

**TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**7<sup>TH</sup> June 2022**

**A.1 17/01229/OUT - Land adjacent and to The rear of 755 and 757, St Johns Road, Clacton On Sea, Essex, CO16 8BJ**

Following the publication of the committee report dated 7 June 2022 Members are advised to note the following points and consider these updates:

**Minor amendment to description of development to reflect recent changes to the Use Classes Order** (changes included in **bold *Italic***): Outline application (all matters reserved except means of access) for the redevelopment (including demolition) of the site for up to 950 residential units (including affordable housing) with a new Neighbourhood Centre comprising a local healthcare facility of up to 1500sqm NIA and up to 700sqm GFA **for use Classes E(a) (shops), E(b) (food and drink) and/or F.1** (community centre); a 2.1ha site for a new primary school; and associated roads, open space, drainage, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

**Amend recommendation sections (Section 1 - page 22 and Section 8 – page 48):**

- a) Within 6 (six) months of the date of the Committee's resolution to approve, 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 (where relevant):

And

That the Assistant Director for Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission in the event that such legal agreement has not been completed within the period of 6 months, as the requirements necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms had not been secured through a s106 planning obligation (to be added to section 8)

**A new condition 42:** Concurrently with the submission of the reserved matters as outlined in condition 3, full details of the market housing mix of each phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented as may be approved.

Reason: To ensure the mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenure reflects the requirements as set out in Local Plan policy LP2

**One further late objection** has been received raising the following issues:

- Existing roads and infrastructure would be overwhelmed
- Existing agricultural land and public footpath offer a welcome escape
- Impact on local wildlife
- The open space between Jaywick/Clacton and St Osyth is a valuable break in

Officer Comment – *the matters raised are addressed in the 'Assessment' section of the report under the 'Principle of Development', 'Ecology and Nature Conservation', 'Landscape & Visual Impact' and 'Transport and Access'*

**RECOMMENDATION remains unchanged subject to consideration of the above.**

## **A.2 16/02039/OUT - Land off London Road, Clacton**

A letter has been received from Cllr. G. Guglielmi which states the following:

*I write to express my support for this application. Although I no longer have any real links to this proposal, I was originally involved at the very beginning back in 2015 when I was Cabinet Member for Planning.*

*Tim Martin from Land Logic, who very sadly is no longer with us, asked to meet with me and Cllr Paul Honeywood together with Officers to discuss a self-build project he wanted to promote on this site. At that time, vacant self-build plots were costed from £50k and a large completed self-build 4 bedroom house would have worked out at around £180k; even now with all the increases and higher costs this would still be below £200k.*

*Where else locally would anyone be able to secure a decent-sized family home for such a low cost? To buy a 4 bedroom house now you'd need around £400k. This proposal would also greatly enhance the Council's affordable housing provision – it includes 67 affordable homes for local people.*

*It has always been this Council's aspiration to make self-build a reality, but unfortunately this has never materialised – to date, not one self-build home has been delivered in the District. This proposal is also very much in line with the Government's wish to boost the delivery of self-build and custom-build homes, as the UK 'levels up and builds back better' after the Covid-19 pandemic, so this is a golden opportunity to fulfil this Council's ambitions.*

*The Officer's recommendation of refusal justifies policy considerations, and rightly so, but the Officer's report also highlights the very fine balance on which this recommendation has been made.*

*When Tim Martin presented his plans, we asked him what evidence he had to demonstrate that this would be a sustainable project. He went away, conducted a market research exercise with his delivery partner, which was recently updated; and they were inundated with expressions of interest: 7,267 to be precise, 60 of which were from people based locally.*

*The application site happens to be within the identified Green Gap, but as its development will not 'close' the Gap; and will deliver a comprehensive list of benefits, I truly feel that there are some very strong reasons to justify a departure from policy and allow you to grant permission for this application.*

*I would also like to highlight the impeccable way in which the applicant conducted himself throughout the whole process. He could have easily submitted an application during the time the Council was vulnerable and without a Local plan in place, and very possibly secured planning permission by default as many more aggressive agents and developers did, but he didn't. He chose to work with our Officers.*

*The Green Gap Policy came to life in 2017 when a public enquiry was decided on just that main issue, which was 2 years on from when the application was lodged, but of course it wasn't in place back in 2015!*

*Please support this application to create a real opportunity for Tendring to have something truly affordable which not only fits in with the Council's aspirations, but also with national ambitions.*

Further information has been received from the applicant's agent which states makes the following points:

- *The officer assessment of custom and self-build (CSB) housing ignores in the planning balance how the Council is meeting its demand for CSB and the relevance of other market information provided which should be taken into consideration. This is disappointing and something elected members should be made aware of in determining the application.*
- *Previous correspondence also made clear that Custom Build Homes have been retained as the preferred enabling partner for this project and that we are the first custom build housing enabler in the UK. We are experts in delivering this form of housing. My correspondence said that in my professional opinion as an expert in the field of CSB housing and a former civil servant leading the Government's policy on self-build and custom housebuilding for many years and being on the steering group for the recent Bacon Review, the development applied for qualifies as custom build development under the Act. For officers to advise members in the report that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal meets the criteria of CSB housing is highly questionable and unsubstantiated.*
- *The fact that layout is included as part of the application does not mean that the development cannot deliver custom build housing. The test under the legislation, as advised by the Government's PPG, is that the initial owner of the home has primary input into its final design and layout. The masterplan and the customisable housing products we would offer for the project enable potential home owners to have choice over plot size and the type of house they wish to have built for them, plus choice over the layout of their home on their chosen plot and full choice over internal fit out, as well as external landscaping. Choices over external appearance of homes may also be available. This ensures the development is FULLY compliant with the 2015 Act, as amended. All design details/choices would be set out in a design code which would be submitted with the reserved matters application, in line with advice in the National Model Design Code.*
- *If the Council require a mechanism to secure custom and self-build provision and reassurance on design and choice, this can be secured by planning condition or obligation -as is convention- and influenced under the reserved matters application.*