the Town Hall, Station Road, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 1SE at 5.00 pm on Tuesday, 7 July 2026.

Information for Visitors

FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

There is no alarm test scheduled for this meeting. In the event of an alarm sounding, please calmly make your way out of any of the fire exits in the hall and follow the exit signs out of the building.

Please heed the instructions given by any member of staff and they will assist you in leaving the building and direct you to the assembly point.

Please do not re-enter the building until you are advised it is safe to do so by the relevant member of staff.

Your calmness and assistance is greatly appreciated.

TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th June 2026

Item A.1 - 26-00112-FUL - 1 Wellesley Road Clacton On Sea Essex CO15 3PP

No updates

Item No. A.2 – 26/00515/FUL – Lacies View Colchester Road, Stones Green Harwich Essex CO12 5DA

An addendum has been submitted (06.05.26) in response to the Officer Committee Report. No additional information has been provided that hasn't already been included within the suite of associated documents with the submission and addressed within the Committee Report.

Additional Planning History included to Section 4:

21/00868/FUL - Proposed barn and vehicular access – Approved 03.08.21

Additional Comments included to Section 5 –

Environmental Health

29.05.26

Contaminated Land - Given the proposal sites proximity to historic and current agricultural land, the EP Team are requesting a Watching Brief to be applied to any approval:

We are requesting that the LPA are contacted in the event of unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction and that the below minimum precautions are undertaken until such time as the LPA responds to the notification. I would also advise that the developer is made aware that the responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with them.

(Also provide detail on minimum requirements for dealing with unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction).

REASON: to protect the health of site workers and end users.

Construction Activities:

Have reviewed the submitted CMS and have no adverse comments to make.

Asbestos:

Should any asbestos containing materials be present on the development site, or used within the original construction of the building in question, it must be safely removed by a qualified contractor, with relevant transfer notes being obtained to confirm safe and responsible removal and disposal.

***INFORMATIVE** Foul Drainage: The application indicates a Sewerage Treatment Plant will be utilised as a way of disposing of foul waste; should the application be approved the Applicant / Agent should ensure the installation is fully compliant with the Environment Agency's Binding Rules and any other relevant Government guidance and British standards, in respect of these systems. Information on this can be found at: Septic tanks and treatment plants: permits and general binding rules: The general binding rules - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). It is strongly recommended these rules are complied with, as they will minimise any potential nuisance to nearby residential dwellings, assist in preventing a potential Public Health nuisance, and minimise the potential for adverse incidents, of which may result in formal enforcement action.

Update to wording at Section 6 – Representations to include:

Paragraph 6.2 to read: 'None from 3rd parties for or against'

Inclusion of paragraph 7.23 at Section 7 – Assessment which reads:

7.22 In conclusion, the development fails to comply with Policy LP7:

- Outside defined proximity to settlements:
The site is not within the required walking distance of any settlement development boundary (exceeds 600m/400m thresholds).
- Fails location criteria (a) and (b):
It is not safely accessible on foot within:
 - o 600m of a strategic or smaller urban settlement; or
 - o 400m of a rural service centre.
- Does not meet criterion (c):
The proposal does not involve previously developed land, nor land demonstrated to be unviable for employment use.
- Located beyond the planned settlement hierarchy:
The development lies outside all recognised SDBs and therefore conflicts with the spatial strategy directing growth to settlements.
- Settlement context is weak:
Nearest settlements (Wix, Beaumont cum Moze, Great Oakley) are 'Smaller Rural Settlements', the lowest tier, further undermining compliance.

These points collectively mean the proposal does not satisfy the core locational requirements of Policy LP7 and is therefore not supported in principle under that policy.

Update to paragraph numbering Section 7 – Assessment

Section comprises paragraphs numbers 7 – 7.95 not 7- 7.96

Update to paragraphs 7.27 & 7.28 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

Social objective

7.27 The application site is located approximately 1,613 metres to the south of Wix settlement development boundary, which significantly limits convenient access to day-to-day services and facilities. There are no footpaths or safe pedestrian routes connecting the site to the settlement. The nearest bus stop is situated to the north of the application site, approximately 2km away, which is not considered a walkable distance given the lack of a footpath. As a result, future occupants of the proposed dwelling would be heavily reliant on private transport for all daily needs. The proposal would provide a significant social benefit for the individual with protected characteristics and her family given the bespoke nature of the design proposal. However, when considering the social objective as a whole the unsustainable location of the site is considered to result in overriding harm failing to meet the social strand of sustainability.

7.28 The provision of one additional dwelling at a time when the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply would contribute to the district's overall housing stock, improve housing choice particularly given the self-build nature of the proposal, while also providing incremental population support for local services. This results in a modest social benefit however it is not considered that this modest benefit would outweigh the disbenefits of the location of the site and the future occupant's likely reliance on private transport for their day-to-day needs or the fact that no public benefits are identified. The proposal therefore fails the social aims of sustainability.

Update to paragraph 7.47 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

7.47 Officers acknowledge that planning permission runs with the land and not with the applicant. The needs of the applicant's daughter have been taken into account, and Officers are sympathetic to the circumstances. The proposal has been assessed in the context of the Equality Act and national policy on inclusive design. However, these personal circumstances do not outweigh the identified harm arising from the proposal's conflict with the unsustainable location of the site and harm to the rural character of the area that would be if approved permanent and establish residential use in perpetually.

Update to paragraph 7.69 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

7.69 Owing to the isolated and rural nature of the site and significant separation distance from any neighbouring properties, the proposal does not raise any concerns in relation to the impact on residential amenities.

Update to paragraph 7.80 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

7.80 Adopted Local Plan Section 2 Policy PPL5 requires all new development to make adequate provision for drainage and sewerage, with a preference for connection to the mains in accordance with the drainage hierarchy and building regulations. Paragraphs 181, 187 and 198 of the NPPF (2024) require planning decisions to ensure that development is appropriate for its location and does not increase flood risk elsewhere or result in unacceptable pollution.

Update to paragraph 7.81 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

7.81 Whilst detailed foul and surface water drainage proposals have not been submitted as part of this application, the submitted Planning Statement acknowledges that detailed surface water drainage and foul sewage disposal arrangements can be achieved and secured through appropriately worded pre-commencement planning conditions should planning permission be granted.

Update to paragraph 7.82 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

7.82 At this stage, Officers are satisfied that there is no substantive evidence before the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the site could not be adequately drained or serviced. The proposal presents clear opportunities to improve localised drainage conditions within the site, particularly through the management, maintenance and potential enhancement of the existing on-site ditch network which currently forms part of the site's drainage infrastructure. The principle of development would not be prejudiced by the absence of detailed drainage design at this stage.

Update to paragraph 7.84 at Section 7 – Assessment to include:

7.84 Subject to such conditions, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not likely result in an unacceptable risk of flooding, surface water run-off, or inadequate foul drainage provision, in accordance with the objectives of Section 14 of the NPPF (2024) and relevant local plan policies relating to flood risk and drainage.

Update to Section 8 – Conclusion to Omission of:

~~Whilst the proposal has been deemed acceptable in terms of highway safety, residential amenity, and ecology (including the potential for BNG and a wildlife sensitive lighting design), these do not overcome the fundamental harm identified.~~

Update to Section 8 – Conclusion to include:

Whilst the proposal could be made acceptable in ecological, highway and amenity terms through conditions, these matters do not overcome the fundamental policy conflict relating to the site's unsustainable location and harm to rural character.

Update to Section 8 – Conclusion to include:

Officers are also not persuaded that the revised design reaches the exceptionally high threshold required

under Paragraph 84(e) of the NPPF. Whilst bespoke and thoughtful, the proposal is not considered to be truly outstanding or sufficiently innovative such that it would significantly enhance its immediate setting or raise standards of rural design more generally for others.

Update to paragraph 9.2 Section 9 – Recommendation to read:

In addition, introducing a dwelling in this remote location would erode the rural character without outweighing benefit, and would set an unwanted precedent for further proposals in the area exacerbating this harm. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy SP7 of Section 1 and Policies SPL3 and PPL3 of Section 2 of the Local Plan, which require high-quality design that responds positively to local character and protects the rural landscape from harm.

Whilst the proposal would deliver the modest benefit of one self-build dwelling this would not meet the self-build criteria under TDLF Policy LP7. This benefit is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the identified harms arising from the unsustainable location, the associated car dependency for use and services, and the erosion of the rural character of the area. As such and having regard to NPPF Paragraph 11(d)(ii), the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 taken as a whole. The proposal does not therefore constitute sustainable development.

Update to Plans and Supporting Documents at Section 9 – Recommendation to include:

9.4 'Proposed Site Layout Plan' drawing No. 281LV_104_B (rec'd 08.06.26), received to clarify that the existing barn on site will remain ancillary to the host dwelling.

Update to paragraph 10.6 at Section 10 – Additional Considerations to read:

10.6 It is not considered that the recommendation to ~~grant~~ refuse permission in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence or freedom from discrimination except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation to grant permission is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Update to paragraph at Section 10 – Additional Considerations omission of:

~~10.8 The New Homes Bonus (NHB) is one local finance consideration capable of being a material consideration to which the weight given shall be determined by the decision maker. The NHB is a payment to local authorities to match the Council Tax of net new dwellings built, paid by Central Government over six consecutive years. In this instance, it is not considered to have any significant weight attached to it that would outweigh the other considerations.~~