

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

<b>Present:</b>	Councillors Fowler (Chairman), White (Vice-Chairman), Alexander (except item 58), Everett, Goldman, Smith (except item 58), Sudra and Wiggins
<b>Also Present:</b>	Councillor Scott (except items 60 – 63)
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Gary Guiver (Director (Planning & Communities)), John Pateman-Gee (Head of Planning & Building Control), Ian Ford (Committee Services Manager), Joanne Fisher (Planning Solicitor), Michael Pingram (Senior Planning Officer), Oliver Ashford (Planning Officer) and Katie Koppenaar (Committee Services Officer)
<b>Also in Attendance</b>	Michael Carran (Assistant Director (Economic Growth, Culture & Leisure)) (items 54 – 58 only), Andy White (Assistant Director (Building and Public Realm)), Emma Twine (Project Manager (Levelling Up)) (items 54 – 58 only)

**54. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

There were no apologies for absence submitted nor substitutions on this occasion.

**55. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

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

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee, held on Tuesday 4 February 2025, be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

**56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In relation to Agenda Item 5 (report A.1 – Planning Application 24/01890/FUL – Land at High Street Car Park, Carnarvon Road, Clacton-on-Sea), Councillors Alexander and Smith both declared an Interest and both informed the Committee that they would withdraw from the meeting and leave the room whilst the Committee deliberated on this application and reached its decision.

In relation to Agenda Item 6 (report A.2 – Planning Application 24/00937/FUL – Elmtree Garage, Colchester Road, Elmstead), Councillor Wiggins declared for the public record that she was one of the local Ward Members. Councillor Wiggins stated that she was not pre-determined on this application and she therefore would remain in the meeting and take part in the deliberations and decision making.

**57. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 38**

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

58. **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.1. - 24/01890/FUL - LAND AT HIGH STREET CAR PARK, CARNARVON ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA**

Earlier on in the meeting, as detailed under Minute 56 above, Councillors Alexander and Smith had both declared an Interest in this application. They thereupon withdrew from the meeting and left the room whilst the Committee deliberated on this application and reached its decision.

Members were told that this application was before the Planning Committee on the basis that the applicant and owner of the site was Tendring District Council.

Officers made Members aware that the application sought the demolition of the existing multi-story car park and all other structures, to be replaced by a new multi-story car park providing 301 spaces, the erection of 28 affordable residential units and the erection of 1,330sqm of flexible commercial floorspace. Given that the site fell within the Settlement Development Boundary for Clacton-on-Sea, and was also an area prioritised for regeneration, the principle of development was acceptable. The proposed commercial uses might not necessarily be main town centre uses, but Officers believed that they would still be a boost to the commercial offering in the surrounding area.

The Committee was informed that Officers considered that the design, scale and layout was an acceptable response to the character and appearance of the area, and whilst there would be a degree of harm to the amenities of Number 39 Carnarvon Road, on balance that was not considered so significant that it warranted recommending a refusal. The residential units all met the technical housing space standards and provided for enough private amenity space, and Essex Highways Authority had raised no objections subject to conditions. The parking provision was also considered to be of an acceptable level.

Members were made aware that the proposed development would result in the loss of a Copper Beech tree, however, whilst unfortunate it would not have been feasible to retain it without significant revisions to the wider scheme. Furthermore, the proposed development included a significant increase of soft landscaping, and therefore on balance the wider benefits of the scheme were considered to outweigh the harm of the loss of that tree.

The Committee was also told that taking all the above into consideration, Officers had concluded that, whilst there were some minor harms as a result of the development, they were significantly outweighed by the benefits the scheme would generate.

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 subject to a Section 106 legal agreement.

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

There was no update circulated to Members prior to the meeting in relation to this application.

Mike Carran, representing the applicant, spoke in support of this application.

<b>Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-</b>	<b>Officer's response thereto:-</b>
<i>Has some of the affordable housing been reserved for Essential Workers? If not, could it be looked into and encouraged?</i>	<i>40% of the housing provision is for affordable housing. A housing allocation for Essential Workers does not form part of this application. TDC's affordable housing definition follows that within the NPPF. As there is not an Essential Worker Policy within the Local Plan there is not a basis on which to insist upon it via a condition. Going forward, the landowner can make such a provision but it falls beyond the scope of this application.</i>
<i>With the current car park there seems to be very little use of the upper floors. How can we ensure that, going forward, people do not park in the open spaces given that most users of the High Street Multi Storey car park currently park in the open on the ground floor.</i>	<i>The open spaces you mention will be inaccessible to vehicles. Cars will only be able to access the new multi-story car park and will have no choice but to park within.</i>
<i>There is Japanese knot weed on the site. What provision can TDC make to deal with this problem in a safe manner.</i>	<i>The Environment Agency (EA) would need to be involved in any matter regarding this knot weed and a permit from the EA would be required to treat or remove the knot weed. Therefore, it is outside of the Council's remit to impose a planning condition.</i>
<i>The height of the proposed new multi-storey car park will be five storeys. The present car park is three storeys. How will the impact of this be managed?</i>	<i>The separation distance from the site of the proposed new multi-storey car park to buildings the other side of Carnarvon Road is 20m and therefore this will not be an issue. The new car park will affect the residential units adjacent to it. However, the relocation of the car park site further away from the backs of buildings in Station Road will be a significant positive outcome.</i>
<i>Are there parking spaces at the very top of the site?</i>	<i>No – this area is allocated for public seating and a community space.</i>
<i>Can you confirm that you are satisfied that there is no conflict of interest given that ECC Place Services have been involved in both the Green Infrastructure and the Ecology assessments?</i>	<i>Yes, we are satisfied that there is no such conflict of interest. ECC took steps to ensure that there was no crossover of the Officers involved in those assessments.</i>
<i>Is there any parking provision for invalids? Will lifts be provided within the multi-storey? Can there be such parking adjacent to the High Street?</i>	<i>21 invalid parking spaces will be provided on the ground floor. There will be two lifts providing access to the higher storeys. Disabled facilities will also be provided adjacent to those lifts.</i>
<i>Will there be any electric vehicle charging points provided?</i>	<i>36 EV charging points will be provided. There is currently only one provided</i>

	<i>within the existing car park.</i>
<i>Will the new buildings be coloured grey?</i>	<i>Both the residential and mixed-use buildings will likely be "light blue". However, Condition 10 will secure such details.</i>

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

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (1) on appropriate terms as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Building Control to secure the completion of a legal agreement under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dealing with the following matters:
  - Affordable Housing provision; and
  - Biodiversity Net Gain (Unless the applicant opts to deal with this under the planning condition)
- (2) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant planning subject to the agreed Section 106 agreement and conditions as stated at paragraph 10.2, 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;
- (3) the sending of any informative notes to the applicant as may be deemed necessary; and
- (4) in any event of the Planning obligations or requirements referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured and/or not secured within 12 months from the date of this meeting that the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds at their discretion.

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

Earlier on in the meeting, as detailed under Minute 56 above, Councillor Wiggins had declared for the public record that she was one of the local Ward Members. Councillor Wiggins had also stated that she was not pre-determined on this application. She therefore remained in the meeting and took part in the deliberations and decision making.

The Committee heard that this application was before Members as the application had been called in by Councillor Scott due to his perceived impact of the proposals on traffic, noise and light pollution.

Members were told that the application sought full planning permission for the "Demolition of existing buildings, removal of existing canopy, pump islands and underground tanks. Construction of new sales building with 'Food to Go' offer and ATM, installation of new canopy, pump islands and forecourt, installation of 2 x 60 KL underground fuel tanks, creation of new Electric Vehicle Charging (EVC) hub and

associated infrastructure, jet wash bays and associated plant room, bin store, car parking, car care facilities and all other associated works.”

Officers told Members that the existing commercial building (office/storage), sales building and forecourt would be demolished and replaced by a larger sales building and forecourt. The new forecourt would provide refuelling for 16 vehicles. The new sales building would be located along the northern boundary of the site with a GIA of 380sqm, larger than the 289sqm. The sales area would provide two new ‘Food to Go’ uses including a bakery and a hot food takeaway. It would also feature staff area, three customer toilets and a new ATM and pay at night window.

The proposed EVC hub would be comprised of eight bays with canopies above located along the western boundary with a height of 2.8m. A new canopy would also cover the existing fuel pumps in the same location at the existing but covering a larger area. That would be a similar height to the existing.

Further, the Committee was told that new customer car parking of 15 spaces and 1 accessible bay, four new jet wash bays, new underground fuel tanks and associated infrastructure were all proposed.

Members also heard that the proposed development was considered by Officers to be an upgrade of existing facilities in accordance with the existing use on site.

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 Officer (OA) in respect of the application.

An Officer Update Sheet had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting which covered the following matters:-

*“Environment Agency – Additional Consultee Response 24.01.2025 – Holding objection removed*

*“We have reviewed the documents as submitted and we consider that planning permission could be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following planning conditions are included as set out below. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and we would maintain our objection to the application.*

*We ask to be consulted on the details submitted for approval to your Authority to discharge these conditions and on any subsequent amendments/alterations.*

#### *Environmental setting*

*The site is underlain by superficial Cover Sand Deposits designated as a Secondary B Aquifer. The site is located within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ), namely SPZ 3. The site is located over a EU WFD groundwater body. Shallow groundwater may also be present at the site. The location of the site is therefore considered to be of moderate/high environmental sensitivity.*

*Condition 1 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to install the underground tanks have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the full structural details of the installation, including details of excavation, the tank(s), tank surround, additional containment, associated pipework, monitoring system schedule and maintenance schedule. The scheme shall be fully implemented subsequently maintained, in accordance with the scheme, or any changes subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.*

*Reasons - To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters (particularly the Secondary B aquifer, Source Protection Zone 3) from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024; paragraphs 187,196 and 197), EU Water Framework Directive, and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements (2018) D2 and D3.*

*Condition 2 Prior to commencement, no development shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority: 1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified: All previous uses potential contaminants associated with those uses a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site. 2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site. 3) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority.*

*Condition 3 No occupation shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.*

*Condition 4 No development should take place until a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan in respect of contamination including a timetable of monitoring and submission of reports to the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reports as specified in the approved plan, including details of any necessary contingency action arising from the monitoring, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any necessary contingency measures shall be carried out in accordance with the details in the approved reports. On completion of the monitoring specified in the plan a final report demonstrating that all long-term remediation works have been carried out*

*and confirming that remedial targets have been achieved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Condition 5 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved. Reasons To protect and prevent the pollution of the water environment (particularly the Secondary B aquifer, Source Protection Zone 3) from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework(NPPF 2024; paragraphs 187,196 and 197), EU Water Framework Directive, River Basin Management Plan and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Position Statements (2017) A4 – A6, J1 – J7 and N7.*

*Condition 6 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.*

*Reasons Piling or other penetrative ground improvement methods can increase the risk to the water environment by introducing preferential pathways for the movement of contamination into the underlying aquifer and/or impacting surface water quality. For development involving piling or other penetrative ground improvement methods on a site potentially affected by contamination or where groundwater is present at a shallow depth, a suitable Foundation Works Risk Assessment based on the results of the site investigation and any remediation should be undertaken. This assessment should underpin the choice of founding technique, and any mitigation measures employed, to ensure the process does not cause, or create preferential pathways for, the movement of contamination into the underlying aquifer, or impacting surface water quality.”*

***Officer Response – Having considered all of the above consultee’s response, Officers consider that recommended Condition 6 should be carried forward and added to any approval. The other recommended conditions do not meet the 6 tests within the NPPF and are not recommended to be carried forward.***

*Elmstead Parish Council Additional Comments – Received 25.02.25*

*“On the public access portal, the Parish Council’s comment was labelled as neutral – this is incorrect. As stated at the end of paragraph 3 of our response, “Elmstead Parish Council must object to this application”.*

*There seems to have been further misunderstandings in the officer’s reported response to our concerns we’d like to clarify as we feel the summary misrepresents our position.*

*We’d question the assertion that a significantly expanded petrol station facility, with additional food service provision, will not cause additional traffic. Why would the site need four times as many staff if there was not a substantial increase in customers – who, given its location next to a busy A road, and primary purpose as a fuel station, will overwhelmingly be travelling by motor vehicle? Logically this must cause significantly increased traffic flow.*

*While we would suggest the expanded food service provision will in fact increase noise throughout the 24-hour period, our main concern has not been recognized in the report. The new site layout will absolutely move existing and new sources of noise significantly closer to neighboring residential properties and noise sensitive businesses (the adjacent pet shop).*

*Of special concern is the impact of the multiple pressure washing bays – which the report into our objection fails to mention.*

*Finally, if the committee has visited the site today, we'd like to again emphasize our concerns about the complexities of 2 entrances/exits for vehicular traffic to the westbound A133 with an increase of traffic both to and from the site, and the roads rapidly increasing throughput.”*

Harry Capstick, the applicant’s agent, spoke in support of the application.

Luke Worsfold, a member of the public, spoke against the application.

Councillor Gary Scott, caller-in and a local Ward Member, spoke against the application.

<b>Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-</b>	<b>Officer’s response thereto:-</b>
<i>Why have five out of the six proposed additional planning conditions submitted by the Environment Agency (EA) been turned down by Officers?</i>	<i>Officers feel that it is not down to the Local Planning Authority to duplicate existing legislation that can be enforced by other bodies. However, Officers would be content to add them as an Informative Note to the applicant or add them as extra conditions if that it was what the Committee resolves.</i>
<i>If Councillor Scott had not called-in this application, would it have been brought before the Committee?</i>	<i>No. It would have fallen to Officers to process under delegated powers.</i>
<i>Can you confirm if there is any parking provision for bikes and/or motorbikes?</i>	<i>It would appear so from the plan but cannot be certain. This can be covered by an additional condition.</i>
<i>Can you confirm that the site lighting proposed will be of the modern, less intrusive kind?</i>	<i>This is covered by one of the proposed conditions.</i>
<i>Can you confirm that the site cannot be accessed from Dale Close?</i>	<i>Yes, I can confirm that.</i>
<i>Any current noise pollution is generated from the front of the site. Now with this redevelopment potentially the whole of the site will be a source of noise and will likely affect more residents in the vicinity. What can be done about this?</i>	<i>Environmental Health are satisfied that an adequate noise assessment survey has been carried out and they were happy with the results.</i>
<i>The Car Wash facility will be a noisy facility. Is there a time limit on its use? How near would it be to the nearest neighbour?</i>	<i>The application indicates that it will be operational from 7am to 7pm. However, this can be set via an additional condition.</i>
<i>Can this proposed facility be relocated further up the A133 nearer the Garden</i>	<i>The Committee has to consider the application before it.</i>



<i>Community site?</i>	
<i>Are the proposed new fuel tanks larger than the existing?</i>	<i>The new fuel tanks will be slightly larger.</i>
<i>Can you confirm that there will be no negative impact on the local water courses?</i>	<i>I can't give any guarantees but there are other bodies such as the Environment Agency that can impose site licence conditions and enforce them.</i>
<i>Why is there no provision for hydrogen powered vehicles?</i>	<i>This was the choice of the applicant who did not include it as part of their application.</i>
<i>Has the Environment Agency been made aware that Officers are recommending that 5 out of 6 of their conditions should not go forward? If not, then should this matter be deferred until they have been made aware and have had a further opportunity to respond?</i>	<i>The EA representation was received only yesterday and so they have not been so informed. Any such deferral would be the decision of Members. These are only recommendations; the Committee is at liberty to not follow them e.g. the Committee could resolve to add the EA's proposed conditions as extra conditions to the approval of this planning application.</i>
<i>EV charging can be a slow process so where will customers go whilst waiting?</i>	<i>That would be down to the individual concerned. They could remain in the car; go into a food outlet; or go for a walk. It would be entirely their choice.</i>
<i>How long has this site been a petrol station?</i>	<i>Only part of the site has been a petrol station. Cannot give an exact figure in years but it is likely to have been several decades.</i>

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

**RESOLVED** that:-

- 1) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions stated at paragraph 10.2 of the Officer report (A.2), together with the extra conditions proposed by the Environment Agency (as detailed in the Update Sheet), a condition to secure the jet wash operation hours as 7am to 7pm and a condition for the provision of two wheeled parking, 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.

**60. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.3. - 24/01643/FUL - GUNFLEET SAILING CLUB, MARINE PARADE EAST, CLACTON-ON-SEA**

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

It was reported that the application sought full planning permission for a small extension to the sailing club clubhouse to accommodate an entrance lobby and race officer box.

Members were told that the site was located within the settlement development boundary, within Clacton Greensward Safeguarded Open Space and within Flood Zone 2.

The Committee was informed that the proposed development was not considered by Officers to cause any material harm to visual or residential amenity, highway safety, biodiversity, or flood risk.

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 & Building Control in respect of the application.

An Officer Update Sheet had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting setting out changes to the Approved Plans Condition as follows:-

*“Addition of two plans; existing and proposed northwestern elevation and existing and proposed south western elevation and the addition of the ‘North Eastern and South Eastern’ as shown below:*

#### 1. COMPLIANCE: APPROVED PLANS & DOCUMENTS

*CONDITION: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings/documents listed below and/or such other drawings/documents as may be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing pursuant to other conditions of this permission or such drawings/documents as may subsequently be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as a non-material amendment following an application in that regard.*

- Existing and Proposed North Eastern Elevation – Received 26.11.2024
- Existing and Proposed South Eastern Elevation – Received 26.11.2024
- Proposed Floor Plan – Received 26.11.2024
- Existing and proposed North Western elevation – Received 26 February 2026
- Existing and proposed South Western elevation – received 26 February 2026

*REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper phased planning of the development.”*

There were no public speakers on this occasion.

There were no questions from the Committee to Officers on this occasion.

It was moved by Councillor Alexander, seconded by Councillor Wiggins 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 10.2, and subject to the variation to the wording of Condition 1 (as detailed in the Update Sheet), 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.

**61. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (PLANNING & COMMUNITIES) - A.4. - 24/01592/FUL - UPPER PROMENADE, MARINE PARADE WEST, CLACTON-ON-SEA**

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

Members were reminded that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of 2no. CCTV and supporting columns on the back edge of the public footway, along the Upper Promenade, off Marine Parade West, Clacton-on-Sea.

Officers made Members aware that the application proposed two 9-metre-high column poles, which included the 1-metre-high swan neck adaptor and dome camera fitted to the top providing a 360-degree view along Marine Parade West and into Alton Road and the second positioned to look down Penfold Road. Both were supplemented by a proposed fixed camera giving a 180 degree view up Alton Road from its junction with Marine Parade West and Penfold Road and its junction with Marine Parade West.

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

Furthermore, the CCTV columns, as identified by the Council's heritage consultants, would have some harm in terms of 'less than substantial' harm upon the significance and setting of the historic lampposts, however, the public benefit for the installation of the CCTV cameras to provide security in public areas was considered to outweigh that level of harm and the proposed development was considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Clacton Seafront Conservation Area.

Members heard that the proposed development formed part of the Safer Streets Programme aiming to combat place-based crime through situational crime prevention. The proposed 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 Planning Officer (OA) in respect of the application.

There had been no updates circulated to Members prior to the meeting in relation to this application.

Andrew White, representing the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

<b>Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-</b>	<b>Officer's response thereto:-</b>
<i>Can you confirm that the CCTV poles will be painted black and could be made to mimic the existing Victorian streetlight columns?</i>	<i>It is one of the proposed conditions that the CCTV poles be finished in black. It would be difficult to get a modern CCTV pole to mimic a Victorian era column. It could look overly false and dilute the historical aspects of the genuine columns. This aspect is also not part of the submitted application.</i>
<i>Will these CCTV poles carry the required warning signs about filming?</i>	<i>This is not a planning consideration as it does not form part of the planning application. If such signs are found to require advertisement consent then that would be processed via a further planning application.</i>

It was moved by Councillor White, seconded by Councillor Alexander 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.4), 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.

**62. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

**RESOLVED** that, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of Agenda Item 10 on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 6a and 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 12A, as amended, of the Act.

**63. EXEMPT MINUTE**

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

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

NOTE: Councillors Everett and Smith did not vote because they had not been present when the matter was originally heard.

The meeting was declared closed at 7.16 pm

**Chairman**