

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE,
HELD ON TUESDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY, 2025 AT 5.00 PM
IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM - TOWN HALL, STATION ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA,
CO15 1SE**

Present:	Councillors Fowler (Chairman)(except item 47), White (Vice-Chairman)(in the Chair for item 47 only), Alexander (except item 47), Everett (except item 52), Goldman, Smith (except item 47), Sudra and Wiggins
Also Present:	Councillor P B Honeywood (except items 46 – 53)
In Attendance:	Gary Guiver (Director (Planning & Communities)), John Pateman-Gee (Head of Planning & Building Control), Joanne Fisher (Planning Solicitor), Alison Newland (Planning Team Leader) (except items 46 - 53), Michael Pingram (Senior Planning Officer) (except items 48 - 53), Bethany Jones (Committee Services Officer) and Katie Koppenaar (Committee Services Officer)
Also in Attendance:	Michael Carran (Assistant Director (Economic Growth, Culture & Leisure)) (except items 48 – 53), Keith Simmons (Head of Democratic Services & Elections) (except Items 42 – 53) and Andy White (Assistant Director (Building and Public Realm))

40. DEFERMENT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS A.2 - 24/00937/FUL - ELMTREE GARAGE, COLCHESTER ROAD, ELMSTEAD, CO7 7EE AND A.4 - 24/01643/FUL - GUNFLEET SAILING CLUB, MARINE PARADE EAST, CLACTON-ON-SEA

The Chairman informed the meeting that she was proposing to defer consideration of Planning Applications **A.2 – 24/00937/FUL – Elmtree Garage, Colchester Road, Elmstead, CO7 7EE** and **A.4 – 24/01643/FUL – Gunfleet Sailing Club, Marine Parade East, Clacton-on-Sea** until the next meeting of the Committee on the grounds that there were a large number of planning applications due to be considered at this meeting and in the interests of the efficient dispatch of business and a timely conclusion of the meeting.

It was moved by Councillor Wiggins, seconded by Councillor Smith and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that any consideration of application **A.2 – 24/00937/FUL – Elmtree Garage, Colchester Road, Elmstead, CO7 7EE** be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.

It was moved by Councillor Alexander, seconded by Councillor Goldman and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that any consideration of application **A.4 – 24/01643/FUL – Gunfleet Sailing Club, Marine Parade East, Clacton-on-Sea** be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

There were no apologies for absence or substitutions submitted on this occasion.

42. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

It was moved by Councillor Sudra, seconded by Councillor Alexander and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee, held on Tuesday 3 December 2024, be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

43. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Alexander declared an interest in relation to Planning Application **24/01716/FUL – Milton Road Car Park, Milton Road, Dovercourt, CO12 3LA** and **informed the meeting** that, due to his being a Member of the Levelling-Up Portfolio Holder Working Party, he would not participate in the Committee's deliberations and decision making for that application and that he would therefore leave the room.

Councillor Smith declared an interest in relation to Planning Application **24/01716/FUL – Milton Road Car Park, Milton Road, Dovercourt, CO12 3LA** and informed the meeting that, due to his being a Member of the Levelling-Up Portfolio Holder Working Party, he would not participate in the Committee's deliberations and decision making for that application and that he would therefore leave the room.

Councillor Fowler (Chairman) declared for the public record in relation to Planning Application **24/01716/FUL – Milton Road Car Park, Milton Road, Dovercourt, CO12 3LA** that she was predetermined and that therefore she would not participate in the Committee's deliberations and decision making for this application and that Councillor White (Vice-Chairman) would take over as Chairman for this item.

Councillor P Honeywood declared for the public record that, in relation to Planning Application **24/01384/OUT – Colchester Institute, The Clacton Campus, Church Road, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 6JQ** and due to his making reference to the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) when speaking to the Committee later on in his capacity as a Ward Member, and as he was the Chairman of NEPP, he had not been involved in the representations submitted. He also declared that he was an Essex County Councillor, and he would make reference to Essex County Council Heritage, but that he was not involved in the representations.

Later on in the meeting, as reported in Minute 52 below, Councillor Everett declared an interest in relation to Planning Application **24/017164/FUL – Outside 48 Wellesley Road, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 3PJ** in that he worked opposite the application site. Councillor Everett thereupon left the room when the application was put to the Committee, and it was deliberated and decided upon.

44. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 38

There were no such Questions on Notice submitted by Councillors on this occasion.

45. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.1 - 24-01384-OUT - COLCHESTER INSTITUTE, THE CLACTON CAMPUS, CHURCH ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 6JQ

Members were told that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee following a call-in from Councillor Paul Honeywood. The concerns raised by him had related to: Negative impact on urban design/street scene, highways impact and/or other traffic issues, poor layout and/or density issues, negative impact on neighbours, and inadequate parking provision exacerbated by it not being retirement provision.

Members were reminded that the site lay within the settlement development boundary, Priority Area for Regeneration, Clacton Seafront Conservation Area (CSCA), and within the setting of Grade II listed buildings.

Officers made Members aware that the application sought outline planning permission, with all matters except landscaping included for consideration, for 60 flats as a part conversion part newbuild redevelopment of the former college site. The site had been vacant since 2020 and was in a very poor condition and subject to repeated acts of antisocial behaviour. An appeal for 61 retirement apartments had been dismissed in December 2022 on the grounds that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CSCA by virtue of the proposed architectural finish and detail appearing convoluted, monotonous, and out of character in the street scene.

Members were informed that the scale of development required to make the site viable for redevelopment, as evidenced by the viability assessments, would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CSCA and setting of the Grade II listed former Grand Hotel, and harm to visual and neighbouring amenity. It was considered that, on balance, the public benefits of the proposal outweighed the harm, and the application was recommended by Officers for approval.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council's Planning Team Leader (AN) in respect of the application.

An Officer Update Sheet had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting which informed the Committee about the Conservation Area status and a change to condition wording which was as follows:-

"Conservation Area status

Paragraph 8.26 of the committee report confirms that the site is proposed for removal from the Clacton Seafront Conservation Area (CSCA) within the latest draft of the CSCA Appraisal (2021). That draft was agreed by Cabinet on Friday (31/01/2025) but Members have one week to call that decision in to Full Council. The draft cannot therefore be adopted before 08/02/2025. At Planning Committee on 04/02/2025 the site therefore remains within the CSCA and subject to the statutory duty and policy considerations explained within the committee report. The decision by Cabinet to agree the draft, which includes removing this site from the CSCA, is a material consideration.

Change to condition wording

Minor change to wording of condition 5 (RAMS) to make it pre-commencement rather than pre-occupation:

05. PRE-COMMENCEMENT CONDITION: MITIGATION TO BE AGREED, RAMS

CONDITION: The hereby approved development shall not be first commenced until detailed proposals addressing the mitigation of the development's impact on protected Essex Habitats Sites have been submitted to and received written approval from the Local Planning Authority. Such proposals must provide and secure mitigation in accordance with the joint Habitats Regulations Assessment Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) or demonstrate mitigation measures of an equivalent effectiveness to the satisfactory of the Local Planning Authority. For any on site mitigation proposals approved, it shall be carried out in full prior to first occupation and thereafter shall be maintained as approved.

REASON: In order to safeguard protected wildlife species and their habitats in accordance with the NPPF and Habitats Regulations. Failure to achieve satisfactory mitigation would result in harm by new residents due to the development's impact on protected sites meaning the development must mitigate the burden of development regardless of scale of impact.

NOTE/S FOR CONDITION:

This condition establishes the necessity to ensure the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures due to the impact of the approved development. Such mitigation may be required on-site, off-site, or a combination of both.

Typically, a contribution towards visitor management measures at the protected Habitats Site(s) may be the preferred and simplest approach to fulfil the requirements of this condition. To fulfil this requirement, you can contribute funds towards a range of mitigation projects in the protected areas. It is essential to secure this provision through a legal agreement between the District Council, Developer/Applicant, and site owners before occupation. If this is the approach to fulfilling this condition you wish to take, you are strongly advised to finalise the legal agreement with the District Council before submitting any request to discharge this condition. Should this be the route chosen, failure to conclude the agreement within the discharge of condition application timeframe may lead to the refusal to discharge the condition. Please note if there are other obligations needed for this development, for example to secure monitoring and maintenance of a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan, you may wish to combine these together as one agreement. Furthermore, please also note a legal agreement will include legal fees and may require obligations to secure monitoring and associated fees.”

Roger Gilles, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Paul Honeywood, the Ward Member and caller-in, spoke against the application.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	Officer's response thereto:-
<i>If Councillor P Honeywood had not brought this application to Committee, would this application have been approved by Officers?</i>	<i>Yes, it could have been a delegated approval without the call-in.</i>
<i>What has changed from the application in 2022 to the application in front of the Committee?</i>	<i>The appeal was for 61 retirement units and now this application is for 60 flats, so similar scale but a completely different design. The only detail that the Inspector dismissed the appeal on was the detailed design of that scheme. The scale, the parking, the neighbour impact and all the other issues were deemed to be acceptable in that case and Officers have compared the current proposal to that.</i>
<i>Has there been an increase in parking spaces or is there the same amount?</i>	<i>There has been a significant increase. The appeal scheme had 61 retirement units with 20 parking spaces, there is now 60 flats with 41 parking spaces. There is also a car club scheme which was not in the appeal.</i>
<i>Would it be fair to say that there would be ample parking spaces for the 60 flats?</i>	<i>That would be down to judgement in the debate. In terms of the Highways Standards, this application is less than those standards, but Members are dealing with an application that Officers deem to be sustainable within the location of Clacton and Officers have the Highways recommendation to accept the standards that has been proposed.</i>
<i>Would the housing contribution not be met?</i>	<i>That is correct. There is no affordable housing provision which is why there is a viability assessment which is only to meet the RAMS which is mandatory otherwise there would be habitat harm.</i>
<i>Did the appeal application before have a housing contribution?</i>	<i>The appeal application had a Section 106 which was submitted during the appeal which had a deferred contribution to have affordable housing so if the development was not completed within 3 years the developer had to provide £112,000 towards off-site affordable housing, but if the development was completed within 3 years, then the developer would not have to provide anything.</i>
<i>So, it is possible to get affordable housing on a scheme?</i>	<i>That was for retirement housing which would have different costings, but Officers have had an up-to-date viability assessment and independently reviewed by the same people who reviewed the previous case and said that it was not viable at this time and construction costs have increased since 2022.</i>
<i>So, the Council is not going to get an affordable housing contribution but, on some schemes, it is possible to do so?</i>	<i>Members could take that away as an opinion in order to consider the application, but it is not what is before Members and therefore,</i>

	<i>Members should concentrate on what is being proposed and the evidence provided. For the policy on affordable housing, it does allow for viability to be a consideration and therefore is not contrary to the Council's affordable housing policy.</i>
<i>Is it up to Members to decide if this scheme is an appropriate scheme or not?</i>	<i>That scheme was refused and dismissed at appeal for other reasons so that scheme was not possible because it wasn't approved. This scheme has to be considered on its individual merits, alternative schemes may be out there, but they are not before Members, therefore Members would need to consider the harm and the considerations of this application.</i>
<i>Would Members be within their remit to refuse the application on the merit of not having affordable housing?</i>	<i>Members have the option to refuse the scheme based on lack of contributions if Members feel that the evidence before them in terms of viability is not correct.</i>
<i>If the builders wanted to pay a mitigating contribution, if there is not a Section 106 agreement, how does the Council get that money?</i>	<i>Because there has been a viability review, that is why there is not a Section 106 agreement as the review has said that it cannot provide it and can only provide RAMS which can be secured by conditions. If it had been proven to be viable then the Section 106 would have come forward.</i>
<i>Are there any private spaces for these flats?</i>	<i>In terms of gardens, there are 4 front gardens in the scheme and there are balconies. There are around 11 units that do not have amenity space, but the rest do have private amenity space. Given the location and the Town centre being close to the beach, Officers are not raising concerns in terms of not providing enough private amenity space.</i>
<i>Is the sycamore tree going to be protected?</i>	<i>One of the sycamore trees will be retained and the other tree has fungus in it so the Council's Tree Officer has given their view that it has not got a long-life expectancy so that one will be coming out. There is other tree planting that is being proposed.</i>
<i>Are the heritage buildings near by all Grade II?</i>	<i>They are all Grade II.</i>
<i>Has a letter of objection been received from Thorogood Road? If so, is there steps that the Committee can take to reduce the privacy to residents?</i>	<i>All the letters of objections are summarised in the report. The report relates to the current impact.</i>
<i>Are there any mitigating steps that the Committee can take to keep the privacy?</i>	<i>Officers had the withdrawn proposal which had a greater impact on the property and the current scheme has brought that down and added more screens to balconies which will be overlooking which is unavoidable.</i>
<i>So, the new design has lessened the privacy circumstance?</i>	<i>The current degree of overlooking is quite high. The proposed degree of overlooking at best is</i>

	<i>slightly less but similar which needs to be taken as a balanced opinion. The Inspector took that issue in the previous scheme. It is a judgement on harm.</i>
<i>Have the applicants submitted a tree survey?</i>	<i>No, they haven't. Tree Officer's review was that it had not been submitted, nevertheless, the trees identified for removal do not merit retention and the tree with the greatest amenity value is retained.</i>

It was moved by Councillor Everett, seconded by Councillor Goldman and:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant outline planning permission subject to the conditions as stated in paragraph 10.2 of the Officer report (A.1), the Officer Update Sheet to the change of wording on Condition 5 and to make sure that the best possible Wi-Fi is available, or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referred is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

46. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.2 - 24-00937-FUL - ELMTREE GARAGE, COLCHESTER ROAD, ELMSTEAD, CO7 7EE

This item had been deferred for the reasons set out in Minute 40 above.

47. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.3 - 24-01716-FUL - MILTON ROAD CAR PARK, MILTON ROAD, DOVERCOURT, CO12 3LA

Earlier on in the meeting as reported under Minute 43 above, Councillors Alexander, Fowler (Chairman) and Smith had each declared for the public record that they had an interest. They therefore withdrew from the meeting and took no part whilst the Committee deliberated and made its decision on this application. The Chair was thereupon occupied by the Vice-Chairman (Councillor White).

The Committee heard that this application was before the Planning Committee on the basis that the applicant was Tendring District Council.

It was reported that the proposal would result in the demolition of the existing multi-storey car park, to be replaced with a single storey car park providing for 23 spaces. In this instance, the regeneration of a large vacant site within the Dovercourt Town Centre was supported in principle. Further, the proposal was considered to result in a visual enhancement to the area and would also not harm any of the surrounding heritage assets.

Members were told that Officers considered that there would not be any significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents, and ECC Highways had raised no objections subject to conditions. The proposal resulted in the loss of some existing parking

provision, but it was noted that the site was currently vacant and there had been a significant increase in provision at Orwell Road car park directly adjacent; the combination of those factors ensured that there would be sufficient provision overall.

Officers therefore told Members that taking all of the above into consideration, the application was considered to comply with local and national planning policies and accordingly was recommended by them for approval.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council’s Senior Planning Officer (MP) in respect of the application.

There were no updates circulated to Members on this item.

Michael Carran, the applicant’s representative, spoke in support of the application.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	Officer’s response thereto:-
<p><i>What did the holding objection say?</i></p>	<p><i>It is listed on Page 103 of the Agenda in the 3 bullet points provided. Which are:</i></p> <p><i>“o Run off rate should be limited to the 1 in 1-year greenfield rate in the first instance, if it has been demonstrated this is unviable, run off rate should be limited to a minimum of 50% betterment of the existing brownfield rate. This should be supported by calculations. The Drainage strategy states that the discharge of 2l/s is a betterment of the existing discharge from the site, however the current brownfield discharge rate and greenfield rate has not been detailed within the document.</i></p> <p><i>o The private drainage general arrangement drawing looks to show the rain gardens placed within the parking bays. It also does not correspond with the proposed site layout drawing.</i></p> <p><i>o A CV value of 1 should be used within the surface water design calcs as whilst areas of permeable paving has been proposed, there is no infiltration proposed at the site and as such these areas will contribute to the positive drainage system.”</i></p>
<p><i>Could you confirm what that means?</i></p>	<p><i>The Planning Team have discussed this, and Officers feel that on this occasion, it is something that Officers can get addressed via a planning condition. The applicant was preparing a revised drainage strategy that could address the specific points, but Officers ran out of time to get that</i></p>

	<i>included before this Planning Committee. There are opportunities to provide patches of greenspace that could act as better drainage to what is currently on site at the moment.</i>
<i>Is there any way that we can make sure that people do not jump over the railings?</i>	<i>There is no condition or a way for the Council to stop the public from jumping over the railings from a planning perspective. The existing situation has the same fencing. There has been an improvement in health and safety.</i>

It was moved by Councillor Wiggins, seconded by Councillor Sudra and:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as stated at paragraph 10.2 of the Officer report (A.3), or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referenced is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

48. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.4 - 24-01643-FUL - GUNFLEET SAILING CLUB, MARINE PARADE EAST, CLACTON-ON-SEA

This item had been deferred for the reasons stated in Minute 40 above.

49. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.5 - 24-01596-FUL - CAR PARK/SKATE PARK, CLACTON LEISURE CENTRE, VISTA ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 6DJ

The Committee heard that this application was before the Planning Committee as Tendring District Council was the applicant.

It was reported that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of a CCTV camera and supporting column on the highway edge of the public footway at the Car Park for Clacton Leisure Centre, Vista Road.

Members were told that the application proposed a 12-metre-high column, positioned at a location of an existing parking sign (parking sign plate to be relocated onto new column) with a swan neck adaptor and dome camera fitted to the top (giving a 360-degree view around the Car Park), supplemented by a proposed fixed camera. The columns would be painted black (same appearance as the existing columns elsewhere within Clacton).

The Committee was informed that the proposal was of a similar height and appearance as existing street light columns and other existing CCTV columns in the Town and would not appear prominent or harmful within the street scene.

The Committee was made aware that the proposal formed part of the Safer Streets Programme aiming to combat place-based crime through situational crime prevention. The proposals were supported by The Office of the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner by provision of funding to deliver the intended works. The development would contribute to the Council's Corporate Plan 'Our Vision' 2024/25 and 2024 – 2028 Theme, Championing our local environment.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council's Head of Planning and Building Control (JP-G) in respect of the application.

An Officer Update Sheet had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting which informed the Committee of a minor word changing of:-

“Paragraph 7.5 – Minor change to wording should read 8 metres and not 12 metres high”

There were no public speakers on this occasion.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	Officer's response thereto:-
<i>Does there need to be a new pole?</i>	<i>In terms of the 360 degree element, it is not proposed before Members.</i>

It was moved by Councillor Alexander, seconded by Councillor Goldman and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions as stated at paragraph 9.2 of the Officer report (A.5), or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referenced is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

50. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.6 - 24-01761-FUL - OUTSIDE 137-139 OLD ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 3AX

The Committee heard that this application was before Members as Tendring District Council was the applicant.

Members were told that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of a CCTV camera and supporting column on the highway edge of the public footway outside Numbers 137 & 139 Old Road, Clacton-on-Sea.

The Committee was informed that the application proposed a 12-metre-high column, positioned at a location of an existing parking sign (parking sign plate to be relocated onto new column) with a swan neck adaptor and dome camera fitted to the top (giving a 360-degree view along Old Road), supplemented by a proposed fixed camera. The columns would be painted black (same appearance as the existing columns elsewhere in Clacton).

The Committee were made aware that the proposal was of a similar height and appearance as existing street light columns and other existing CCTV columns in the Town and would not appear prominent or harmful within the street scene.

Officers reminded Members that the proposal formed part of the Safer Streets Programme aiming to combat place-based crime through situational crime prevention. The proposals were supported by The Office of Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner by provision of funding to deliver the intended works. The development would contribute to the Council's Corporate Plan 'Our Vision' 2024/25 and 2024 – 2028 Theme, Championing our local environment.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council's Head of Planning and Building Control (JP-G) in respect of the application.

An Officer Update Sheet had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting which informed the Committee of a minor word changing of:-

"Paragraph 7.5 – Minor change to wording should read 8 metres and not 12 metres high"

There were no public speakers on this occasion.

There were no questions on this occasion.

It was moved by Councillor Goldman, seconded by Councillor Wiggins and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions as stated at paragraph 9.2 of the Officer report (A.6), or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referenced is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

51. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.7 - 24-01763-FUL - ADJACENT TO 37 HIGH STREET, OPPOSITE FORMER POST OFFICE, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 6PL**

The Committee heard that the application was before Members as Tendring District Council was the applicant.

Members were told that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of a CCTV camera and supporting column on the highway edge of the public footway outside number 37 High Street, Clacton-on-Sea.

The Committee was informed that the application proposed a 12-metre-high column, positioned at a location of an existing parking sign (parking sign plate to be relocated onto new column) with a swan neck adaptor and dome camera fitted to the top (giving a 360-degree view along High Street), supplemented by a proposed fixed camera. The column would be painted black (same appearance as the existing columns elsewhere within Clacton).

The Committee was made aware that the proposal was of a similar height and appearance as existing street light columns and other existing CCTV columns in the Town and would not appear prominent or harmful within the street scene.

Members were reminded that the proposal formed part of the Safer Streets Programme aiming to combat place-based crime through situational crime prevention. The proposals were supported by The Office of the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner by provision of funding to deliver the intended works. The development would contribute to the Council's Corporate Plan 'Our Vision' 2024/25 and 2024 – 2028 Theme, Championing our local environment.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council's Head of Planning and Building Control (JP-G) in respect of the application.

An Officer Update Sheet had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting which informed the Committee of a minor word changing of:-

"Paragraph 7.5 – Minor change to wording should read 8 metres and not 12 metres high"

There were no public speakers on this occasion.

There were no questions on this occasion.

It was moved by Councillor Everett, seconded by Councillor Alexander and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as stated at paragraph 9.2 of the Officer report (A.7), or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referenced is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

52. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.8 - 24-01764-FUL - OUTSIDE 48 WELLESLEY ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 3PJ

Councillor Everett declared an interest in relation to this Planning Application as he worked opposite the proposed application site and that he would therefore not participate in the discussions and decision-making. Councillor Everett thereupon left the room.

The Committee heard that the application was before Members as Tendring District Council was the applicant.

Members were told that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of CCTV cameras and a supporting column on the highway edge of the public footway, outside no. 48 Wellesley Road, Clacton-on-Sea.

The Committee was informed that the application proposed a 12-metre-high column, with a swan neck adaptor and dome camera fitted to the top (giving a 360-degree view along Wellesley Road in both directions, and into Meredith Road), supplemented by a proposed fixed camera giving a 180 degree view up Meredith Road from its junction with Wellesley Road.

Members were made aware that the proposal was of a similar height and appearance as existing street light columns and other existing CCTV columns in the Town and would not appear prominent, out of character or visually harmful within the street scene.

Officers reminded Members that the proposal formed part of the Safer Streets Programme aiming to combat place-based crime through situational crime prevention. The proposals were supported by The Office of the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner by provision of funding to deliver the intended works.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council’s Head of Planning and Building Control (JP-G) in respect of the application.

There were no updates circulated to Members prior to the meeting on this occasion.

There were no public speakers on this occasion.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	Officer’s response thereto:-
---	-------------------------------------

<i>Are the cameras on 24 hours a day?</i>	<i>Yes, they are on for 24 hours a day. This pole is 12 metres so then it is mindful to not be looking directly into windows.</i>
<i>Do residents know this CCTV is going to be there?</i>	<i>Yes.</i>
<i>Are residents happy for this?</i>	<i>There has been nothing received to disagree with the CCTV.</i>

It was moved by Councillor Alexander, seconded by Councillor Sudra and:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as stated at paragraph 9.2 of the Officer report (A.8), or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referenced is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

53. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.9 - 24-01765-FUL - OPPOSITE ORWELL ROAD, MARINE PARADE EAST, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 1PR

The Committee heard that this application was before Members as Tendring District Council was the landowner and applicant.

Members were told that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of CCTV and a supporting column on the back edge of the public footway, opposite Orwell Road, to the front of the Pavillion Fun Park, Marine Parade East, Clacton-on-Sea.

The Committee was informed that the application proposed an 8-metre-high column, with a swan neck adaptor and dome camera fitted to the top providing a 360-degree view along Marine Parade East and into Orwell Road, supplemented by a proposed fixed camera giving a 180 degree view up Orwell Road from its Junction with Marine Parade East.

Members were made aware that the proposal was of a similar height and appearance as existing street light columns and would be viewed in the context of the existing tall, amusement equipment and lighting columns. The development would not appear prominent, out of character or visually harmful within the street scene.

Officers reminded Members that the CCTV column would have no impact upon the significance and setting of the historic lampposts and was considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Clacton Seafront Conservation Area.

Members were further told that the proposal formed part of the Safer Streets Programme aiming to combat place-based crime through situational crime prevention.

The proposals were supported by The Office of the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner by provision of funding to deliver the intended works.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval.

At the meeting, an oral presentation was made by the Council's Head of Planning and Building Control (JP-G) in respect of the application.

There were no updates circulated to Members on this occasion.

There were no public speakers on this occasion.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	Officer's response thereto:-
<i>Will the camera be looking at the children's play area?</i>	<i>Possibly, yes.</i>

It was moved by Councillor Wiggins, seconded by Councillor Goldman and:-

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions as stated at paragraph 9.2, or varied as is necessary to ensure the wording is enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects, including appropriate updates, so long as the principle of the conditions as referenced is retained; and,
- 2) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary.

The meeting was declared closed at 7.03 pm

Chairman