MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, HELD ON TUESDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 2026 AT 5.00 PM IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM, TOWN HALL, STATION ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 1SE

Present:	Councillors Fowler (Chairman), White (Vice-Chairman), Alexander, Codling, Goldman, Sudra and Wiggins (except item 29)
Also Present:	Councillors Griffiths (except items 29 - 31) and Scott (except item 31)
In Attendance:	Gary Guiver (Corporate Director (Planning & Community)), John Pateman-Gee (Head of Planning & Building Control), Ian Ford (Democratic Services Manager), Joanne Fisher (Planning Solicitor & Acting Legal Services Manager), Alison Newland (Planning Manager (DM)) (except items 30 & 31), Amy Lang (Principal Planning Officer), Alison Pope (Planning Officer) (except items 29 - 31), Charlotte Cooper (Planning Officer) (except item 31) and Katie Moss (Democratic Services Officer)
Also in Attendance:	Lee Heley (Corporate Director (Place and Wellbeing) & Deputy Chief Executive) and Chad Nugent (Project Delivery Unit Communications Lead)

23. CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

The Democratic Services Manager (Ian Ford) informed the Committee that, on 25 September 2026, in accordance with the expressed wishes of the Leader of the Reform UK Group, and the authority delegated to him, the Chief Executive had appointed Councillor Aimee Keteca to serve on the Planning Committee in place of Councillor Jeff Bray.

Councillor Keteca had not yet been able to receive the required mandatory training and therefore was unable to sit as a member of the Committee at the present time.

24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Land (with no substitution).

25. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee, held on Thursday 3 September 2026, be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wiggins declared an interest, in relation to Planning Application 26/00287/OUT – Land to north of Colchester Road, Elmstead, CO7 7EF, in that she was one of the Ward Members and she was pre-determined. She therefore would not sit as

a member of the Committee for this item but would retire from the room whilst this application was determined.

Councillor Wiggins also declared for the public record, in relation to Planning Application 26/00874/PIP – Land east of 3 Orchard View, Wivenhoe Road, Alresford, CO7 8BD that she was one of the Ward Members for the application and confirmed that she was not pre-determined on this application.

Councillor Scott, who was present in the public gallery, declared for the public record, in relation to Planning Application 26/00287/OUT – Land to north of Colchester Road, Elmstead, CO7 7EF, that he was one of the Ward Members for the application.

Councillor Scott also declared for the public record, in relation to Planning Application 26/00874/PIP – Land east of 3 Orchard View, Wivenhoe Road, Alresford, CO7 8BD that he was one of the Ward Members for the application.

Councillor Alexander declared for the public record, in relation to Planning Application 26/00727/FUL – Car Park, Hastings Avenue, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 1AW that he was one of the Ward Members for the application and confirmed that he was not pre-determined on this application.

In response to a query from Councillor Wiggins, the Planning Solicitor confirmed that Members did not need to declare an interest on those planning applications where the Council was either the applicant or the landowner and that the Planning Committee was duly authorised to determine such applications.

27. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 38

No questions on notice pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 38 had been submitted for this meeting.

28. REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PLANNING AND COMMUNITY) - A.4 - PLANNING APPLICATION 26/00727/FUL - CAR PARK, HASTINGS AVENUE, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 1AW

Earlier on in the meeting, as detailed under minute 26 above, Councillor Alexander had declared for the public record, in relation to this application that he was one of the Ward Members, and he had confirmed that he was not pre-determined on this application.

The Committee was informed that this application sought planning permission for a temporary boat hall for a period of seven years to accommodate the RNLI's Shannon-class lifeboat and associated launch tractor. The existing lifeboat station could not accommodate the vessel due to the size and configuration of the current boat hall.

Members were advised that the proposal was considered by Officers to be acceptable in principle and that it would provide significant public benefits through the continued operation of a vital emergency service. No objections had been raised by the Environment Agency, Essex Highways, Place Services Ecology or the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer. Whilst there would be a temporary loss of part of the overflow parking area, this harm was outweighed by the operational and public benefits of the development. Subject to conditions, 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 Officer (AP) in respect of the application.

No updates had been circulated to Members in relation to this application.

No member of the public had registered to speak on this application.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	**Officer's response thereto:-**
Why are we limiting this to seven years?	*The proposal before us is for a seven year temporary permission for the lifeboat house while the RNLI look for a more permanent solution.*
I'm curious about its construction and what it is made of especially the sides.	*The sides are sheet steel cladding, and they would be powder coated and coloured ready for the advertisement decals to go on showing the lifeboat images. The roofing is plastic coated membrane and that would be coloured white and there would be a steel structure inside.*
Presumably this is for the winter time only? I'm assuming that. It's a great tourist attraction and something that the area does not want to lose. Does the skirt go right the way around the building and completely encase the boat inside?	*It does. It will not be a see through structure. It will have the decals on the side depicting the lifeboat. It will be a secure and weather proof structure that will be floor to ceiling covered in the materials of the building.*
During the summer months will that structure remain in place, or will they open it in the warmer weather so people can get a much better view of the lifeboat?	*I understand that it will be closed. It won't be open though the RNLI do have 'open days' so it maybe possible as part of those to view the lifeboat but that's not part of the application so I cannot guarantee that.*
Have there been any representations submitted since the time the report was published?	*No there have not.*

After debate, it was moved by Councillor White, seconded by Councillor Goldman 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.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) informative notes be sent to the applicant, as may be deemed necessary, by the Head of Planning and Building Control.

29. REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PLANNING AND COMMUNITY) - A.1 - PLANNING APPLICATION 26/00287/OUT - LAND TO NORTH OF COLCHESTER ROAD, ELMSTEAD, CO7 7EF

Earlier on in the meeting, as reported under minute 26 above, Councillor Wiggins had declared that she was one of the local Ward Members and that she was pre-determined on this application. She did not sit therefore as a member of the Committee for this item, and she retired from the room whilst it was deliberated upon and determined.

Also, as reported under minute 26 above, Councillor Scott, who was present in the public gallery, had declared that he was also one of the local Ward Members for this application.

Further to minute 13 (7.7.26), when this application had been deferred by the Planning Committee so that further information could be sought in respect of: *ownership; what happens to the footpath; a clearer plan for the access point; and further consideration of the impact on amenity*, Members were informed that the additional information requested had been detailed under the 'Proposal' section of the Officer report (A.1) from paragraph 7.6 onwards and that all changes to the previous committee report (excluding those copied from the 7th July 2026 Update Sheet and updated paragraph references) were in bold italics.

The Committee was reminded that the application site lay outside but abutted the settlement development boundary in the adopted Local and Neighbourhood Plans; within a Green Landscape Buffer in the adopted Neighbourhood Plan; and within a draft Strategic Green Gap in the emerging Local Plan. No objections had been raised by consultees.

Members were made aware that the NPPF 2024 had been replaced on 17th August 2026 by the NPPF 2026. The Officer report had been updated to assess the proposal against the new NPPF 2026 including Policy S5 for development outside settlements. It was important to note that the NPPF 2026 under Policy S5 created a stronger presumption in favour of sustainable development outside settlements where there was an evidenced unmet housing need than the previous 'tilted balance'. The report still concluded that the proposal was recommended for approval.

The Committee had before it the published Officer report (A.1) containing the key planning issues, relevant planning policies, planning history, any response from consultees, written representations received and a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

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

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, an Officer update sheet had been circulated to the members of the Committee in relation to this application and published to the Council's website. That update sheet had reported that 12 additional letters of objection had been received raising the following additional concerns which had not already been

addressed within the Officers' report (A.1) (Officer response shown in brackets and *italics*):

- Object to double yellow lines this specific area has average age of 80 and multiple disabled badge holders with an application submitted for a disabled parking bay close to the new access *(Disabled parking bays and double yellow lines are separately controlled by Essex County Council. Given the existing off street parking provision for Meadow Close plus wider availability of street parking beyond the proposed double yellow lines this is not considered to amount to significant harm to amenity and is required to protect highway efficiency of movement and safety)*.
- Tye Road should be used for access, particularly given new A1331 reduction in traffic *(This is not the access proposal for consideration and would result in substantial loss of hedgerow and trees, and harm to ENP Important View 3)*.
- Part of entrance to application site is owned by Meadow Close landowner *(the applicant confirms they control all application site land; any dispute would be a private matter and would not prevent determination of this planning application)*.
- Double yellow lines will impede access for ambulances and carers and won't be enforced (*See general parking comment above, in addition emergency services can park on double yellow lines. The North Essex Parking Partnership are responsible for enforcement)*.
- Existing Meadow Close road is 4.8m wide *(This is agreed)*.
- Double yellow lines weren't shown previously so we did not object to them *(the request by Highways for double yellow lines was referred to in the previous (7th July) Committee Report, Officer assessment and within condition 19 as a requirement to mitigate the impacts of the proposal. The double yellow lines have now been shown on the amended plan for clarity)*.

There was no public speaking on this application at this meeting as that had taken place at the meeting of the Committee held on 7 July 2025.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	**Officer(s) response thereto:-**
Can people with disability badges park on double yellow lines?	*Yes, they can park for up to three hours in the majority of cases but there are some restrictions such as proximity to junctions for example.*
Do we have a hard copy of the annotated site access plan available?	*I don't have it. But just to clarify that the annotations point out the existing 1.4m footways; the existing 4.8m carriageway that extends into the site and also the proposed double yellow lines. These are the only changes made to the original plan.*
So apart from the minor changes to the site access plan, the rest of this application remains the same as when it was last before the Committee. Is that correct?	*Yes, that is correct.*
With the ownership of the properties to either side of the proposed	*Estimating from the photo, I would estimate that the width of the gap between the edge of the carriageway and the gate is 3metres. This is all within the control of*

entrance into this site, what is that distance from the boundaries of those properties to the wooden gate i.e. what is the width of the land between those boundaries? It looks narrow.	*the applicant and within the redlined area. No land is taken from the properties to either side.*
If there is only a 3m gap how will they achieve the 5m wide road?	*The road carries on as it is until you get right into where the field gate is and then it gradually tapers outwards to 5.5 metres i.e. within the new development site (the current field). Essentially therefore the road only expands within the site. It does not expand before the gate there is no change at that point so the road will remain at 4.8 metres up until the location of the current field gate. Then it will widen within the development itself. This is an outline application only, and it is only the point of access that is the determinative point of this application.*
So, upon exiting the development site the road will, in effect, narrow down. Is that correct?	*Yes.*
If this application is not determined tonight and therefore will be still undetermined by the 31st October 2026, will it be removed from this Committee's jurisdiction under the new Regulations that come into force on that date?	*Yes, if it is again deferred this evening, it will not be determined by the 31st Officer 2026 and so this application, under the new Regulations, would need to be considered by the Nominated Member and the Nominated Officer to determine whether it was determined by an Officer or whether it should be submitted to the Committee for its determination. Obviously, I cannot pre-judge that conversation.*
So, in theory this application could end up being determined by an Officer under the new regulatory system? Is that correct?	*Yes. In addition, any reserved matters application that would follow in if this outline application were to be approved, would be deemed a Schedule 1 application under the new Regulations and it would be mandatory that it would be determined by an Officer as it would be for less than 500 houses.*
Can we do anything about the yellow lines being included?	*You could consider that they are not necessary. You could consider it a reason for refusal of the application. You have options available. Ultimately, the proposal before us given the advice received from the Highways Authority is that in order to approve this development it is necessary to put on those conditions that are set out in the report and that includes the provision of double yellow lines for the purposes of supporting this development. We don't like usually to put on conditions that are subject to a secondary regime and therefore run the risk of not being approved and which may then*

	stop the development from proceeding as it would then not be able to comply with the conditions imposed upon the planning permission granted.

After the debate, it was moved by Councillor Fowler, seconded by Councillor Goldman and:-

RESOLVED that:-

(a) the Head of Planning and Building Control secure the completion of a legal agreement under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dealing with the matters as summarised at paragraph 9.2 of the Officer report (A.1) and on appropriate terms and on any other such terms as may be deemed necessary by the Head of Planning and Building Control;

(b) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant outline planning permission subject to the agreed section 106 agreement and the conditions as stated at paragraph 9.3 of the Officer report (A.1), 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;

(c) informative notes be sent to the applicant as may be deemed necessary by the Head of Planning and Building Control; and

(d) in the event of the planning obligations or requirements referred to in resolution (a) above not being secured within 12 months of the date of this meeting the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds at their discretion.

30. REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PLANNING AND COMMUNITY) - A.2 - PLANNING APPLICATION 26/00874/PIP - LAND EAST OF 3 ORCHARD VIEW, WIVENHOE ROAD, ALRESFORD, CO7 8BD

Earlier on in the meeting, as detailed under minute 26 above, Councillor Wiggins had declared for the public record, in relation to this application that she was one of the Ward Members, and she had confirmed that she was not pre-determined on this application.

Councillor Scott, who was present in the public gallery, had also declared for the public record, in relation to this application that he was one of the Ward Members.

It was reported that this application sought 'Permission in Principle' for the erection of one self-build dwelling. The scope of consideration was limited to the location, land use and amount of development proposed.

The Committee was informed that the application site was located within the defined Settlement Development Boundary of Alresford, where residential development was supported in principle by the adopted Tendring District Local Plan and the Alresford Neighbourhood Plan. Having regard to the site's sustainable location and the scale of development proposed the principle of development was considered by Officers to be acceptable.

The proposal was considered by Officers to accord with Policies SP3, SPL1, SPL2 and LP7 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond, together with Policy ALRES1 of the Alresford Neighbourhood Plan. Officers had therefore recommended the application 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 Officer (CC) in respect of the application.

No updates had been circulated to Members in relation to this application.

No member of the public had registered to speak on this application.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	**Officer's response thereto:-**
Is a PIP application similar to an outline planning application?	*Yes, it is similar, but it is more limited in scope. Under an outline application, the applicant will have the opportunity to submit some details if they want to such as access. But with a Permission in Principle, we are only allowed to consider location, land use and the amount.*
Under the new Regulations, presumably because this is a TDC Officer's application any next stage(s) applications would still come before the Committee for determination?	*In terms of the new legislation, any "own interest" applications (i.e. applications that are on TDC land or submitted by an officer or Member of the Council) would automatically need to be considered by the Nominated Member and the Nominated Officer who would determine, on its individual merits, whether it would fall to be determined by an Officer or by the Committee. It would be highly likely that it would be referred to the Committee in the interests of openness and transparency but that could not be guaranteed as that decision cannot be pre-determined.*
I understood it to be the case that an "own interest" application would fall into Schedule 2 and therefore would come to the Committee automatically.	*It's correct to say that it would fall into Schedule 2. However, all Schedule 2 applications need to be considered by the Nominated Member and the Nominated Officer who would determine its determination route. The only difference between "own interest" applications and other Schedule 2 applications is that "own interest" applications do not have to considered*

	against the two tests set out in the Regulations.
The area outlined for development seems to be a rather odd shape. Why is that?	*The whole site currently serves as a garden to number 3 Orchard View. It is legally garden use. The intention is to allow the land not built on to become the garden for the new property without the need to apply for planning permission to do so and would be a civil matter of ownership rather than a planning matter.*
Under the relevant history section of the report, I note that it states that there is a legal agreement in relation to RAMS that's already completed. How is that so if this application has not been determined?	*It's a draft Section 106 obligation that has not yet been "signed off". It will only be at the point that permission is granted that the landowners will sign the obligation and it will bind the land in question.*

After the debate, it was moved by Councillor Alexander, seconded by Councillor Goldman and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to grant permission in principle.

31. REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PLANNING AND COMMUNITY) - A.3 - PLANNING APPLICATION 26/00883/FUL - CLACTON LEISURE CENTRE, VISTA ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 6DB

The Committee was informed that the proposed redevelopment of part of Clacton Leisure Centre would deliver a significantly enhanced and more diverse range of leisure, sport and recreational facilities, including new play areas, cycling facilities, tennis and padel courts, a pavilion and associated landscaping. The scheme would provide substantial community, health and wellbeing benefits, achieve biodiversity net gain, and was supported by statutory consultees, subject to conditions.

The proposal was considered by Officers to accord with the NPPF and adopted Local Plan policies, with any potential impacts capable of being suitably mitigated through planning conditions. Accordingly, it was recommended by Officers that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report (A.3).

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 refusal.

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

No updates had been circulated to Members in relation to this application.

Lee Heley, representing the applicant (Tendring District Council), spoke in favour of this application.

Matters raised by Members of the Committee:-	**Officer's response thereto:-**
I note that there has been only one objection received, what was that regarding?	*That objection is summarised within Section 6.2 of the Officer report (A.3).*

After the debate, it was moved by Councillor Goldman, seconded by Councillor Fowler and unanimously:-

RESOLVED that:-

(3) 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.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

(4) informative notes be sent to the applicant, as may be deemed necessary, by the Head of Planning and Building Control.

The meeting was declared closed at 6.32 pm

Chairman