

Thurrock: A place of opportunity, enterprise and excellence, where individuals, communities and businesses flourish

Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting will be held at **7.00 pm** on **5 January 2017**

Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL

Membership:

Councillors Barbara Rice (Chair), Peter Smith (Vice-Chair), John Allen, Tom Kelly, Oliver Gerrish and Terry Piccolo

Substitutes:

Councillors Tim Aker, Gary Collins, David Potter, Joycelyn Redsell and Gerard Rice

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Minutes	5 - 10
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 8 November 2016.	
3. Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
4. Declaration of Interests	
5. Port of Tilbury Expansion	11 - 14

6.	Fees & Charges Pricing Strategy 2017/18	15 - 44
7.	Congestion Task Force Update (including Highways Permitting Proposal)	45 - 52
8.	Thurrock Design Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	53 - 76
9.	Highways and Transportation Capital Programme 2017-18	77 - 78
10.	Work Programme	79 – 80

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Jenny Shade, Senior Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **22 December 2016**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Members of the public can attend all meetings of the council and its committees and have the right to see the agenda, which will be published no later than 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

Recording of meetings

This meeting may be recorded for transmission and publication on the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

Members of the public not wishing any speech or address to be recorded for publication to the Internet should contact Democratic Services to discuss any concerns.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Guidelines on filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings

The council welcomes the filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings as a means of reporting on its proceedings because it helps to make the council more transparent and accountable to its local communities.

If you wish to film or photograph the proceedings of a meeting and have any special requirements or are intending to bring in large equipment please contact the Communications Team at CommunicationsTeam@thurrock.gov.uk before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will then be consulted and their agreement sought to any specific request made.

Where members of the public use a laptop, tablet device, smart phone or similar devices to use social media, make recordings or take photographs these devices must be set to 'silent' mode to avoid interrupting proceedings of the council or committee.

The use of flash photography or additional lighting may be allowed provided it has been discussed prior to the meeting and agreement reached to ensure that it will not disrupt proceedings.

The Chair of the meeting may terminate or suspend filming, photography, recording and use of social media if any of these activities, in their opinion, are disrupting proceedings at the meeting.

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

Wi-Fi is available throughout the Civic Offices. You can access Wi-Fi on your device by simply turning on the Wi-Fi on your laptop, Smartphone or tablet.

- You should connect to TBC-CIVIC
- Enter the password **Thurrock** to connect to/join the Wi-Fi network.
- A Terms & Conditions page should appear and you have to accept these before you can begin using Wi-Fi. Some devices require you to access your browser to bring up the Terms & Conditions page, which you must accept.

The ICT department can offer support for council owned devices only.

Evacuation Procedures

In the case of an emergency, you should evacuate the building using the nearest available exit and congregate at the assembly point at Kings Walk.

How to view this agenda on a tablet device



You can view the agenda on your [iPad](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) with the free modern.gov app.

Members of the Council should ensure that their device is sufficiently charged, although a limited number of charging points will be available in Members Services.

To view any “exempt” information that may be included on the agenda for this meeting, Councillors should:

- Access the modern.gov app
- Enter your username and password

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

Breaching those parts identified as a pecuniary interest is potentially a criminal offence

Helpful Reminders for Members

- *Is your register of interests up to date?*
- *In particular have you declared to the Monitoring Officer all disclosable pecuniary interests?*
- *Have you checked the register to ensure that they have been recorded correctly?*

When should you declare an interest *at a meeting*?

- **What matters are being discussed at the meeting?** (including Council, Cabinet, Committees, Subs, Joint Committees and Joint Subs); or
- If you are a Cabinet Member making decisions other than in Cabinet **what matter is before you for single member decision?**



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

any of your registered interests and in particular any of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

- your spouse or civil partner's
- a person you are living with as husband/ wife
- a person you are living with as if you were civil partners

where you are aware that this other person has the interest.

A detailed description of a disclosable pecuniary interest is included in the Members Code of Conduct at Chapter 7 of the Constitution. **Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer about disclosable pecuniary interests.**

What is a Non-Pecuniary interest? – this is an interest which is not pecuniary (as defined) but is nonetheless so significant that a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard to be so significant that it would materially impact upon your judgement of the public interest.

Pecuniary

If the interest is not already in the register you must (unless the interest has been agreed by the Monitoring Officer to be sensitive) disclose the existence and nature of the interest to the meeting

If the Interest is not entered in the register and is not the subject of a pending notification you must within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the register

Unless you have received dispensation upon previous application from the Monitoring Officer, you must:

- Not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter at a meeting;
- Not participate in any vote or further vote taken at the meeting; and
- leave the room while the item is being considered/voted upon

If you are a Cabinet Member you may make arrangements for the matter to be dealt with by a third person but take no further steps

Non- pecuniary

Declare the nature and extent of your interest including enough detail to allow a member of the public to understand its nature



You may participate and vote in the usual way but you should seek advice on Predetermination and Bias from the Monitoring Officer.

Vision: Thurrock: A place of **opportunity**, **enterprise** and **excellence**, where **individuals**, **communities** and **businesses** flourish.

To achieve our vision, we have identified five strategic priorities:

1. Create a great place for learning and opportunity

- Ensure that every place of learning is rated “Good” or better
- Raise levels of aspiration and attainment so that residents can take advantage of local job opportunities
- Support families to give children the best possible start in life

2. Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity

- Promote Thurrock and encourage inward investment to enable and sustain growth
- Support business and develop the local skilled workforce they require
- Work with partners to secure improved infrastructure and built environment

3. Build pride, responsibility and respect

- Create welcoming, safe, and resilient communities which value fairness
- Work in partnership with communities to help them take responsibility for shaping their quality of life
- Empower residents through choice and independence to improve their health and well-being

4. Improve health and well-being

- Ensure people stay healthy longer, adding years to life and life to years
- Reduce inequalities in health and well-being and safeguard the most vulnerable people with timely intervention and care accessed closer to home
- Enhance quality of life through improved housing, employment and opportunity

5. Promote and protect our clean and green environment

- Enhance access to Thurrock's river frontage, cultural assets and leisure opportunities
- Promote Thurrock's natural environment and biodiversity
- Inspire high quality design and standards in our buildings and public space

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 8 November 2016 at 7.00 pm

- Present:** Councillors Barbara Rice (Chair), Peter Smith (Vice-Chair), John Allen, Oliver Gerrish and Terry Piccolo and Jocelyn Redsell (Substitute for Councilor Tom Kelly)
- Apologies:** Councillors Tom Kelly
- In attendance:** Chris Atkinson, C2C Communications and Stakeholder Manager
Andrew Millard, Head of Planning & Growth
Ann Osola, Head of Highways & Transportation
Adrian Barritt, Transport Development Manager
Matthew Brown, Regeneration Programme Manager
Helen Horrocks, Strategic Lead Commissioner for Public Health
Stephen Taylor, Programmes and Projects Manager
Carl Tomlinson, Finance Manager
Jessica Feeney, Senior Democratic Services Officer
-

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

15. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 13 September were approved as a correct record.

16. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

17. Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

18. Air Quality & Health Strategy

Members were informed that in 2015, a decision was taken by Thurrock Council to develop an integrated Health and Air Quality Strategy through which to tackle the health problems associated with and exacerbated by air pollution within the borough.

The Transport Development Manager and the Strategic Lead Commissioner for Public Health presented a power point presentation to members which outlined the following.

Thurrock's Air Quality & Health Strategy framed the authority's approach to improving air quality and to reduce air pollution exposure to safe levels for human health across the borough. The Strategy provided the context for the council to manage air quality through a suite of borough-wide policies to prevent new Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) from arising as well as outlining a number of actions and measures to improve air quality in each AQMA with a view to moving towards advisory limits and future revocation.

The overall strategic aim of this Thurrock Air Quality & Health Strategy is to improve air quality in the borough to reduce the health impacts of air pollution.

The Chair of the Committee stated that the new AQMA's for Aveley (Ship Lane) and Purfleet bypass were unacceptable.

Members discussed the current HGV width restrictions in the borough in Ship Lane in Aveley and the Cross Keys in Chadwell St Mary. The Chair of the Committee stressed the need for joint Police and Council enforcement to prosecute offenders.

Councillor Smith questioned what improvements would be made within the next 12 months. The Committee was informed by the Head of Highways and Transportation that actions of the strategy would be implemented, Members were also made aware that camera enforcement for weight restrictions would be implemented through the Capital Programme which would be outlined in the report for Overview and Scrutiny in January. Councillor Gerrish asked for confirmation as to when the cameras would be erected, it was explained that this was due to take place at the end of the financial year.

Members felt that the education transport plan required a reassessment to aid in the reduction of air pollution in the borough.

The Chair of the Committee stated that some vulnerable members of the community more frequently used public transport and were exposed to air pollution.

Councillor Gerrish highlighted that the Clean Air Zones were ambitious and requested that detailed consideration was put forward.

Councillor Allen stated that Tilbury would be impacted greatly if the Lower Thames Crossing Proposal was implemented by the Government.

RESOLVED:

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the Air Quality & Health Strategy and provided comments for final document for submission to December Cabinet.

19. C2C Update

The Head of Highways and Transportation introduced the report explaining to Members that on 13 December 2015, c2c changed train journey times with the aim of increasing capacity on their services to accommodate 3,000 more passengers during the morning peak. The main beneficiaries of the new timetable improvements are most likely to be the passengers of Basildon, Benfleet, Chafford Hundred and Ockendon stations. The changes to train timetables were also a part of plan to increase capacity on c2c services. The new timetable accommodates an additional 3,000 passengers on short trips and 1,400 more seats available to long distance passengers travelling during the morning peak hours into London.

Christ Atkinson a C2C representative gave his apologies as he was unable to attend the committee in July 2016. A PowerPoint presentation was then presented to the committee highlighting the following points:

- The number of passengers borough-wide in the AM had increased by 9.8% and 12.4% PM.
- Forthcoming changes included 10 Thurrock trains lines being increased to eight carriages.
- The seat availability train calculations had demonstrated improvements in the number of passengers able to gain a seat in the AM and PM.

Councillor Redsell queried if there was any safety issues regarding the number of passengers on board during peak hours. The C2C representative explained that C2C had invested in expensive machinery that eliminated the danger of any passenger being at risk.

Councillor Gerrish questioned what the future was likely to hold in relation to growth. The C2C Representative confirmed that the new carriages that were being allocated would be likely to cater for the growth expected up until 2019.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee received the c2c service update report and agree the timing of future updates to the Committee.

20. Tilbury Community Led Local Development

Members of the Committee were informed that the Community Led Local Development (CLLD) was a new intervention using European Funding which works with targeted communities to develop a bottom-up approach to tackle long-standing and complex issues around employment, skills & business growth.

In November 2015 the Council submitted an Expression of Interest to develop a CLLD programme targeting Tilbury. The CLLD programme focuses on the 20% most deprived areas of the country. The two Tilbury wards: Tilbury St Chads, Tilbury Riverside & Thurrock Park were identified as having amongst the highest levels of deprivation in the borough, whilst at the same time

providing a contiguous area that included significant and emerging employment opportunities through the expansion of Tilbury Port. The expression of interest was approved and a small amount of funding was made available to support development of a delivery strategy. The final strategy was submitted in August 2016 and is now being considered by the Local Enterprise Partnership and by the Government authorities responsible for managing the programme.

Members were provided with an update on the progress made since the last report to Cabinet.

Members congratulate the regeneration team on securing the funding.

Councillor Piccolo queried what differences there would be through this funding programme compared to previous funding programmes. The Regeneration Programme Manager explained that the development would involve peer to peer involvement and the use of Tilbury companies' services.

The Chair of the Committee echoed the view that peer to peer involvement was needed and that the Regeneration team must work and listen to the residents.

Councillor Redsell stated that the heart of the community had been taken out of Tilbury through the Port and the River, it was highlighted to the Committee that the Ferry from Tilbury to Gravesend currently did not run on a Sunday.

RESOLVED:

Members of Overview and Scrutiny Committee gave their views on the priorities identified within the CLLD strategy, and on the principle that The Council takes on the role of the Accountable Body in the full applications to the EU funding streams.

21. Council Spending Review Update

Members were informed by the Finance manager that the report highlighted the main changes to the MTFS for the period 2017/18 through to 2019/20 and the governance structure for the Council Spending Review and Transformation Programme, including the budget planning table enabling agreement of the budget in February 2017. It was explained that The MTFS presented to Council in February 2016 shows the budget gap over the 3 years 2017/18 to 2019/20 as £18.443m. This already assumes delivery of £2.484m savings previously agreed for 2017/18 and assumes a Council Tax increase of 3.99% in each year.

Given the level of saving previously delivered across the council, the pressures identified in 2016/17 and that there are minimal reserves to call upon, it is essential that there is a clear strategy to close the budget gap set out in the MTFS. As a result, the focus would be on 3 key areas:

- Income generation.
- Achieving more / same for less.
- Demand management / early intervention.

Members of the Committee shared the view that the budget Gap would prove a difficult challenge for the council.

The use of consultants in the Council was discussed amongst the Committee. Councillor Redsell highlighted that Consultants must only be contracted when specifically needed. Councillor Piccolo also felt that there was a need for effective use of consultants.

Councillor Gerrish requested that all savings proposals were to be presented at the Planning Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee for scrutiny before being implemented.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That Planning, Transport & Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the revised MTFS position, and the Council Spending Review approach and timetable.**
- 2. That Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented on the proposals currently being considered within the remit of this committee.**

22. Cycling Infrastructure Plan Update

Members were informed by the Head of Planning and Transportation that in July 2014 Thurrock was awarded £5 million towards cycle route improvements to be delivered across the Borough by 2019. The Council was committed to enhancing Thurrock's cycle network; making it easier and safer to get around the Borough by bike, connecting routes, providing access to key employment and residential centres; offering an attractive alternative to using the car.

The Transport Development Manager provided a PowerPoint presentation which updated the committee on progress with the implementation of the Thurrock Cycle Infrastructure plan since the award of the growth fund monies in April 2016 with the first phase of £1.6m schemes planned of construction in spring and summer of 2017-18.

Members suggested the use of multipurpose pathways which could be used by different modes of transport such as bikes, skateboards, roller-skates and pedestrians. Councillor Rice explained that she had witnessed the success of similar schemes in previous years.

Councillor Redsell stated she did not see many people traveling on bikes throughout the borough, it was highlighted to the Transport Development

Manager that there was a previously established cycle path through Orsett merging onto Stifford Road that hadn't been completed, it was confirmed that this would be investigated.

Councillor Smith advised the Transport Development Manager to carefully consider structure nine and fifteen which were located in Aveley.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee received an update on the roll-out of Thurrock Cycle Infrastructure Programme and provide comments to inform subsequent phases of the programme.

23. Work Programme

The Head of Planning and Growth requested that the Design Guide and Tilbury Port Expansion update was allocated to the January 2017 Committee.

The Head of Highways and Transportation requested that the Capital Programme was also allocated to the January Committee.

The meeting finished at 9.15 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

5 January 2017	ITEM: 5
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview & Scrutiny Committee	
Port of Tilbury Expansion	
Wards and communities affected: Tilbury	Key Decision: Non-key
Report of: Leigh Nicholson, Development Management Manager	
Accountable Head of Service: Andy Millard – Head of Planning and Growth	
Accountable Director: Steve Cox – Director of Environment and Place	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

Port of Tilbury [PoT] is one of the important growth hubs in Thurrock boasting 820 FTE staff and contributing £388 million GVA to the UK economy. Until recently, the need for port-related growth has mainly been accommodated through optimising the use and intensity of the existing estate. However, there is a limit to which PoT can continuously drive its growth ambitions within its current estate.

Recognising the limitations of their existing land holdings, PoT has recently acquired 61 hectares of land to the east of the existing Port and is now working with the Council to create a development strategy to maximise the benefits for the local community and minimise impacts.

This report sets the background to a presentation that will be made at the meeting by the PoT.

1. Recommendations

1.1 Members note the report as a statement of the current status and progress on the production of a Development Strategy for the eastern expansion of Port of Tilbury and provide comments to assist in the further development of that Strategy

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 Until recently, the need for port-related growth has mainly been accommodated through optimising the use and intensity of the existing estate. This intensity of use and volume of throughput has increased within

the Port's boundaries, as well as necessitating land reclamation and the expansion onto the Fortland Distribution Park.

- 2.2 In addition to these changes, to accommodate the increased tonnage through the Port, there has been innovative use of handling processes to maximise increased tonnage across the quay. This has included increasing the height and sophistication of cargo buildings such as the Enterprise Distribution Centre (EDC). However, there is a limit to which PoT can continuously drive its growth ambitions within its current assets.
- 2.3 This was a key reason why a new port-centric distribution scheme on land to the North of the established Port, at London Distribution Park (LDP). In 2016, the Council approved a 214,000 sqm distribution and fulfilment centre on the LDP site, to be occupied by Amazon. As of late 2016, construction of this development is well under way providing a new public open space between the developed area and the existing Broadway housing estate and a number of other community benefits, including a cycle/footpath link to the ASDA supermarket.
- 2.4 It is evident that the Port of Tilbury requires further expansion beyond its current assets in order to meet its accumulating growth demand. The development ambition and its potential to deliver community benefits have not been captured due to the sites outside the existing Port of Tilbury are extremely constrained.

3. Issues and/or Options:

- 3.1 To enable deliverability and provide evidence for the Local Plan, in 2015 the Council's Planning Service commissioned Peter Brett Associates (PBA) to examine five Port expansion scenarios in detail. That study suggested that the only market-viable solution is the expansion of the Port to the east. In early 2016, the Planning Service further studied the development scenario from a place-making perspective. That study also concluded that the eastern expansion would best balance the site constraints and regeneration opportunities for the local community if innovative delivery mechanism could be materialised.
- 3.2 PoT recently acquired approximately 61 hectares (152 acres) of the western part of RWE's former landholding at the former Tilbury Power Station. The southern boundary of this land parcel is defined by the River Thames and includes a deep water jetty, previously used for importation of coal. The site has a frontage of 290m to the river.
- 3.3 PoT is now working with the Council to create an eastern expansion Development Strategy to maximise the benefits for the local community, whilst minimising impacts. As one of the Council's identified Growth Hubs this approach is broadly supported, but it is seen as vital that the expansion is carefully coordinated with the regional transport network and potential new infrastructure and informed by the emerging Local Plan. It is also considered that, as a fundamental driving principle, the Development Strategy should be

used to develop a framework for future land uses and to improve access to the waterfront and broader connectivity to the town. In addition, the masterplan should maximise environmental as well as socio-economic conditions in Tilbury.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 Progression of a Development Strategy for the expansion of the PoT is a matter of key importance to the future prosperity of the Port and communities of Tilbury. Members' comments will feed into the process of developing that Strategy. Members will be kept informed of future progress, notably as the Local Plan progresses.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 Initial informal consultation with stakeholders, partners and agencies is underway.

6. Impact on Corporate Policies, Priorities, Performance and Community Impact

- 6.1 Tilbury is a Key Strategic Economic Hub that will continue to be a major generator of jobs for local people over the Local Plan period. It is vital that any future expansion of the PoT is carefully planned so as to ensure the maximum benefits not only for the PoT, but the local community and the wider environment.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Sean Clark**
Head of Corporate Finance

The costs associated with progressing this work on the Council's side can be met from within the existing Local Plan budget.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Vivien Williams**
Principal Regeneration Solicitor

The associated Local Plan work will be prepared within the existing regulations for the preparation of Local Development Documents under the Town and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Warren**

Community Development and Equalities Manager

There are no direct diversity issues linked with this report, however, evolving policy options for Tilbury will be appraised in taking the new Local plan forward, including equality impacts as part of the associated Sustainability Appraisal.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, crime and Disorder)

All statutory planning documents (which this work will eventually inform) will be subject to a full Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment under current legislation. This includes a Health Impact Assessment.

8. Background Papers Used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright)

PoT Vision Presentation.

9. Appendices to the report

None.

Report Author:

Leigh Nicholson

5 January 2017	ITEM: 6
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview & Scrutiny Committee	
Fees & Charges Pricing Strategy 2017/18	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key
Report of: Carl Tomlinson, Finance Manager	
Accountable Head of Service: Andy Millard, Head of Planning & Growth Ann Osola, Head of Transportation & Highways	
Accountable Directors: Steve Cox, Corporate Director for Environment and Place	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

Local Authorities are involved in a wide range of services and the ability to charge for some of these services has always been a key funding source to Councils.

This report specifically sets out the charges in relation to services within the remit of this Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Charges will take effect from the 1 April 2017 unless otherwise stated.

In preparing the proposed fees and charges, Directorates have worked within the charging framework and principles set out in the report.

The full list of proposed charges is detailed in Appendix 1 to this report.

The proposed deletion of current fees and charges are detailed in Appendix 2 to this report.

1. Recommendations

1.1 That Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the revised fees and charges proposals including those no longer applicable

1.2 That Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee comment on the proposals currently being considered within the remit of this committee

2. Background

2.1 The paper describes the fees and charges approach for the services within the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Scrutiny Committee remit for 2017/18 and will set a platform for certain pricing principles moving forward into future financial years.

2.2 The paper provides narrative for the following areas:

- Parking
- Highways Maintenance and Permitting
- Development Control
- Building Control
- Land Charges

2.3 The fees & charges that are proposed are underpinned in some instances by a detailed sales and marketing plans for each area. This will ensure delivery of the income targets for 2017/8, for ease these are summarised below

Service: £000's	Actual 15/16	Budget 16/17	Budget 17/18
Parking	789	952	980
Highways Maintenance	119	192	197
Highways and Transportation Other	33	126	129
Development Control	960	896	923
Building Control	285	266	273
Land Charges	301	195	201
Commercial Hall Hire	24	22	23
TOTAL	2,511	2,649	2,726

3. Thurrock Charging Policy

3.1 The strategic ambition for Thurrock is to adopt a policy on fees and charges that is aligned to the wider commercial strategy and ensures that all discretionary services cost recover.

3.2 Furthermore, for future years, while reviewing charges, services will also consider the level of demand for the service, the market dynamics and how the charging policy helps to meet other service objectives.

3.3 When considering the pricing strategy for 2017/18 some key questions were considered.

- Where can we apply a tiered/premium pricing structure
- How sensitive are customers to price (are there areas where a price freeze is relevant)
- What new charges might we want to introduce for this financial year

- How do our charges compare with neighbouring boroughs
- How do our charges compare to neighbouring boroughs and private sector competitors (particularly in those instances where customers have choice)
- How can we influence channel shift
- Can we set charges to recover costs
- What do our competitors charges
- How sensitive is demand to price
- Statutory services may have discretionary elements that we can influence
- Do we take deposits, charge cancellation fees, charge an admin fee for duplicate services (e.g. lost certificates.)

4. Proposals and Issues

- 4.1 The fees and charges for each service area have been considered and the main considerations are set out below.
- 4.2 A council wide target of £0.350m has been proposed within the MTFS for additional income generation in respect of fees and charges income for 2017/18.

5. Parking

- 5.1 Historically the council has increased parking charges in line with inflation with increases for on-street and off-street in alternate years. For 2017/18, given the level of charges in Thurrock and restrictions on ticket machines, on-street charges are increasing in line with inflation and rounded for customer convenience.
- 5.2 Charges for the suspension of parking bays have been increased to bring in line with comparable authorities. A new charge is proposed for controlled parking zone NHS permits to bring in line with the approach taken for Council staff.

6. Highways Maintenance

- 6.1 Charges have been increased in line with inflation. There has been a change in arrangements for vehicle crossing applications. The council no longer acts as agent for completion of the works although current applications will be honoured. In future the council will charge a fee for assessing the safety and suitability of the proposal in line with council highways policies. The charge for white line bar markings has increased from £60 to £150 to bring the charge in line with delivery cost.

7. Highways Permitting

- 7.1 There is a separate paper on the agenda setting out the council's intention to move from highways noticing to a highways permitting scheme.

8. Development Control

- 8.1 Fee income is dependant entirely on market forces and the majority of fees are nationally set. Whilst the market has been strong in the previous two years this cannot be a guarantee of future income levels. Even a small downturn in the market, could see a reduction in the number of planning applications.

9. Building Control

- 9.1 Fee income is dependant entirely on market forces. In 2016/17 the Service is on target to produce a small surplus of income over expenditure. The Building Control account is governed by legislation that requires that that Council does not produce a profit or loss over a rolling three year period and that any increase in income has to be ring-fenced within the Building Control account.

10. Land Charges

- 10.1 Local Land Charge (LLC) income is derived from charges associated with the sale and purchase of property in Thurrock. This account functions on a cost recovery basis, therefore any increase in income cannot be used outside of the LLC budget.

11. Reasons for Recommendation

- 11.1 The setting of appropriate fees and charges will enable the Council to generate essential income for the funding of Council services. The approval of reviewed fees and charges will also ensure that the Council is competitive with other service providers and neighbouring councils.

12. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 12.1 Consultations will be progressed where there is specific need. However, with regard all other items, the proposals in this report do not affect any specific parts of the borough. Fees and charges are known to customers before they make use of the services they are buying.

13. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 13.1 The changes in these fees and charges may impact the community; however it must be taken into consideration that these price rises include inflation and no profit will be made on the running of these discretionary services.

14. Implications

14.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Carl Tomlinson**
Finance Manager

Additional income will be generated from increases but this is variable as it is also dependent on demand for the services. Increases to income budgets have been built into the MTFS.

14.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **David Lawson**
Monitoring Officer

Fees and charges generally fall into three categories – Statutory, Regulatory and Discretionary. Statutory charges are set in statute and cannot be altered by law since the charges have been determined by Central government and all authorities will be applying the same charge.

Regulatory charges relate to services where, if the Council provides the service, it is obliged to set a fee which the Council can determine itself in accordance with a regulatory framework. Charges have to be reasonable and must be applied across the borough.

Discretionary charges relate to services which the Council can provide if they choose to do so. This is a local policy decision. The Local Government Act 2003 gives the Council power to charge for discretionary services, with some limited exceptions. This may include charges for new and innovative services utilising the power to promote environmental, social and economic well-being under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000. The income from charges, taking one financial year with another, must not exceed the cost of provision. A clear and justifiable framework of principles should be followed in terms of deciding when to charge and how much, and the process for reviewing charges.

A service may wish to consider whether they may utilise this power to provide a service that may benefit residents, businesses and other service users, meet the Council priorities and generate income.

Decisions on setting charges and fees are subject to the Council's decision making structures. Most charging decisions are the responsibility of Cabinet, where there are key decisions. Some fees are set by full Council.

14.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Becky Price**
Community Development Officer

The Council has a statutory duty under the Race Relations Act 2000 (Amendment), the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 and the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 (Amendment) to promote equality of opportunity in the provision of services and employment. Decisions on setting charges and fees are subject to the Council's decision making structures. Concessions should be available to groups or individuals in the community, where the increase may result in them being excluded from particular activities.

14.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None applicable.

15. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

None

16. Appendices to the report

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Proposed Fees and Charges for 2017/18.

Appendix 2 – Schedule of Fees and Charges that are no longer applicable.

Report Author:

Carl Tomlinson

Finance Manager

Name of fee or Charge	Statutory/ Discretionary Charge	VAT Status 17/18	2016/17			2017/18		
			Charge excl. VAT 2016/17	VAT Amount 2016/17	Charging incl. VAT 2016/17	Charge excl. VAT 2017/18	VAT Amount 2017/18	Charging incl. VAT 2017/18
Building Control Fees - Upon application with the Thurrock Council Building Control dept	D	Z	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
Car Parking - Annual Administration Fee - Residents Permits	D	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
Car Parking - Annual Administration Fee - Visitor Permits	D	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
Car parking - Discretionary suspension of the use of on-street parking places for waiting/loading - charge per parking space	S	O	£ 20.00	£ -	£ 20.00	£25 per day	£ -	£25 per day
Car Parking - Off Street-Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Car Parks (excl. Grays Beach) - Over 1 hour under 2 hours	D	S	£ 1.08	£ 0.22	£ 1.30	£ 1.08	£ 0.22	£ 1.30
Car Parking - Off Street-Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Car Parks (excl. Grays Beach) - Over 2 hours under 4 hours	D	S	£ 1.75	£ 0.35	£ 2.10	£ 1.75	£ 0.35	£ 2.10
Car Parking - Off Street-Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Car Parks (excl. Grays Beach) - Over 4 hours under 6 hours	D	S	£ 3.08	£ 0.62	£ 3.70	£ 3.08	£ 0.62	£ 3.70
Car Parking - Off Street-Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Car Parks (excl. Grays Beach) - Over 6 Hours	D	S	£ 4.83	£ 0.97	£ 5.80	£ 4.83	£ 0.97	£ 5.80
Car Parking - Off Street-Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Car Parks (excl. Grays Beach) - Under 1 hour	D	S	£ 0.58	£ 0.12	£ 0.70	£ 0.58	£ 0.12	£ 0.70
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Canterbury Parade, South Ockendon - 1 to 2 hours	D	S	£ 0.50	£ 0.10	£ 0.60	£ 0.50	£ 0.10	£ 0.60
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Canterbury Parade, South Ockendon - All day	D	S	£ 1.75	£ 0.35	£ 2.10	£ 1.75	£ 0.35	£ 2.10
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Canterbury Parade, South Ockendon - Under 1 hour	D	S	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -

Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Beach - 0 to 2 hours	D	S	£ 0.92	£ 0.18	£ 1.10	£ 0.58	£ 0.12	£ 0.70
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Grays Beach - All day	D	S	£ 2.67	£ 0.53	£ 3.20	£ 2.67	£ 0.53	£ 3.20
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - 0-2 hours	D	S	New			£ 0.58	£ 0.12	£ 0.70
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - All day	D	S	New			£ 2.67	£ 0.53	£ 3.20
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club - 0 to 1 hour	D	O	£ 0.60	£ -	£ 0.60	£ 0.70	£ -	£ 0.70
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club - 1 to 2 hours	D	O	£ 1.00	£ -	£ 1.00	£ 1.20	£ -	£ 1.20
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club - All Day	D	O	£ 3.00	£ -	£ 3.00	£ 3.20	£ -	£ 3.20
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Short Stay (excl. Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club) - 0 to 1 hour	D	O	£ 0.60	£ -	£ 0.60	£ 0.70	£ -	£ 0.70
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Short Stay (excl. Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club) - 1 to 2 hour	D	O	£ 1.20	£ -	£ 1.20	£ 1.40	£ -	£ 1.40
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Short Stay (excl. Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club) - 2 to 4 hour	D	O	£ 2.00	£ -	£ 2.00	£ 2.30	£ -	£ 2.30
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display Quick Stops - 0 to 30 mins	D	O	£ 0.60	£ -	£ 0.60	£ 0.70	£ -	£ 0.70
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display Quick Stops - 30 to 45 mins	D	O	£ 0.80	£ -	£ 0.80	£ 0.90	£ -	£ 0.90
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display Quick Stops - 45 mins to 1 hour	D	O	£ 1.20	£ -	£ 1.20	£ 1.40	£ -	£ 1.40
Car Parking - Penalty Charge Notices - Higher Level Contraventions - Penalty Charge	S	O	£ 70.00	£ -	£ 70.00	£ 70.00	£ -	£ 70.00
Car Parking - Penalty Charge Notices - Higher Level Contraventions - Penalty Charge paid within 14 days	S	O	£ 35.00	£ -	£ 35.00	£ 35.00	£ -	£ 35.00
Car Parking - Penalty Charge Notices - Lower Level Contraventions - Penalty Charge	S	O	£ 50.00	£ -	£ 50.00	£ 50.00	£ -	£ 50.00

Car Parking - Penalty Charge Notices - Lower Level Contraventions - Penalty Charge paid within 14 days	S	O	£ 25.00	£ -	£ 25.00	£ 25.00	£ -	£ 25.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Business Permits - Per Month thereof	D	O	£ 36.00	£ -	£ 36.00	£ 36.00	£ -	£ 36.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Business Permits - Per year	D	O	£ 360.00	£ -	£ 360.00	£ 360.00	£ -	£ 360.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Business Permits - for 6 months	D	O	£ 192.00	£ -	£ 192.00	£ 192.00	£ -	£ 192.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - NHS Permits	D	O	New			£ 120.00	£ -	£ 120.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Operational Permits	D	O	£ 120.00	£ -	£ 120.00	£ 120.00	£ -	£ 120.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Residents Permits	?	S	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ 2.00	£ 12.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Residents Permits - Per year - 1st Permit per Household	D	O	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Residents Permits - Per year - 2nd Permit per Household	D	O	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Residents Permits - Per year - 3rd Permit per Household	D	O	£ 66.00	£ -	£ 66.00	£ 66.00	£ -	£ 66.00
Car Parking - Penalty Permits - Controlled Parking Zones - Visitor Permits - Additional Sheets of 20 per Household	D	O	£ 6.00	£ -	£ 6.00	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
Commercial Matters - Administration fee for processing Commercial & Other Applications	D	S	£ 25.00	£ 5.00	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ 6.00	£ 36.00
Commercial Matters - Assignment of Leases (Council owned premises) Minimum charge May rise to maximum of £670 if negotiations extended	D	S	£375 - £750	£75 - £150	£450 - £900	£375 - £750	£75 - £150	£450 - £900

Commercial Matters - Dilapidation Surveys and Schedules of Repair/Condition (Council Owned Premises) Minimum fee and hourly rate charge in preparing survey and supervising works	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00	£ 385.00	£ 77.00	£ 462.00
Commercial Matters - Licence to undertake alterations/building works May rise to maximum of £670 if negotiations extended	D	S	£375 - £750	£75 - £150	£450 - £900	£375 - £750	£75 - £150	£450 - £900
Commercial Matters - Licence to vary lease terms (Council owned premises) May rise to maximum of £670 if negotiations extended	D	S	£375 - £750	£75 - £150	£450 - £900	£375 - £750	£75 - £150	£450 - £900
Commercial Matters - New Letting - Non Standard Commercial Shop Lease - Dependant upon complexity or extended negotiations	D	S	£625 - £1,250	£125 - £250	£750 - £1,500	£640 - £1,300	£128 - £260	£768 - £1,560
Commercial Matters - New Letting - Standard Commercial Shop Lease	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00	£ 385.00	£ 77.00	£ 462.00
Commercial Matters - Other Processes and Consents	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00	£ 385.00	£ 77.00	£ 462.00
Highways - Licences - Consideration of an application for a licence in writing to erect or retain on or over a highway any scaffolding or other structure, in connection with any building, or demolition or the alteration, repair, maintenance or cleaning of any building which obstructs the highway pursuant to Section 169(1) and (2) of the 1980 Act.	S	Z	£75 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£ -	£75 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£77 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£ -	£77 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion
Highways - Anything done in connection with the clearance of accident debris pursuant to Section 41 and 130 of the 1980 Act in respect of accidents occurring on or after 1st April 1999	D	O	Actual costs + admin	£ -	Actual costs + admin	Actual costs + £100 admin	£ -	Actual costs + £100 admin

Highways - Consideration by a local authority of an application pursuant to any provision contained in an order under Section 1,6 9 or 14 of the 1984 Act for an exemption from any prohibition or restriction imposed by the order on the stopping, parking, waiting, loading or unloading of vehicles on a road	D	O	Actual costs + admin	£ -	Actual costs + admin	Actual costs + £100 admin	£ -	Actual costs + £100 admin
Highways - Consideration of a request in respect of a highway maintainable at the public expense to execute such works as are specified in the request for constructing a vehicle crossing over a footway or verge in that highway pursuant to Section 184 of the 1980 Act	D	O	Based on cost + 25% admin and supervision	£ -	Based on cost + 25% admin and supervision	£375 upfront payment; if the crossing does not meet criteria £300 is refundable; £200 is refundable upon satisfactory completion	£ -	£375 upfront payment; if the crossing does not meet criteria £300 is refundable; £200 is refundable upon satisfactory completion
Highways - Licences - Anything done in connection with site inspections to monitor compliance with duties imposed by Section 172(3) and by Section 173(1) of the 1980 Act on a person who has erected a hoarding or fence.	S	Z	Actual costs + Admin	£ -	Actual costs + Admin	Actual costs + £100 Admin	£ -	Actual costs + £100 Admin
Highways - Licences - Consideration of an application for consent to carry out any works in a street to provide means for the admission of light to premises situated under, or abutting on, the street pursuant to Section 180(2) of the 1980 Act	S	Z	Actual costs + Admin	£ -	Actual costs + Admin	Actual costs + £100 Admin	£ -	Actual costs + £100 Admin

Highways - Licences - Consideration of an application for consent to make an opening in the footway of a street as an entrance to a cellar or vault there under pursuant to Section 180(1) of the 1980 Act.	S	Z	Actual costs + Admin	£ -	Actual costs + Admin	Actual costs + £100 Admin	£ -	Actual costs + £100 Admin
Highways - Licences - Consideration of an application for consent under Section 179(1) of the 1980 Act to construct works to which that Section applies under any part of the street	S	Z	Actual costs + Admin	£ -	Actual costs + Admin	Actual costs + £100 Admin	£ -	Actual costs + £100 Admin
Highways - Licences - Consideration of an application for consent for the obligation to erect a hoarding or fence in accordance with Section 172(1) of the 1980 Act to be dispensed with pursuant to sub-section (2) of that Section.	S	Z	£75 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£ -	£75 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£77 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£ -	£77 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion
Highways - Licences - Consideration of an application for consent temporarily to deposit building materials, rubbish or other things in a street that is a highway maintainable at the public expense or to make a temporary excavation in it, and the undertaking of site inspections to monitor compliance with such consent pursuant to Section 171(1),(2) (4) and (5) of the 1980 Act.	S	Z	£75 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£ -	£75 + returnable deposit (£100 min) on satisfactory completion	£77 to deposit building material	£ -	£77 to deposit building material
Highways - License for table and chair arrangements on the public highway £250 per table (max 4 chairs per table) with a maximum of £2000 capped on application.	D	E	£ 250.00	£ -	£ 250.00	£ 250.00	£ -	£ 250.00
Highways - Provision of (or recovery of) white bar markings	D	O	£ 60.00	£ -	£ 60.00	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00
Highways - Skip License (to Skip Companies)	D	E	£ 30.00	£ -	£ 30.00	£31 per week plus £5 per day after the first week	£ -	£31 per week plus £5 per day after the first week

Local Land Charges - Additional parcel - commercial	S	O	£ 35.00	£ -	£ 35.00	£ 35.00	£ -	£ 35.00
Local Land Charges - Additional parcel - personal search	S	O	£ 2.00	£ -	£ 2.00	£ 2.00	£ -	£ 2.00
Local Land Charges - Additional parcel - residential	S	O	£ 28.00	£ -	£ 28.00	£ 28.00	£ -	£ 28.00
Local Land Charges - Cancellation fee for Con29 search	S	O	£ 75.00	£ -	£ 75.00	£ 75.00	£ -	£ 75.00
Local Land Charges - Charges for a copy of the local land charges search	S	O	£ 15.00	£ -	£ 15.00	£ 15.00	£ -	£ 15.00
Local Land Charges - Con290 - Per question	S	S	£ 22.00	£ -	£ 22.00	£ 22.00	£ 4.40	£ 26.40
Local Land Charges - Con29R - Unrefined data search package	S	S	£ 40.00	£ -	£ 40.00	£ 40.00	£ 8.00	£ 48.00
Local Land Charges - Copy of agreements and tree preservation orders	S	O	£ 30.00	£ -	£ 30.00	£ 30.00	£ -	£ 30.00
Local Land Charges - Copy of planning decision and enforcement notices	S	O	£ 15.00	£ -	£ 15.00	£ 15.00	£ -	£ 15.00
Local Land Charges - Copy of smoke control order	S	O	£ 7.00	£ -	£ 7.00	£ 7.00	£ -	£ 7.00
Local Land Charges - Electronic Format - Con29R Search - commercial	S	S	£ 136.00	£ -	£ 136.00	£ 135.83	£ 27.17	£ 163.00
Local Land Charges - Electronic Format - Con29R Search - residential	S	S	£ 87.00	£ -	£ 87.00	£ 86.67	£ 17.33	£ 104.00
Local Land Charges - Form LLC1 Only	S	O	£ 21.00	£ -	£ 21.00	£ 21.00	£ -	£ 21.00
Local Land Charges - Paper Format - Con29R Search - commercial	S	S	£ 140.00	£ -	£ 140.00	£ 140.00	£ 28.00	£ 168.00
Local Land Charges - Paper Format - Con29R Search - residential	S	S	£ 90.00	£ -	£ 90.00	£ 90.00	£ 18.00	£ 108.00
Local Land Charges - Personal search request and viewing of in	S	O	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
New Highways Information - Searches and Enquiries	D	O	£50 per hour Standard POA for large searches	£ -	£50 per hour Standard POA for large searches	£52 per hour	£ -	£52 per hour

Non Commercial Matters - Area up to 25 Sqm - Land offering development potential either as a separate plot or if combined with other land	D	S	Negotiable	£ -	Negotiable	Negotiable	£ -	Negotiable
Non Commercial Matters - Area up to 25 Sqm - Sale of land at the end of the rear garden retained by the Council from a Right to Buy sale or amenity land adjoining a property sold under a Right to Buy	D	S	Negotiable	£ -	Negotiable	Negotiable	£ -	Negotiable
Non Commercial Matters - Other Processes and Consents	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00	£ 385.00	£ 77.00	£ 462.00
Non Commercial Matters - Request for an easement over Council Land Applicant would also need to pay for additional cost of works (eg drop kerb and crossover) and any additional legal costs affecting the title to the property.	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00	£ 385.00	£ 77.00	£ 462.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 1. Whole Hall hire Weekends per hour	D	E	£ 36.00	£ -	£ 36.00	£ 38.00	£ -	£ 38.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 2. Whole Hall hire Weekdays per hour	D	E	£ 17.00	£ -	£ 17.00	£ 18.00	£ -	£ 18.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 3. Hire of Small Meeting Room per hour	D	E	£ 7.20	£ -	£ 7.20	£ 8.00	£ -	£ 8.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 4. Senior Citizens / Charitable Organisations	D	E	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -	£ -
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 5. Whole Hall hire Daytime/Weekends per hour	D	E	£ 22.45	£ -	£ 22.45	£ 23.00	£ -	£ 23.00
Passenger Transport - DBS Check	D	Z	£ 55.00	£ -	£ 55.00	£ 55.00	£ -	£ 55.00

Passenger Transport - The issue by a County Council, District Council, passenger transport authority or passenger transport executive in England, a County Council or County Borough Council in Wales, to a person eligible to receive travel concessions under a scheme established under Section 93 of the Transport Act 1985, of - (b) a duplicate by a London Borough Council or the Common Council of the City of London of a travel concession permit pursuant to section 52(4) of the London Regional Transport Act 1984 or pursuant to section 53(2)(b) of that Act in accordance with arrangements under section 50(1).	D	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
Passenger Transport - The issue by a County Council, District Council, passenger transport authority or passenger transport executive in England, a County Council or County Borough Council in Wales, to a person eligible to receive travel concessions under a scheme established under Section 93 of the Transport Act 1985, of - (a) any permit or other document as evidence of entitlement to receive travel concessions	S	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00	£ -	£ -	£ -
Passenger Transport - Utilities request for bus stop to be suspended	D	Z	£ 50.00	£ -	£ 50.00	£75 per day + £50 per month thereafter	£ -	£75 per day + £50 per month thereafter
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 0-2 & TS - Immediate	D	S	New			£ 55.00	£ 11.00	£ 66.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 0-2 & TS - Major	D	S	New			£ 215.00	£ 43.00	£ 258.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 0-2 & TS - Major (PAA)	D	S	New			£ 95.00	£ 19.00	£ 114.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 0-2 & TS - Minor	D	S	New			£ 60.00	£ 12.00	£ 72.00

Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 0-2 & TS - Permit Variation	D	S	New			£ 45.00	£ 9.00	£ 54.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 0-2 & TS - Standard	D	S	New			£ 120.00	£ 24.00	£ 144.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 3&4 No TS - Immediate	D	S	New			£ 35.00	£ 7.00	£ 42.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 3&4 No TS - Major	D	S	New			£ 140.00	£ 28.00	£ 168.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 3&4 No TS - Major (PAA)	D	S	New			£ 70.00	£ 14.00	£ 84.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 3&4 No TS - Minor	D	S	New			£ 40.00	£ 8.00	£ 48.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 3&4 No TS - Permit Variation	D	S	New			£ 35.00	£ 7.00	£ 42.00
Permit Fees - Road Category - Cat 3&4 No TS - Standard	D	S	New			£ 70.00	£ 14.00	£ 84.00
Planning fees - Planning fees are listed seperately on the Thurrock Council Website*	D	Z	£ -	£ -	£ -	*	£ -	*
Planning fees - Section 106 monitoring fee	D	Z	Negotiable	£ -	Negotiable	£ -	£ -	£ -
Right of Way - Additional costs may be payable in the event of a public enquiry under the Highways Act 1980 Section 302 and / or Local Government Act 1972 Section 250	S	O		£ -	£ -	Actual costs of advertising and officers time	£ -	Actual costs of advertising and officers time
Rights of Way - Application for Highways Deposits of Statement, Maps and Declarations (Section 31(6) of the Highways Act 1980)	S		New			£200 fee for the first parcel of land + £25 for each additional parcel	£ -	£200 fee for the first parcel of land + £25 for each additional parcel
Rights of Way - Costs for Public Path Orders Regulations 1993	S		New			Approx cost £1,200 includes non-refundable fee of £100.00	£ -	Approx cost £1,200 includes non-refundable fee of £100.00

Rights of Way - Public Path Creation Order (section 25 and 26 of the Highways Act 1980)	S		New			£500 admin fee +actual cost of advertisement	£ -	£500 admin fee +actual cost of advertisement
Street Naming and Numbering - New Properties - Re-naming of a building/block flat/industrial estate	D	O	£ 130.00	£ -	£ 130.00	£ 135.00	£ -	£ 135.00
Street Naming and Numebring - Re-naming of individual properties	D	O	£55.00 + £10.00 for every affected extra property	£ -	£55.00 + £10.00 for every affected extra property	£57 + £10 for every affected extra property	£ -	£57 + £10 for every affected extra property
Street Naming and Numebring - Naming of roads on new developments. New Street name per street	D	O	£ 200.00	£ -	£ 200.00	£ 205.00	£ -	£ 205.00
Street Naming and Numebring - New Properties - 1-5 Properties 4 weeks administration	D	O	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00	£ 154.50	£ -	£ 154.50
Street Naming and Numebring - New Properties - 26-75 Properties 8 weeks administration	D	O	£ 350.00	£ -	£ 350.00	£ 360.00	£ -	£ 360.00
Street Naming and Numebring - New Properties - 6-25 Properties 6 weeks administration	D	O	£ 160.00	£ -	£ 160.00	£ 164.80	£ -	£ 164.80
Street Naming and Numebring - New Properties - 76-100 Properties 10-12 weeks administration	D	O	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00	£ 154.50	£ -	£ 154.50
Street Naming and Numebring - New Properties - Over & Above 100 Properties - for every additional property	D	O	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00	£ 154.50	£ -	£ 154.50
Street Naming and Numebring - Renaming of Street where requested by residents	D	O	£200 for first + £335.00 for every extra property	£ -	£200 for first + £335.00 for every extra property	£205 for first + £345 for every extra property	£ -	£205 for first + £345 for every extra property

Traffic Management - or the giving of a notice under Section 14(2) of the 1984 Act for the reason mentioned in Section 14(1)(a).	S	O	New			£ 580.00	£ -	£ 580.00
Traffic Management - Anything done by a local authority in connection with or in consequence of a request to the Authority, the Chief Officer of Police or any other person specified by or under an order made under Section 49(4) of the 1984 Act to suspend the use of a parking place or any part of it.	S	O	£ 560.00	£ -	£ 560.00	£ 700.00	£ -	£ 700.00
Traffic Management - Anything done by a local traffic authority in connection with or in consequence of a request to vary an order under Section 1,6,9 or 14 of the 1984 Act so as to create an exemption or exclusion from a prohibition or restriction imposed by the Order on the stopping, parking waiting, loading or unloading of vehicles on a road.	S	O	£ 1,030.00	£ -	£ 1,030.00	£ 1,060.00	£ -	£ 1,060.00
Traffic Management - Anything done by a local traffic authority in connection with or in consequence of an event requiring traffic management measures	D	O	Actual costs + 20% admin	£ -	Actual costs + 20% admin	Actual costs + 20% admin	£ -	Actual costs + 20% admin
Traffic Management - Anything done by a local traffic authority in connection with or in consequence of the making of an order under Section 14(1)	S	O	£ 560.00	£ -	£ 560.00	£ 700.00	£ -	£ 700.00
Traffic Management - Anything done by a local traffic authority in consequence of a request to revoke or amend an order under Section 6,32(1) (b) or 45 of the 1984 Act so that a particular length of road may cease to be a place where vehicles may be parked in accordance with the order.	S	O	£ 1,030.00	£ -	£ 1,030.00	£ 1,060.00	£ -	£ 1,060.00

Traffic Management - Consideration by a local authority of a request that, under Section 65(1) of the 1984 Act, it cause or permit a traffic sign (not being a sign which fulfils the conditions specified in Section 65(3A)(i) and (ii) to be placed on or near a road to indicate the route to specified land or premises.	S	O	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00	£ 155.00	£ -	£ 155.00
Traffic Management - Permitting - Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) - Working in breach of a condition (This is the same as FPN penalties under the notice system, the Authority may extend the 36 day period at its discretion in any particular case)	S		New			£120 if paid within 36 days, discounted to £80 if paid within 29 days	£ -	£120 if paid within 36 days, discounted to £80 if paid within 29 days
Traffic Management - Permitting - Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) - Working without a permit (The Authority may extend the 36 day period at its discretion in any particular case)	S		New			£500 if paid within 36 days, discounted to £300 if paid within 29 days	£ -	£500 if paid within 36 days, discounted to £300 if paid within 29 days
Traffic Management - The placing by a local traffic authority of a traffic sign pursuant to Section 65(1) of the 1984 Act in accordance with a request of the kind referred to in the preceding paragraph.	S	O	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00	£ 155.00	£ -	£ 155.00
Traffic Management - Traffic Signal data information	D	S	Actual cost(Min £150)	£ -	Actual cost(Min £150)	Actual cost(Min £155)	£ -	Actual cost(Min £155)
Traffic Management - Wide load arrangements	S	O	Actual costs + 20% Admin	£ -	Actual costs + 20% Admin	Actual costs + 20% Admin	£ -	Actual costs + 20% Admin
Transport Development - Accident data provision	D	Z	£ 150.00	£ -	£ 150.00	£ 155.00	£ -	£ 155.00

Transport Development - Assistance to individuals undertaking recognised qualifications or research	D	Z	Free in normal otherwise at the of the Head of Service	£ -	Free in normal otherwise at the of the Head of Service	Free in normal otherwise at the of the Head of Service	£ -	Free in normal otherwise at the of the Head of Service
Transport Development - Commercial access; no adoptable road (fee is for checking drawing and supervision works)	S	O	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	£ -	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	£ -	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit
Transport Development - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	?		Transport Development - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	£ -	Transport Development - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	Transport Development - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	£ -	Transport Development - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)

Transport Development - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road Section 278 agreement (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	S	O	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	£ -	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost Hoarding Deposit £120 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit	£ -	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost Hoarding Deposit £120 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit
Transport Development - Commuted sums for highway & ancillary works arising from development	D	Z	Calculated on a case by case basis	£ -	Calculated on a case by case basis	25% of actual costs	£ -	25% of actual costs
Transport Development - Crane oversail licence (temporary during construction). Applicable when cranes operate over the public highway	S	O	£ 180.00	£ -	£ 180.00	£ 185.00	£ -	£ 185.00
Transport Development - Crane oversail licence (temporary during construction). Applicable when cranes operate over the public highway - Deposit	S	O	£500-£5000	£ -	£500-£5000	£500-£5000	£ -	£500-£5000
Transport Development - Department Publications	D	Z	Purchase price set by Delegated Officer	£ -	Purchase price set by Delegated Officer	Purchase price set by Delegated Officer	£ -	Purchase price set by Delegated Officer
Transport Development - Development Control Design guide for the constructions of adoptable works	D	Z	£ 50.00	£ -	£ 50.00	£ 52.00	£ -	£ 52.00

Transport Development - Flat only development's; no adoptable road (fee is for checking drawing and supervision of works)	S	O	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	£ -	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit	£ -	Min fee £3k 8.5% of cost Hoarding - Deposit £120 per spm, fee 10% of deposit
Transport Development - Incidental Technical Information	D	Z	Case by case basis	£ -	Case by case basis	Case by case basis	£ -	Case by case basis
Transport Development - New Adoptable Residential Estate Road with standard Bellmouth Section 278 (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	S	O	Min fee £3k Under £100k, 9% of cost Over £100k, 8% of cost Hoarding Deposit £120 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600	£ -	Min fee £3k Under £100k, 9% of cost Over £100k, 8% of cost Hoarding Deposit £120 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost Hoarding Deposit £120 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600	£ -	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost Hoarding Deposit £120 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600
Transport Development - New Adoptable Residential Estate Road with standard Bellmouth Section 38 (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works)	S	O	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8% of cost Over £1m, 5% of cost	£ -	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8% of cost Over £1m, 5% of cost	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost	£ -	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost

Transport Development - Residential Estate Road Bellmouth to private drive, access to distributor roads or higher category by Section 278 agreement (Fee is for checking drawings and supervision of works) Lower category roads serving 5 units – Section 184 cross over application	S	O	Min fee £3k Under £100k, 9% of cost Over £100k, 8% of cost Hoarding Deposit £100 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600	£ -	Min fee £3k Under £100k, 9% of cost Over £100k, 8% of cost Hoarding Deposit £100 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost Hoarding Deposit £100 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600	£ -	Up to £30k min £3k Up to £1m, 8.5% of cost Over £1m, 5.5% of cost Hoarding Deposit £100 per sqm of highway enclosed Hoarding fee 10% of deposit, min £600
Transport Development - Temporary Construction Access Licence	S	O	£ 180.00	£ -	£ 180.00	£ 185.40	£ -	£ 185.00
Transport Development - Temporary Construction Access Licence - Deposit	S	O	£500-£5000	£500-£5000	£500-£5000	£500-£5000	£ -	£500-£5000
Travel Plans - Monitoring Travel Plans - Large Developments	S	Z	£ 2,400.00	£ -	£ 2,400.00	£ 2,470.00	£ -	£ 2,470.00
Travel Plans - Monitoring Travel Plans - Large developments where two or more land-uses on-site exceed the DfT thresholds, or the development in total is double the threshold	S	Z	£ 3,600.00	£ -	£ 3,600.00	£ 3,710.00	£ -	£ 3,710.00
Travel Plans - Monitoring Travel Plans - Small Developments	S	Z	£ 840.00	£ -	£ 840.00	£ 865.20	£ -	£ 865.20
Planning fees - Section 106 monitoring fee	D	Z	Negotiable	£ -	Negotiable	£ -	£ -	£ -

This page is intentionally left blank

Name of fee or Charge	Statutory/ Discretionary Charge	VAT Status 2015/16	Charge excl. VAT 2016/17	VAT Amount 2016/17	Charging incl. VAT 2016/17
REMOVE - Travel Plans - Right of Way - Footpaths - Cost of Advertising etc. per order	S	O	£ 720.00	£ -	£ 720.00
REMOVE - Travel Plans - Right of Way - Footpaths - Cost of Advertising etc. per order - (a) The charge relates to advertising and administrative costs, payable in advance	S	O		N/A	£ -
REMOVE - Travel Plans - Right of Way - Footpaths - Cost of Advertising etc. per order - (b) If the order is withdrawn , following objections, 50% of the charge will be redunded	S	O		N/A	£ -
REMOVE - Travel Plans - Right of Way - Footpaths - Cost of Advertising etc. per order - (c) A separate agreement for Public Diversion Orders under the Highways Act 1980 Section 119 (5) may be made which may incur additional costs as necessary.	S	O		N/A	£ -
REMOVE - The issue by a County Council, District Council, passenger transport authority or passenger transport executive in England, a County Council or County Borough Council in Wales, to a person eligible to receive travel concessions under a scheme established under Section 93 of the Transport Act 1985, of - Wide load arrangements.	S	O	Actual costs + 20% Admin	N/A	Actual costs + 20% Admin
REMOVE - Anything done by a local traffic authority in connection with or in consequence of an order made or to be made by them under Section 16A of the 1984 Act.	S	O	£ 545.00	£ -	£ 545.00
REMOVE - Anything done by a local authority in connection with or in consequence of a request to the Authority, the Chief Officer of Police or any other person specified by or under an order made under Section 49(4) of the 1984 Act to suspend the use of a parking place or any part of it.	S	O	£ 545.00	£ -	£ 545.00
REMOVE - Consideration by a local authority of a request that, under Section 65(1) of the 1984 Act, it cause or permit a traffic sign (not being a sign which fulfils the conditions specified in Section 65(3A)(i) and (ii) to be placed on or near a road to indicate the route to specified land or premises.	S	O	Actual cost + £100 non-returnable application cost	N/A	Actual cost + £100 non-returnable application cost

REMOVE - The placing by a local traffic authority of a traffic sign pursuant to Section 65(1) of the 1984 Act in accordance with a request of the kind referred to in the preceding paragraph.	S	O	Actual cost plus £100 non-returnable application cost	N/A	Actual cost plus £100 non-returnable application cost
REMOVE - The issue by a County Council, District Council, passenger transport authority or passenger transport executive in England, a County Council or County Borough Council in Wales, to a person eligible to receive travel concessions under a scheme established under Section 93 of the Transport Act 1985, of: (a) any permit or other document as evidence of entitlement to receive travel concessions	S	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
REMOVE - The issue by a County Council, District Council, passenger transport authority or passenger transport executive in England, a County Council or County Borough Council in Wales, to a person eligible to receive travel concessions under a scheme established under Section 93 of the Transport Act 1985, of: (b) a duplicate by a London Borough Council or the Common Council of the City of London of a travel concession permit pursuant to section 52(4) of the London Regional Transport Act 1984 or pursuant to section 53(2)(b) of that Act in accordance with arrangements under section 50(1)	S	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
REMOVE - The issue by a County Council, District Council, passenger transport authority or passenger transport executive in England, a County Council or County Borough Council in Wales, to a person eligible to receive travel concessions under a scheme established under Section 93 of the Transport Act 1985, of: Wide load arrangements	S	O	Actual Costs Plus 20% Administration	N/A	Actual Costs Plus 20% Administration
Commercial Matters - Administration fee for processing Commercial & Other Applications	D	S	£ 25.00	£ 5.00	£ 30.00
Commercial Matters - New Letting - Standard Commercial Shop Lease	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00
Commercial Matters - New Letting - Non Standard Commercial Shop Lease - Dependant upon complexity or extended negotiations	D	S	625 to 1250	N/A	625 to 1250
Commercial Matters - Dilapidation Surveys and Schedules of Repair/Condition (Council Owned Premises) Minimum fee and hourly rate charge in preparing survey and supervising works	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00

Commercial Matters - Assignment of Leases (Council owned premises) Minimum charge May rise to maximum of £670 if negotiations extended	D	S	375 to 750	N/A	375 to 750
Commercial Matters - Licence to vary lease terms (Council owned premises) May rise to maximum of £670 if negotiations extended	D	S	375 to 750	N/A	375 to 750
Commercial Matters - Licence to undertake alterations/building works May rise to maximum of £670 if negotiations extended	D	S	375 to 750	N/A	375 to 750
Commercial Matters - Other Processes and Consents	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00
Non Commercial Matters - Request for an easement over Council Land Applicant would also need to pay for additional cost of works (eg drop kerb and crossover) and any additional legal costs affecting the title to the property.	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00
Non Commercial Matters - Area up to 25 Sqm - Sale of land at the end of the rear garden retained by the Council from a Right to Buy sale or amenity land adjoining a property sold under a Right to Buy	D	S	Negotiable	N/A	Negotiable
Non Commercial Matters - Area up to 25 Sqm - Land offering development potential either as a separate plot or if combined with other land	D	S	Negotiable	N/A	Negotiable
Non Commercial Matters - Other Processes and Consents	D	S	£ 375.00	£ 75.00	£ 450.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 1. Whole Hall hire Weekends per hour	D	E	£ 36.00	£ -	£ 36.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 2. Whole Hall hire Weekdays per hour	D	E	£ 17.00	£ -	£ 17.00
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 3. Hire of Small Meeting Room per hour	D	E	£ 7.20	£ -	£ 7.20
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 4. Senior Citizens / Charitable Organisations	D	E	£ -	£ -	£ -
Non Commercial Matters - Stanley Lazell Memorial Hall Dell Road - 5. Whole Hall hire Daytime/ Weekends per hour	D	E	£ 22.45	£ -	£ 22.45
Travel Plans - Penalties for not meeting targets set and agreed as part of planning conditions	D	Z	Case by case basis	N/A	Case by case basis
REMOVE - Highways (Sc.538) Adoptions & (Sc.278) License - Commercial access; with adoptable distributor road	D	O	Checking and Supervision 10%	N/A	Checking and Supervision 10%
REMOVE - Highways (Sc.538) Adoptions & (Sc.278) License - Section 38 or section 205 to make up private road	D	O	8.5% of cost (3.5% Checking Drawings & 5% Supervision)	N/A	8.5% of cost (3.5% Checking Drawings & 5% Supervision)

REMOVE - Highways (Sc.538) Adoptions & (Sc.278) License - £0 to £1,000,000	D	O	8.5% of cost (3.5% Checking Drawings & 5% Supervision)	N/A	8.5% of cost (3.5% Checking Drawings & 5% Supervision)
REMOVE - Highways (Sc.538) Adoptions & (Sc.278) License - Greater than £1,000,000	D	S	Flat Rate fee 5.5% of Cost	N/A	Flat Rate fee 5.5% of Cost
REMOVE - Traffic Management - Temporary Signal application	D	S	Actual costs + 16% admin fee	N/A	Actual costs + 16% admin fee
REMOVE - Consessionary Bus Passes	D	Z	£ -	£ -	£ -
REMOVE - Replacement Bus Passes	D	Z	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
REMOVE - Crossing application fee £25 refundable on construction of the crossing - annual charge	D	O	£ 250.00	£ -	£ 250.00
REMOVE - Car Parking - Annual Administration Fee - NHS Permits	D	O	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - Over 1 hour under 2 hours	D	S	£ 0.83	£ 0.17	£ 1.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - Over 2 hours under 4 hours	D	S	£ 1.67	£ 0.33	£ 2.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - Over 4 hours under 6 hours	D	S	£ 2.50	£ 0.50	£ 3.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - Over 6 hours	D	S	£ 3.33	£ 0.67	£ 4.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet in Cornwall House - Under 1 hour	D	S	£ 0.42	£ 0.08	£ 0.50
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet Station - Over 1 hour under 2 hours	D	S	£ 0.83	£ 0.17	£ 1.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet Station - Over 2 hours under 4 hours	D	S	£ 1.67	£ 0.33	£ 2.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet Station - Over 4 hours under 6 hours	D	S	£ 2.50	£ 0.50	£ 3.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet Station - Over 6 hours	D	S	£ 3.33	£ 0.67	£ 4.00
Car Parking - Off-Street Pay & Display Car Parking Purfleet Station - Under 1 hour	D	S	£ 0.42	£ 0.08	£ 0.50
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - 0 to 15 mins	D	O	Removed	Removed	Removed
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - 0 to 30 mins	D	O	£ 0.60	£ -	£ 0.60
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - 15 to 30 mins	D	O	N/A	N/A	N/A
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - 30 to 45 mins	D	O	£ 0.80	£ -	£ 0.80
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - 45 mins to 1 hour	D	O	£ 1.20	£ -	£ 1.20

Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay (excl. Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club) - 0 to 15 mins	D	O	Removed	Removed	Removed
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay (excl. Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club) - 1 to 2 hours	D	O	£ 1.20	£ -	£ 1.20
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay (excl. Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club) - 15 mins to 1 hour	D	O	N/A	N/A	N/A
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club - 0 to 15 mins	D	O	Removed	Removed	Removed
Car Parking - On-Street Pay & Display - Long Stay Thames Road & Access Road to Yacht Club - 15 mins to 1 hour	D	O	N/A	N/A	N/A
Copies of Decisions and Ordnance Survey - Fees per copy	D	S	£ 12.92	£ 2.58	£ 15.50
Local Land Charges - Additional parcel - commercial	S	O	£ 35.00	£ -	£ 35.00
Local Land Charges - Additional parcel - personal search	S	O	£ 2.00	£ -	£ 2.00
Local Land Charges - Additional parcel - residential	S	O	£ 28.00	£ -	£ 28.00
Local Land Charges - Cancellation fee for Con29 search	S	O	£ 75.00	£ -	£ 75.00
Local Land Charges - Charges for a copy of the local land charges search	S	O	£ 15.00	£ -	£ 15.00
Local Land Charges - Con290 - Per question	S	O	£ 22.00	£ -	£ 22.00
Local Land Charges - Con29R - Unrefined data search package	S	O	£ 40.00	£ -	£ 40.00
Local Land Charges - Copy of agreements and tree preservation orders	S	O	£ 30.00	£ -	£ 30.00
Local Land Charges - Copy of planning decision and enforcement notices	S	O	£ 15.00	£ -	£ 15.00
Local Land Charges - Copy of smoke control order	S	O	£ 7.00	£ -	£ 7.00
Local Land Charges - Electronic Format - Con29R Search - commercial	S	O	£ 136.00	£ -	£ 136.00
Local Land Charges - Electronic Format - Con29R Search - residential	S	O	£ 87.00	£ -	£ 87.00
Local Land Charges - Electronic Format - Full search - LLC1 and Con29R commercial	S	O	£ 157.00	£ -	£ 157.00
Local Land Charges - Electronic Format - Full search - LLC1 and Con29R residential	S	O	£ 108.00	£ -	£ 108.00
Local Land Charges - Form LLC1 Only	S	O	£ 21.00	£ -	£ 21.00
Local Land Charges - Paper Format - Con29R Search - commercial	S	O	£ 140.00	£ -	£ 140.00
Local Land Charges - Paper Format - Con29R Search - residential	S	O	£ 90.00	£ -	£ 90.00

Local Land Charges - Paper Format - Full search - LLC1 and Con29R commercial	S	O	£ 160.00	£ -	£ 160.00
Local Land Charges - Paper Format - Full search - LLC1 and Con29R residential	S	O	£ 110.00	£ -	£ 110.00
Local Land Charges - Personal search request and viewing of in	S	O	£ -	£ -	£ -
Planning Application Publicity List - Per Annum	D	Z	£ 118.00	£ -	£ 118.00
Planning Application Publicity List - Per Copy	D	Z	£ 5.00	£ -	£ 5.00

5 January 2017	ITEM: 7
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Congestion Task Force Update (including Highways Permitting Proposal)	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key
Report of: Julie Nelder, Highways Infrastructure & Network Manager	
Accountable Head of Service: Ann Osola, Head of Transportation & Highways	
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Corporate Director of Environment & Place	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

In April 2016, following growing concerns about the impacts of congestion in Thurrock, a Congestion Task Force was established to bring together Thurrock Council representatives, Highways England, Connect Plus Services (who hold the contract for managing traffic incidents on the M25), Essex Highways Policing, Essex Community Police, Essex County Council and business representatives. The initial focus of the group was the improvement of measures to mitigate the impact of incidents on the M25 and Dartford Crossing on local traffic in Thurrock. This work programme subsequently expanded to encompass joint initiatives to improve the free flow of traffic across local and strategic networks, and work to ensure the future-proofing of the network to accommodate future growth. This report provides the Committee with an overview of the task force work programme, and provides explicit detail on a proposal to migrate from a highways noticing regime to a highways permitting scheme, where Committee views are sought to inform a report to Cabinet in February 2017.

1. Recommendation(s)

That the Committee:

- 1.1 Considers the contents of this report and provides comments on the Congestion Task Force work programme, and specifically, on the proposal to introduce a Highways Permit Scheme in Thurrock as set out in paragraphs 3.5 to 3.13.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 One of the strengths and attractions of Thurrock to both businesses and residents is its key location just outside of Greater London, immediately adjacent to the M25, with deep water access to the Thames and road and rail access to the South East growth area. This strength has attracted a major regional retail park at Lakeside and a thriving freight and logistics industry. The consequence of this is heavy demand for road space, and a vulnerability of local roads to incidents on the M25 and A282 Dartford Crossing.
- 2.2 In February 2016, one such incident led to exceptional disruption on Thurrock's local roads and prompted the Council to invite stakeholder organisations to form a Congestion Task Force to reduce the impact of incidents on the Crossing and work collaboratively to improving the flow of traffic in Thurrock generally.
- 2.3 The first meeting took place on the 28th April 2016, and was attended by Thurrock Council officers, together with representatives from Highways England, Connect Plus Services (who manage and maintain the M25/Dartford Crossing on behalf of Highways England), Essex Roads Police, Essex Community Police and Essex County Council Traffic Control.
- 2.4 Subsequent meetings were chaired by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, with attendance expanding to include representatives from Thurrock Business Board and Planning, Transportation & Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

3. Overview of Work Programme

Mitigation of Impact of Incidents on Dartford Crossing

- 3.1 Early meetings of the Task Force focussed almost exclusively on mitigating the impact of incidents on the M25 and Dartford Crossing. Quick wins included adding Thurrock Council officers to Highways England's National Incident Liaison Officer (NILO) mailing list to receive bulletin updates of incidents which document the collaborative response of police, fire brigade and ambulance services, together with Highways England, Connect Plus Services and their contractors. Information is co-ordinated by Highways England's National Traffic Operations Centre in Birmingham, who also produce media bulletins for the travelling public. Having access to comprehensive and definitive source data allowed the Council to better anticipate the likely duration of incidents, and plan accordingly.
- 3.2 Stakeholders also pooled data to understand the exact nature of the interdependencies between the movement of traffic on the strategic and local networks. When there is a serious incident on the bridge resulting in closure for a significant period, a contraflow system is introduced through the tunnels. In order for this arrangement to be put in place, Highways England have to close southbound access from Jn 31. This in itself leads to long queues

developing in Thurrock. However, currently the traffic management plan allows traffic at Jn 31 to continue to access the M25 northbound, with the result that a significant number of vehicles attempt to exit at Jn 30 to access M25 southbound, despite having been informed that the Crossing is closed. This rapidly results in gridlock which spreads back to other junctions in Thurrock's local network.

- 3.3 The proposed solution to this problem is to close northbound access to the M25 whilst the East Tunnel Bore is in contraflow, and diversionary routing protocols are being updated to reflect this.
- 3.4 Thurrock is also seeking to introduce yellow box junction markings at Junction 31 to deter motorists contributing to gridlock. These will be implemented in the New Year to avoid works being undertaken during Lakeside's Christmas trading period.
- 3.5 Ultimately, partners are working towards a system whereby Highways England, Thurrock and Essex all have access to a cloud-based traffic management system which covers their respective networks from Jn 28 to Jn 31 of the M25, together with the adjacent local junctions, and these junctions can be operated through Collaborative Traffic Management (CTM). The work to progress this work is being undertaken by Highways England's consultants, and the target date for delivery is summer 2018.

Improving Free Flow of Traffic Across Local and Strategic Networks

- 3.6 Thurrock Council as the Highway Authority is responsible for 576 km of road network. The Council has an obligation under the 2004 Traffic Management Act to take all reasonable steps within its power to keep roads clear and traffic moving.
- 3.7 In June 2016, in recognition of the growing challenges in relation to this obligation, Thurrock Council established a dedicated Highways Network Management Team within the Transportation & Highways Service Area (previously, staff had covered a broad range of traffic management and road maintenance duties). A Highways Network Manager was appointed, and tasked with developing measures to give Thurrock more proactive control of traffic movements across its networks. A key recommendation arising from this work was that Thurrock change the mechanism by which it controls the activities of parties undertaking works on the highway from a 'Noticing' to a 'Permitting' system.
- 3.8 There are two methods of control available to the Highways Authority to control street works: i) 'Noticing' which is supported by the New Road and Street Works Act 1991; ii) or 'Permitting' which is supported by the Traffic Management Act 2004. Currently, Thurrock Council utilises the 'Noticing' process to meet its statutory obligations to co-ordinate works within the borough.

- 3.9 The key difference between the two methods is that with ‘Noticing’, the Statutory Undertakers inform a Local / Highway Authority where they are working under New Road and Street Works Act 1991(NRSWA) legislation, whereas with ‘Permitting’, the Traffic Management Act 2004 allows the Authority to implement a Permit Scheme where the statutory undertakers have to apply for permission to work on the network.
- 3.10 Within a Permit Scheme, the Highway Authority can stipulate conditions that enable the works to be contained in a certain period, or restricted hours of work to suit the best operating method for a particular road or area, providing the Council with more control of its network. If works overrun, penalties can be charged. With ‘Noticing’, the Authority relies on the statutory undertakers to carry out their repairs in an expedient considerate manner.
- 3.11 Thurrock Council has, to date, coordinated works under the NRSWA legislation through Notices submitted by the Statutory Undertakers. However, due to growing demand on Thurrock network and necessity to relieve the congestion, steps have been taken to assess costs and benefits of operating a Permit Scheme.
- 3.12 Under a Permitting Scheme, statutory undertakers buy a Permit to occupy road space, based on the duration of occupation, the scale of proposed works, and the sensitivity of the street within the road network. The feasibility study of the Permit Scheme reviewed the volume of potential permits issued on the traffic sensitive and non-traffic sensitive routes on Thurrock network. Table 1 below shows the forecast volumes with the associated charges. The total income from Permit Scheme is currently estimated at £242,340 per annum (legislation requires the Council to set charges such that it recovers the costs of operating the permit Scheme, but does not generate a surplus).

Table 1 – Permit Scheme Income

Activity	Road Category			Permit fee		Income		Total
	Cat 0-2 TS	Cat 3&4 No TS	Total	Cat 0-2 TS	Cat 3&4 No TS	Cat 0-2 TS	Cat 3&4 No TS	
Major (PAA)	n/a	n/a	n/a	95	70	2,090	26,600	28,690
Major	22	380	402	215	140	4,730	53,200	57,930
Standard	88	432	520	120	70	10,560	30,240	40,800
Minor	240	1232	1472	60	40	14,400	49,280	63,680
Immediate (Urgent)	43	272	315	55	35	2,365	9,520	11,885
Immediate (Emergency)	76	408	484	55	35	4,180	14,280	18,460
Total Permit Fee Income	469	2724	3193			38,325	183,120	221,445
Total Variation Income						4,095	16,800	20,895
Total Income						42,420	199,920	242,340

3.13 Overall, the implementation and operation of the Permit Scheme would be cost – income neutral, and implementation costs would be absorbed within overall service budgets. Benefits of a Permit Scheme include:

- Better control of timings of works that affect road and footway space
- Enhanced planning and visibility of works on the network
- Increased collaboration between parties affected by traffic management
- Improved information and awareness about works on the highway

3.14 It is proposed that, subject to Cabinet approval in February 2017, Permitting is introduced in Thurrock with effect from June 2017.

Future-Proofing Thurrock's Highways Network

3.15 The third and final strand of the Congestion Task Force Work Programme involves work to understand the capacity and pressures on Thurrock's current road network, the future requirements of road users, and the nature of infrastructure enhancements needed to meet these needs. To date, work has been undertaken to build a strategic model of trip making across the borough, and this is being validated against existing traffic count data. The intention is that, once built, this model will allow the Council to test out the traffic implications of future possible land uses as they emerge through the Local Plan development process, along with the cumulative implications of proposed land use changes in Thurrock and the wider South East.

3.16 Thurrock is also in the early stages of exploring possible opportunities offered by cutting-edge technology to improve road capacity and the travelling experiences of road users. We are currently in dialogue with the Transport Systems Catapult, one of ten elite technology and innovation centres established and overseen by the UK's innovation agency, Innovate UK. Transport Systems catapult was created to drive and promote Intelligent Mobility – the use of new and emerging technologies to transport people and goods more smartly and efficiently. We hope to be in a position to report on specific outcomes of this dialogue later in the year.

Recommendations to Committee

3.17 Planning, Transportation, regeneration overview and Scrutiny are asked to note the work of the Congestion Task Force, and provide comments, particularly on the proposal to introduce Highways Permitting, as set out in sections 3.5 to 3.13 above.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

4.1 The reason for this recommendation is to support the future work of the Congestion Task Force, and inform a report to Cabinet seeking approval to progress implementation of Highways Permitting scheduled on the Forward Plan for February 2017.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

5.1 The purpose of this report is to consult Overview and Scrutiny on the Congestion Task Force Work Programme, and, in particular, the proposal to introduce Highways permitting with effect from June 2017.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

6.1 Implementation of the Permit Scheme would enhance the Council's priorities in allowing more control over submitted works, this will allow for less delay and congestion, hence reduced costs for Thurrock PLC and related retail and freight movements

6.2 The positive health benefits associated to reduced congestion, would be beneficial for air quality, and promote a 'greener environment' for our residents to live in.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Laura Last**
Management Accountant

The costs of implementation and operation of Permit Scheme are shown to be cost neutral. The implementation cost will be managed through existing budgets. The performance of the estimated costs and income would be reviewed after the scheme is implemented to ensure that the Scheme's operations remain cost – income neutral as required by the legislation.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Vivien Williams**
Planning & Regeneration Solicitor

The Traffic Management Act 2004, and its supporting Codes of Practices, allows for Local Authorities to implement a Permit Scheme in order to meet its statutory responsibilities for the Local Authorities to coordinate works on its network under Section 59 of the New Road and Street Works Act 1991.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Rebecca Price**
Community Development Officer

There are no adverse risks identified for groups with protected characteristics.

7.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None

8. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

Statutory legislation and supporting Codes of Practices.

9. **Appendices to the report**

None.

Report Author

Julie Nelder

Highways Infrastructure & Network Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

5 January 2017	ITEM: 8
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview & Scrutiny Committee	
Thurrock Design Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key
Report of: Monica Qing, Senior Planning Officer	
Accountable Head of Service: Andy Millard – Head of Planning and Growth	
Accountable Director: Steve Cox – Director of Environment and Place	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

This report outlines the background, purpose and consultation process involved in the production of the Thurrock Design Strategy (TDS).

The TDS is being produced as a quality-led policy tool which, alongside Local Plan policies, will be used to inform and assess development proposals, from small infill sites through to larger regeneration and redevelopment schemes. Although SPDs do not have the same weight or status as policies in a Local Plan (as they are not subject to an independent examination before an Inspector) they can still form a 'material consideration' in determining planning applications once they have been adopted.

The draft TDS was published for public consultation from 26th February to 11th April 2015 alongside the Thurrock Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 1) document. One of the key outcomes of the consultation is the recognition of the importance of achieving good design and the benefits this can bring in delivering sustainable communities.

1. Recommendation

- 1.1 Members note the current status and progress on the production and adoption of the Design Strategy and provide comments on the consultation process that will inform the production of the final document.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 In order to support high quality development in the Borough, the Council has recognised the need to produce Design Strategy Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are produced to provide additional detail and guidance to support policies and proposals in an adopted development plan. Although they do not have the same weight or status as policies in a Local Plan as they are not subject to an independent examination before an Inspector they can still form a 'material consideration' in determining planning applications once they have been adopted by the Council following public consultation.

- 2.2 Combined with the relevant national design policy and guidance, the TDS sets out Council's requirements for assessing the context of a site, and provides guidance based on the characteristics of five broad place typologies.
- 2.3 The document also provides a checklist of pre-submission, submission and post-submission design requirements that Thurrock Council will expect in support of planning application proposals. Where proposals do not reflect the guidance and are contrary to national policy they will be considered for refusal.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 3.1 The importance of achieving good design and the benefits this can bring in delivering sustainable communities, is clearly set out in National Planning Policy and Guidance. In preparing the TDS the Council is committed to substantially raising design standards across the Borough and the delivery of the following six objectives:

1. Improve the overall design quality standards of development in Thurrock, enhancing perceptions of place and reinforcing a strong sense of civic pride.
2. Innovate through design improvements in locations where the existing built environment requires regeneration.
3. Enhance the best of the existing built and natural environments drawing on the heritage and identity of towns and villages in Thurrock.
4. Provide clear guidance on the Council's expectations regarding the design approach to be adopted in Thurrock.
5. Work proactively with the development industry to bring forward proposals in a timely and effective way having regard to statutory policy requirements.
6. Lead by example through the design and implementation of Council-led development projects.

- 3.2 The overarching objectives described above will be implemented through the application of the TDS to all projects coming forward within Thurrock where

the Council will work closely with developers and landowners to secure the delivery of high quality development across the Borough.

- 3.3 At its meeting in February 2016, Council agreed to undertake a 6-week consultation on the first draft of the TDS. During that consultation period, the Council received 53 comments from both public and industry experts. The industry experts think one of the TDS's strength is the weight it gives to drawing on context in the design of developments. One of the shared concerns is what is expected of applicants and how design quality will be measured. A summary of the consultation responses and Officers' responses appended to this report.
- 3.4 Corresponding to the shared concerns, it is intended to improve the clarity in terms of what is expected of applicants through further review of the document. In addition, the Council will produce a range of supplementary documents to provide more detailed design guides for five place typologies outlined in the TDS. These design guides will provide more detailed rationale and quality measurements needed but beyond the scope and capacity of the TDS. The work on the Design Guide for Residential Alterations and Extensions is already close to completion and the Design Guide for Industrial Development is the next in the pipeline. This will be followed by the Design Guide for Town Centres and Transport Hubs.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 The Council is looking to work more closely with developers and landowners to secure the delivery of high quality development across the Borough. The TDS will be a key tool to achieve this.
- 4.2 During the 6-week consultation period, the Council received a number of responses. The final TDS will be informed by the consultation responses and the views of this Committee. Once adopted, The TDS will be an important policy tool providing incentives and clear directions for good quality design in Thurrock.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 The draft Thurrock Design Strategy was published for public consultation from 26 February to 11 April 2015 alongside the Thurrock Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 1) document.
- 5.2 During the consultation period the draft TDS document was made available to view at thurrock.gov.uk/localplan with comments being encouraged through the Council's consultation portal or on Comment Forms which were available on request at the Civic Offices and in libraries across the Borough. Council Officers also attended Community Forum meetings and organised a series of drop-in 'Road Show' events to allow people to learn more about the TDS.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 The TDS is prepared as an overarching design vision and objectives at both strategic and local scale. It strengthens corporate policies and priorities particularly in creating a great place, improving health and well-being, promoting and protecting our clean and green environment.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Laura Last**
Management Accountant

The costs associated with progressing this work on the Council's side can be met from within the existing Local Plan budget.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Vivien Williams**
Principal Regeneration Solicitor

The TDS has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012. The guidance within the Design Strategy supplements adopted policies within the Council's Core Strategy as such it has not been subject to a separate Sustainability Appraisal. Once adopted, the Design Strategy will be used as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Warren**
Community Development and Equalities Manager

There are no direct diversity issues linked with this report, however, if adopted, the document will be subject to a Community and Equality Impact assessment to assess the borough-wide equality improvements through better design solutions such as mixed uses and tenures, accessible open spaces and etc. The CEIA will also allow for possible negative impacts to be assessed and mitigated.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

The TDS will have numerous positive impacts on Public Health, Environment and sustainability because it sets out Council's requirements regarding assessing the context of a site and the key design principles and objectives for safe, healthy and sustainable developments.

8. **Background papers used in preparing the** report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

Thurrock Design Strategy Consultations.

9. **Appendices to the report**

Appendix 1 - Summary of Consultation Responses and Officer Responses

Report Author

Monica Qing

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Sport England (Roy Warren)		TDS_1	Making Connections - C3) Promotes active and healthy lifestyles	Disagree	<p>Sport England welcomes the principle of promoting active and healthy lifestyles as one of the key considerations that must be incorporated into design to make safe and effective connections for all travel modes. The specific references in the design strategy to Sport England/Public Health England Active Design guidance are also welcomed. This shows that the Council recognises the role of design in achieving the wider objective of promoting active health communities and would be consistent with the NPPF and the Council's corporate/community priorities and the adopted Core Strategy. However, given the importance of promoting active and healthier lifestyles in Government policy and the Council's own policies, promoting active and healthier lifestyles should not just be a consideration in the context of making connections. It should be an integral part of 'Understanding the Place' (e.g. consideration A2 - incorporating strategic green infrastructure features) and 'Working with Site Features' (e.g. consideration B5 - identifying and incorporating green infrastructure) as well for instance. As set out in the 10 principles in the Active Design guidance, the principles extend beyond active travel and making connections. While for instance the Design Strategy legitimately considers the role of green infrastructure in design in terms of landscape, biodiversity, travel etc. objectives, it is not considered from an active/healthy lifestyle perspective.</p> <p>All parts of the design strategy (beyond consideration C3) should be reviewed to assess how promoting active and healthy lifestyles can be incorporated into the whole design process especially in terms of the parts relating to 'Understanding the Place' and 'Working with Site Features' as well as considering applicability in the local place typologies identified in the strategy. The Active Design guidance principles and case studies provide detailed advice on how this can be interpreted in practice. Furthermore, while acknowledging that the design strategy currently has to be based on policy PMDP2 of the Core Strategy, the emerging local plan that will replace the Core Strategy should be used to provide an updated design policy framework which includes the promotion of active and healthy lifestyles as a criteria that development proposals must meet. This is absent in the current policy.</p>	Agree, in part. Objective A2 is drafted in the context of landscape. Function of "recreation" is stated in para. 3.13.	Add the phrase "encourage recreation" to Paragraph 3.14.
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_4	Paragraph 1.9	Not stated	Paragraph 1.9. This refers to 'national design guidance' which is not a defined term in the NPPF. We recommend that the Council adds a technical footnote with a definition and/or a list of key documents which would fall within this umbrella term. We have assumed that these documents are those listed in paragraph 2.15. A cross-reference to paragraph 2.15 would be useful.	Agree.	Clarify that this is a term to capture content in the NPPF and NPPG. Change "National Planning Policy Guidance to National Planning Practice Guidance

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_5	Paragraph 2.4	Not stated	Chapter 2 and paragraph 2.4. This chapter deals with the importance of good design. We welcome reference to the work by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). We recommend the addition of other guidance produced by Historic England, which has been recently updated and reference should now be to the Historic England Advice Note 4: Tall Buildings. This can be accessed at https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/tall-buildings-advice-note-4/heag037-tall-buildings.pdf/ While our guidance does stress the need for good design, it also identifies that tall buildings can have a negative impact on the historic environment, noting that the NPPF also makes it clear that ‘the Government attaches ‘great weight’ to the conservation of designated heritage assets, including their setting’ (paragraph 132). The SPD should make it clear that design alone cannot mitigate the harm to the historic environment resulting from an inappropriately sited tall building and therefore proposals for tall buildings that result in unjustified and unacceptable levels of harm to designated heritage assets will not be supported. We recommend additional text to this effect within existing paragraph 2.4.	Paras 2.1-2.5 focusses on investing in design quality and relevant research in that context it is not intended to be an exhaustive list of design guidance provided by key stakeholders and influencers.	No action required.
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_6	Paragraph 2.13	Not stated	As national planning policy guidance is regulated updated and amended, we recommend a link to the web-site and a caveat to the effect that it is occasionally updated.	Disagree, current reference is adequate. Para. 2.12 states that the NPPG is a “live resources that is continually updated”.	No action required.
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_7	Paragraph 2.17	Not stated	This refers to landscape characterisation work within the scope of further guidance and background evidence documents. We recommend reference also to the historic characterisation work that the Council have previously undertaken.	The Council is currently in the process of updating its evidence base relating to the historic environment this evidence will inform decision making and future updates of the Design Strategy SPD.	No action required at this time.
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_8	Paragraphs 2.19 to 2-25	Not stated	This deals with ‘Understanding the Character of Thurrock’ and we recommend mention in the explanatory text of the scheduled monuments at Tilbury Fort and Coalhouse Fort, for example, and their link to the history of the area, the evolution of defences along the Thames and the riverside/riverscape setting. Reference to the challenges that confront heritage assets links to heritage-at-risk and the grade II* State Cinema at Grays is such an example. A note to this effect would usefully accompany the image at page 16.	Agree, in part. The scope of the text is general to describe the evolution of Thurrock’s character, rather than to highlight the “challenges”.	Amend text to recognise the fort defences. Amend caption to recognise Grade II* Listed status of State Cinema.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_9	Section 3	Not stated	This section deals with the site appraisal process prior to submission of planning applications. It covers both matters of setting and views and involves the appraisal of impact on heritage assets. As an understanding of settings policy has been published since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011 and as the concept of significance was most recently included in the NPPF, Historic England recommend that these matters are introduced at paragraphs 3.8 to 3.11 or within 3.29 and section B1 on the appraisal of a site's features. Our Advice Note 3 (AN3) 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' and the NPPF Glossary provide definitions of setting. The Government's planning objectives for the historic environment is that conservation decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of a heritage asset's significance and are investigated to a proportionate degree. Our guidance sets out a five stepped staged approach to proportionate decision-making and this can be accessed at https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/gpa3.pdf/	Disagree, this is the role of more primary development management policies. However, there may be some opportunity to elaborate in B1 where setting is mentioned with reference to significance and relative importance.	Review objective B1 and seek to add additional detail where appropriate.
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_10	Paragraph 3.30	Not stated	This paragraph deals with heritage assets and this term covers both designated and locally listed assets. We recommend reference to the definition in the NPPF Glossary. Where the design guide refers to wider historical and cultural references, the term significant places is also used as an umbrella to cover statutorily protected and assets of more local interest. We do recommend reference to the policy test of impact upon significance as is contained in the NPPF at its paragraph 132. We recommend that the aspirational images as used at pages 30 and 33 have a brief explanation of the intended design features as well as the location and perhaps the year of implementation.	Disagree, the intention of Para 3.3 is to highlight the importance of site appraisals in the round rather than in specific context of heritage assets.	No action required.
Historic England (Michael Stubbs)		TDS_11	Section 4 - Commerce and Industry	Not stated	One additional key design requirement is recommended here to address and enhance the setting of riverside and port facilities to improve the relationship with affected listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments. The adopted Core Strategy deals with opportunities to enhance the setting of Tilbury Fort and Coalhouse Fort. We recommend similar guidance is added to this section.	Agree.	Review text in Section 4 relating to Commerce and Industry and ensure that appropriate reference is made to mitigating any potential impact on heritage assets.
Intu Lakeside (Marc Myers)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Stephanie Walker)	TDS_12	Paragraph 1.6-1.7	Disagree	Intu shares the Council's view of the importance of achieving good design set out in the Design Strategy SPD. The recognised link between good design outcomes and achieving corporate and community priorities is also supported. In particular here, recognition by the Council of the role of design encouraging and promoting job creation and economic prosperity is supported. We consider the objectives listed at paragraphs 1.6 and 1.7 should be revised to more directly reflect this. In terms of other objectives, Intu welcomes the commitment of the Council working proactively with the development industry. Intu looks forward to continuing to work in consultation with the Council on design development for proposals.	Corporate and community objectives are high level and provide context for the Design Strategy Objectives.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Intu Lakeside (Marc Myers)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Stephanie Walker)	TDS_13	Paragraph 1.9	Disagree	The tenor of the comment at paragraph 1.9 about refusing schemes which do not reflect its design quality aspirations for the Borough is understood; however the terminology used is considered inappropriate in a policy document and should be removed. Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (i.e. P3/10 11135870v1 weighing up the planning balance). This document will supplement design policies in the Local Plan and its role as such should be made clear within this introduction.	The wording is aimed to emphasise the importance of design as a key material consideration which is often otherwise underappreciated in practice when balances against other wider planning objectives.	No action required.
Intu Lakeside (Marc Myers)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Stephanie Walker)	TDS_14	Paragraph 1.10	Agree	Intu supports the non-prescriptive approach to the Design Strategy referred to at Paragraph 1.10 which states that the design strategy does not establish a rigid blueprint but a framework within which well-designed proposals can be shaped and assessed. This is considered an important element of encouraging good design without risking frustrating development.	Comment noted.	No action required.
Intu Lakeside (Marc Myers)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Stephanie Walker)	TDS_15	Section 4	Agree	Intu also welcomes the use of place typologies and recognition of Thurrock Lakeside as a distinct typology area within the Borough.	Comment noted.	No action required.
Intu Lakeside (Marc Myers)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Stephanie Walker)	TDS_16	Section 3	Disagree	In Section 3.0 designing in context the four main considerations in preparing a site appraisal provides a helpful guide to approaching design, although it should be noted that there are many other factors that might be drawn into any such appraisal and inform an appropriate design response and this should be acknowledged explicitly.	Disagree, the site appraisal considerations are not aimed to provide exclusive or exhaustive assessment criteria.	No action required.
Intu Lakeside (Marc Myers)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Stephanie Walker)	TDS_17	Section 4 - Lakeside	Agree	In terms of the Lakeside Typology Area in Section 4.0. Intu supports the recognition of Lakeside as having significant growth and development potential. The aspirations for Lakeside, as detailed in the design strategy SPD, such as the mix of uses, public realm improvements, bringing development down to the lake front, and place making are appropriate and have guided the design development of proposals which have already obtained planning permission.	Support noted.	No action required.
Janet McCheyne		TDS_18	Full Document	Agree	I agree with the principle, but feel some details need expanding. Change 1: "Development layouts will be expected to be formed to a pattern, character and appearance that is related to the existing settlement" Please can development in rural areas to more distinctly rural: some new builds or extensions have resulted in incongruous town houses. 3 storey dwellings are not appropriate in most village settings; roofs should not be higher than surrounding buildings. Change 2: Inappropriate boundaries for village locations should also mention railings and metal electronic gates which urbanise the environment and are to the detriment of community ethos.	Support noted. Agree that some of the details in the Design Strategy could be expanded, however, the suggested changes could potentially make the document inflexible and no longer fit for purpose. The emphasis the document places on the need to design in context should ensure that new developments in rural areas are designed in an appropriate and sympathetic way.	Review document and add additional detail to explain key points and improve clarity.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_19	Full Document	Not stated	Cogent Land LLP specialises in sustainable development and strategic land. It has secured development plan allocations and planning permissions for major development sites across the UK. Cogent has an established and extensive presence in the Thurrock area, with a strong and committed focus on the potential for sustainable growth and regeneration. Several notable schemes in Thurrock include: Ponds Farm – this site has planning permission for 38,686sqm (416,416 sq. ft.) of employment floor space. When constructed this site will make provision for approximately 900 new jobs; Williamson Farm, Corringham – a planning application was submitted in March 2015. Proposals include the provision of 750 homes; a new railway station; a secondary school; flood mitigation area, and supporting infrastructure; Bata Field, East Tilbury – planning permission was granted for 299 homes. This scheme is currently under construction and is positioned a short-distance from the Lower Thames Crossing routes; and, Land to the west of East Tilbury – a planning application is due to be submitted imminently for the provision of 1,000 homes; primary school; vehicular bridge crossing; and supporting infrastructure. This site is adjacent to the Lower Thames Crossing routes.	Comment noted.	No action required.
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_20	Full Document	Not stated	The draft SPD recognises that achieving good design is important and a benefit in the delivery of more sustainable development and communities. The SPD could further embody the NPPF, for example, the NPPF at section 7.56 states - “Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people”. Section 7.57 continues - “It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes”. Thurrock could reinforce these principles of promoting good design outcomes when delivering development proposals across the Borough. The SPD will then strengthen the delivery of good design.	Comment noted. The Design Strategy already makes reference to national policy, additional references are not deemed necessary as the NPPF already forms part of the Development Plan and is a key consideration in the determination of planning applications.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_21	Full Document	Not stated	<p>The draft SPD has a good structure including a useful Section 3 (Designing in Context) which identifies key design considerations and summarises them into questions that Thurrock Council expect to be addressed as part of any site appraisal. Also Section 5 (The Development Process) provides good guidance on the progression of proposals from pre-application stage to post-application and monitoring. There is a good foundation in design policy which provides a sound design quality policy trail. But as above, the cross reference to NPPF could be stronger. In particular, the central premise of “presumption in favour of sustainable development”. Although definitions of this are still being resolved, reference to it and any agreed interpretation would help throughout the SPD in particular part D of Section 3 - Building in Sustainability. Where clearer guidance would help is in Section 3 - Designing on Context and Section 4 - Place Typologies in Thurrock. The issue of character is introduced in Section 2 – The Importance of Good Design (subsection ‘Understanding the Character of Thurrock’). Paragraph 2.22 notes the sharp contrast between the ancient and the modern, the man-made and the natural. It would help the SPD as a framework if this point was further carried over into Sections 3 and 4. In particular Section 4 on typologies should add further references to the juxtaposition of the ancient and the modern, the man-made and the natural. It is clear the SPD is trying to balance a Thurrock-wide sense of planned order but at the same time be sympathetic to economic-based development ideas that may challenge it. It is possible that planning officers will struggle with this balance. For example, the assessment of character – and critically judging where proposals do not meet expectations of responding to character – allows for a great deal of interpretation. Page 17, paragraph 2.25 in a case in point states: “Good design makes the most of what is already valued, and contributes to a sense of place by providing sustainable multiple benefits to the development and the surrounding area. Where a proposal cannot meet the expectations of character policies, a proposal may be refused or additional changes on site or off site, will be sought to reduce or compensate for the shortfall”. It could be possible for a planning officer to interpret this as support for rejecting designs that on the contrary may have the potential to be successful. Memorable schemes such as the Rainham Marshes RSPB visitor centre, or historically, the Bata shoe factory at East Tilbury might never have been allowed with such guidance.</p> <p>Perhaps the SPD could go further. Along with robust site appraisals, a further qualification could include a comment regarding interventions that challenge the established character of a place by imposing development in the landscape, must require exceptional design standards.</p>	Support noted. Agree that some of the details in the Design Strategy could be expanded upon to provide clarity and ensure consistency.	Review document and add additional detail to explain key points and improve clarity.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_22	Section 4 - Village Locations	Not stated	Currently the SPD expects little change within Villages described in Typology Five, stating that “Proposals coming forward within these locations are likely to be more limited to include small scale infill and redevelopment proposals within the defined development boundaries of existing settlements”. However, some villages could provide the opportunity to make better use of under patronised railway stations. How will a planning officer interpret the conflict between modest proposals as expected in Typology Five – Village Locations (page 60), and the need sustainable transport, as referenced in Typology Two, stating: “Proximity to substantial rail and road infrastructure is a critical part of the design and layout of development as part of a residential neighbourhood”. Some small villages are extensively supported by rail infrastructure but are not considered by Typology Two, as they are too small to be classed as Residential Neighbourhoods. A planning officer will need more certainty as to whether a proposal is sustainable because it makes the best use of rail infrastructure or whether a village with this opportunity should not grow.	The map indicating the broad typology areas shows that all settlements/locations that are adjacent to railway stations should be defined as either typology 1 or typology 2. As such, this comment is considered invalid.	No action required.
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_23	Paragraph 3.48	Not stated	The expectation of design elements to be included in proposals to raise quality is welcomed. However, some of the elements suggested may be challenging when assessed for adoption. An example is the requirement for street trees in paragraph 3.48. Whilst this addition is considered positive, Cogent would like to seek reassurances that the requirements of the Design Strategy SPD have been consulted on and have adoption officer’s approval. It is not uncommon for a policy framework to be agreed only to find subsequent proposals that comply are not acceptable by adoption officers.	Agree, in part. Some of the language used within the Design Strategy is too prescriptive and should be amended before adoption.	Review document and ensure that the guidance meets the criteria for Supplementary Planning Documents set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_24	Full Document	Not stated	It has been identified that some use of specific language on occasion confuses the overall message and therefore diminishes the significance of some points. For example, the word ‘should’ is used frequently in instances when the main point is to urge a quantifiable assessment. Other instances of language use include stating that proposals must accord with a certain criteria ‘where appropriate’ and that proposals must provide an ‘adequate’ provision of something. These words are used without qualification, and therefore do not strengthen the overall message of the SPD, particularly in relation to specific design considerations. Further to this, the use of generic jargon such as seeking ‘design quality that raises the bar’ does not contribute to the specific guidelines expected of a design SPD, against which to measure proposals. The SPD also includes some individual typographical and spelling errors, as follows: Page 17, paragraph 2.24: implies that South Ockendon is a river side settlement; Page 20, paragraph 3.7: ‘features of the Borough’; and Page 22, paragraph 3.15: refers to an unqualified ‘Place Check’, which could be explained in the glossary. As a general comment, the guidance should avoid ambiguous aspirational statements, jargon and also define key technical terms to ensure the SPD is as useful as possible to all parties.	Agree, in part. The language within the document needs to make clear what is required of developers and what we encourage/promote and support as good practice. The word require should only be used where a statement is directly linked to policies within the Core Strategy and/or does not place add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and National Policy.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Cogent land LLP	Iceni Projects Ltd (Paul Drew)	TDS_25	Full Document	Not stated	The Design Strategy SPD provides a good foundation for improving and enhancing the Borough's natural, built and historic environment. It could be made all the more robust as a tool to assist both design teams when producing proposals and case officers when assessing them to ensure that the Design Strategy accords with the aims of Thurrock Council to substantially raise design standards across the Borough. Central to this is ensuring that that all opportunities to cross reference to sustainable development contained within national policy in the form of the NPPF are taken, the classifications of typologies do not restrict sustainable growth, and that specific language is able to be qualified, with generalisations being avoided. In conclusion, with the suggested changes outlined above, Cogent Land LLP welcome this design guidance and are committed to raising the standard of design throughout Thurrock. We trust you find this consultation response helpful and look forward to working alongside Thurrock Council and other stakeholders in developing a robust Design Strategy SPD.	Comments noted.	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and National Policy.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_26	Full Document	Not stated	Urbanissta Ltd has been instructed by Keepmoat South to submit representations to the Thurrock Council Design Strategy Consultation. Keepmoat has an interest in the Site that is located at the Former Treetops School site at Dell Road, Grays. They also have an interest in land that has been advertised as the Corner Site, which is located on the corner of Dell Road with Orsett Road. The Treetops site is the subject of a planning application and is shown at Appendix 1 to these representations. Representations are made on a number of specific points: • Paragraph 1.11 • Policy B5 • Paragraph 3.37 • Paragraph 3.48 • Section D - Building in Sustainability • Paragraph 3.60 • D3 - Sustainable Drainage • Paragraph 4.18 • Typology 5 point 3 • Paragraph 5.5 • Paragraph 5.6 • Paragraph 5.16 Representations in relation to each of the above points will be dealt with separately below. Overall, it is considered that the Design Strategy is in instances negative in its drafting and there are concerns that it has an inflexible and restrictive approach to design may impact upon the prospects of securing the timely and effective delivery of new development.	Comments noted. It is recognised that the language within the document needs to make clear what is required of developers and what we encourage/promote and support as good practice. The word require should only be used where a statement is directly linked to policies within the Core Strategy and/or does not place add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and National Policy.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_27	Paragraph 1.11	Not stated	Providing guidance on the design process having regard to the context of a site, ensuring that proposals are embedded within an understanding of place and thereby avoiding anonymous, 'off-the-peg' schemes is considered overly prescriptive in terms of the manner in which the design process should take place. The design process needs to have regard to the site and it's surroundings and context, this includes architectural content. The design of new development needs to acknowledge respect and respond positively to surrounding development, but it also needs to be buildable and saleable. Standard housing product can in many instances provide a good design solution for a site and as such should not be 'ruled out' by the Design Strategy. Paragraph 1.11 should provide suitably flexibility to enable all types of development to be considered on site where this responds and relates favourably to the local vernacular.	Disagree, if it can be demonstrated by an applicant that a standard house typology is the most appropriate design in the context of an individual site then it will satisfy the conditions of Para 1.11. It should also be noted that Para 1.11 does not seek to impose a particular architectural style and could also be applied to layout issues such as ensuring that a dwelling appropriately addresses a corner.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_28	Objective B5	Not stated	Objective B5 seeks to identify and incorporate green infrastructure, existing open spaces and wider networks as part of a robust landscape framework. Whilst landscape is a significant component of any development proposal, the objectives of Policy B5 are slightly misleading, as it is not always possible for development to provide open spaces that link into and create wider open space networks, particularly where they form part of the urban area. Clearly where such opportunities are possible these will be included within the design rationale and review for a site, however such objective cannot be considered to be a 'requirement' of development as they might not always be appropriate or possible in some developments. Greater clarity is required within the Design Strategy in relation to this matter.	Agree. The language used within Objective B5 could be amended to make it clearer what is expected of developers and recognise that on smaller sites it may not be practical or appropriate to include open space on site.	Review Objective B5 and amend where appropriate.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_29	Paragraph 3.37	Not stated	Paragraph 3.37 states that the Council will reject proposals that have not fully considered the importance of open space. Paragraph 3.37 is negative in its drafting. It is not appropriate for this Design Strategy to be setting out the cases for refusing development, it is the role of the development plan which would set out that there are alternative approaches to open space provision including commuted sums.	Agree, in part. The language used within Objective B5 could be amended to make it clearer what is expected of developers and recognise that on smaller sites it may not be practical or appropriate to include open space on site. It should be noted that the role of a Supplementary Planning Document is to provide additional guidance on the implementation of policy which includes national policy as well as policies within the Core Strategy, where appropriate this can include setting out reasons for refusal.	Review Objective B5 and amend where appropriate.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_30	Paragraph 3.48	Not stated	Paragraph 3.48 states that: "Thurrock Council will also require street trees to be incorporated as part of the hierarchy of streets in all developments". The requirement for street trees in all development is considered too prescriptive, as there may be instances where the provision of street trees is not possible for highways or other technical reasons. The Design Strategy should seek to encourage such opportunities where site circumstances and constraints allow. The requirement for street trees in new development would need to be considered in the context of the overall management of the site as well as overall siting of development in relation to the location of visibility splays, drives and front/back gardens.	Comments noted. It is recognised that the language within the document needs to make clear what is required of developers and what we encourage/promote and support as good practice. The word require should only be used where a statement is directly linked to policies within the Core Strategy and/or does not place add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and National Policy.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_31	Section 3 - Part D	Not stated	Section D of the Design Strategy sets out the Council's preferred approach for sustainable design in new buildings. The Design Guide should reflect the Council's approach to the optional technical standards in light of the National Housing Review 2015. Policies within the Core Strategy Focused Review relating to water and energy efficiency are to be interpreted by reference to the nearest national equivalent standard. In conjunction with the Local Plan, the Design Strategy can assist in clarifying the Council's preferred approach to relevant standards to ensure that development complies from the outset.	Comment Noted. The Design Strategy cannot introduce new policies. Adoption of the Optional Technical Standards will be explored as part of ongoing work on the emerging Local Plan.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_32	Paragraph 3.60	Not stated	Paragraph 3.60 sets out that a site appraisal will identify opportunities for on-site energy to be provided as part of proposals and that sites may be able to be development with their own heat and power system. The potential for combined heat and power would need to be assessed on its own merits in the context of the site size, overall applicability, viability of such uses and the relationship with existing and proposed adjacent uses in terms of noise and impact on amenity. These considerations should be set out clearly within Strategy.	Agree, in part. The language used within Objective D2 could be amended to make it clearer what is expected of developer/applicant.	Review Objective D2 and amend where appropriate.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_33	Paragraph 3.63	Not stated	Paragraph 3.63 states that site assessments will reveal the scope for integrating SUDs into development. Paragraph 3.63 should be amended to include reference to circumstances where underlying ground conditions would also mean that SUDs are not a suitable means of dealing with flood risk and that alternative methods for dealing with flood risk could be adopted.	Disagree, Paragraph 3.63 indicates that applicants should assess the potential it does not require the use of sustainable drainage measures. As such it is flexible enough to respond to concerns raised.	No action required.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_34	Section 4 - Residential Neighbourhoods	Not stated	Point 5 "Thurrock Council will expect proposals for Residential Neighbourhoods to incorporate a number of character areas differentiating one location from another with the number of character areas and this is dependent on context and the size of the scheme being proposed." In this case, it is considered that the Council would need to set out the size and scale of development that is applicable for providing character areas.	Disagree, a residential neighbourhood could consist of several smaller sites with each contributing towards the wider character of the neighbourhood.	No action required.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_35	Section 4 - Village Locations	Not stated	In identifying the village typology the Design Strategy states that: Proposals coming forward within these locations are likely to be more limited to include small scale infill and redevelopment proposals. It is not considered appropriate for this Design Strategy to be advocating the spatial approach to development in Thurrock, this is the role of the Local Plan which will set out the Spatial Strategy. Depending upon the strategy, village extensions may be a suitable approach to housing delivery. This Design Guide is therefore prejudicing the Spatial Strategy of the Local plan and should be removed. Paragraph 4.18 would need to be deleted, as it is not the role of the Design Strategy to identify the size and scale of development.	Agree that it is not appropriate for the Design Strategy to dictate the spatial strategy. However, the statement made in relation to village locations reinforces the spatial strategy set out in the Core Strategy.	No action required.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_36	Section 4 - Village Locations	Not stated	In setting out the key design requirement for village locations, the guide advocates a contemporary interpretation of character within village locations. Contemporary design is not always the most appropriate approach in new development particularly within village locations where there is a greater relationship with local rural architectural characteristics. For example in the context of a Conservation Area or a landscaped area, it might be that a more traditional design style would related better to existing development. Again, we object to the prescriptive approach being applied to village development within the Design Strategy and suggest that a more open and flexible approach to the design solution for a site being determined in a site-by-site, case-by-case basis. Point 3 of the design requirements for village locations should be amended to reflect that contemporary interpretation of character would need to be considered in the context of the overall site and its location and that traditional styles may also remain appropriate design solutions.	Agree that contemporary design may not always be the most appropriate solution but the wording within point 3 is clear that contemporary design is encouraged not required.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_37	Paragraph 5.5-5.6	Not stated	<p>The Design Strategy sets out that a Design Review may assess 'larger scale' projects. The Design Strategy should ideally provide greater clarity as to the framework for the Design Review as this can have implications on project cost and timescales for bringing forward development proposals. It would also be advantageous if a 'major project' or 'larger scale' project was defined and the criteria identified that would trigger a development to be taken to Design Review Panel.</p> <p>The Design Strategy should include more detailed information regarding the Design Review Panel.</p>	Agree, in part. It is appreciated that more information on the design review process would be useful however including additional information within the document may date the document if the process changes.	Include a reference to information about design reviews on Council's website in the text.
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_38	Paragraph 5.16	Not stated	<p>Paragraph 5.16 of the Design Strategy states: "Thurrock Council will resist subsequent proposals for minor amendments or to vary extant permissions or conditions that are likely to undermine their design quality." We would object to the Council's approach to restricting the use of minor amendments in planning applications. The Council are applying an inflexible approach to overall development proposals which may impact upon development coming forward, and this paragraph should be more positive in its drafting and not seek to compromise an established element of the planning process – in securing minor or minor material amendments to previously consented schemes. There may be instances, for example an outline development, where minor amendments may be required to improve the overall siting of development or amend the palette of materials that are more agreeable to the local context.</p>	Disagree, the intention of para 5.16 is to resist minor amendments that reduce the design quality of a scheme. As explained in your comment not all minor amendments will result in a loss of quality and these types of amendments would still be deemed acceptable.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Keepmoat Homes (South)	Urbanissta (Jo Hanslip)	TDS_39	Full Document	Not stated	<p>Keepmoat have serious concerns that the Design Strategy in its current format is too negative in it's drafting and in instances, overly prescriptive. This may have consequences on the ability of development proposals to come forward in a timely manner. Keepmoat would request that the Council revisit specific sections on open space, the use of SUDS, on site heat and power networks and street trees. Currently, the Council have applied an inflexible approach to on site infrastructure but it is considered that these points are reviewed with the strategy setting out alternative approaches to the provision of these types of infrastructure as in some cases it is not possible to provide these on site. The Council should also set out within this Design Strategy, their approach to the implementation of the relevant Building Regulation Standards. The Design Strategy should also be revisited to include more details on the framework for requirement to attend Design Review Panel, as there is currently no information on thresholds, types or scale of developments to which such an obligation will be imposed. Attendance at a Design Review Panel will have cost and timescale implications for developers and will impact upon the delivery of development within the Borough. Thurrock Council has suffered from low levels of housing delivery for a number of years and viability restrictions constraint the delivery of many sites within the Council's administrative area. Any proposals, which seek to further constraint or control development have the potential to impact upon delivery and/or result in additional costs being borne by developments. This risks further delays to the delivery of much needed housing in Thurrock. The Design Strategy should be reviewed to ensure that whilst establishing a framework for ensuring good design within the Thurrock area, it is also positively prepared and drafted so as to support and encourage new developments to be brought forward within the Borough. As currently prepared, it is not considered that the Design Strategy has the balance quite right and as such we consider the document should be amended as detailed in our representations above.</p>	<p>Agree, in part. Some of the language used within the Design Strategy could be amended to improve clarity and worded in a more positive way. With regards to including additional information on the design review process and building regulations the document will be amended to signpost information on the Council's website. Design reviews are encouraged through the National Planning Policy Framework as such the requirement for significant development proposals to be assessed against this process remains valid.</p>	<p>Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and National Policy.</p>

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_40	Full Document	Not stated	<p>Persimmon Homes is a FTSE 100 house builder with a national presence. Persimmon Homes has a strong commitment to Thurrock and welcomes the opportunity to comment on Thurrock’s Draft Design Strategy SPD. Paragraph 1.10 of the document states that the Design Strategy will be used as a “tool to inform and assess proposals within existing locations, at all scales, from small infill sites through to larger regeneration and redevelopment schemes. It will also be used on new comprehensive development sites and master planning projects as and when they come forward within the Borough. It does not establish a rigid blueprint but a framework within which well-designed proposals can be shaped and assessed”. Having regard to the above, the Design Strategy SPD is intended to be used in advance of the production and adoption of the new Local Plan for Thurrock, which is timetabled for adoption in 2020. There are areas of conflict and contradiction between Thurrock’s Draft Design Strategy SPD (2016) and the adopted Development Plan, namely the Thurrock LDF Core Strategy (2011). Furthermore, in certain instances it is not clear that what is advocated, and in some instances prescribed, in the Thurrock’s Draft Design Strategy SPD would allow development to accord with adopted development plan policies. It is not clear in some instances the Policy basis for what is being sought within the SPD. The conflict and contradiction between Policy documents is unhelpful, confusing and needs to be addressed. The SPD should not seek to (a) re-write policy, (b) seek to set standards at odds with policy (c) have the effect of rendering development incapable of meeting adopted policy, (d) render development unviable. Statute is clear regarding the primacy of the development plan and the SPD needs to be reviewed in light of this; - Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 obliges the decision maker to have regards to the provision of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material consideration. - Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that, if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination under the planning acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The SPD should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in the Adopted Development Plan, the LDF Core Strategy (2011). Para 028 of the Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that ‘They [SPD’s] should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on the policies in the Local Plan. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development’. Para 153 of the Planning Practice Guidance (Plan Making – Local Plans) warns Local Authorities not to use SPD’s to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. ‘Para 153 - Each local planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. This can be reviewed in whole or in part to respond flexibly to changing circumstances. Any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified. Supplementary planning documents should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development’. Whilst we are supportive of achieving good</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Design Strategy is intended to guide applicants on the implementation of policies within the Core Strategy including Policy PMD2. It is recognised that the language within the document could be improved to make clear what is required of developers and what we encourage/promote and support as good practice. With the word require used only where a statement is directly linked to policies within the Core Strategy and/or does not place add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. In determining if financial implications are unnecessary the Council will consider policies within the national policies and guidance and the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and national policy.</p>

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
					design, we are concerned that the SPD seeks to place additional costs on development in the Borough. Furthermore, that there has been no assessment of the impact of such measures both individually or cumulatively. Additional costs would impact development viability, deter investment and delivery. Thurrock has a significant shortage in housing when measured against housing targets. In certain instances, the draft SPD is highlighting or referring to documents that formed the evidence based for the LDF Core Strategy which themselves are out of date. This is particularly the case in terms of open space assessment, Green Grid and Green Infrastructure. Furthermore, such documents fail to satisfactorily identify open space requirements and what strategic allocations are identified to deliver in terms of GI. Whilst Persimmon Homes welcome the production of the draft SPD, presently we have concerns regarding lack of consistency with the adopted development plan policies and the, prima facie, lack of consideration of and potential impact upon development viability. Notwithstanding the above, it is not clear as to the timescale for the proposed introduction of this document. Furthermore, whether it will be used from the period of adoption and if so, whether it will apply to schemes pending determination. Upon adoption it would be considered unreasonable to seek to apply this document to schemes that have been submitted or are in the later stages of pre-application discussion. Furthermore, purchasing decisions and options are often taken out on sites significantly before planning applications are advanced. It would seem reasonable to only introduce such guidance after providing an advanced period of notice.		
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_41	Paragraph 3.14	Not stated	Paragraph 3.14 seeks to create new and improved green spaces within development proposals. The requirement does not stipulate a standard or quantum that the Council will seek to achieve and as such is vague and not helpful. The Council does not have a clear standard which it applies. The standard contained in the Thurrock Local Plan (1997) Annex would not allow for the densities of development prescribed within the LDF Core Strategy (2011).	Comments noted. The Council is currently in the process of preparing its Active Place Strategy which looks at needs for open space, pitch, and built leisure facilities across the borough. Once finalised, piece of work will inform policies within the emerging Local Plan and future Supplementary Planning Documents.	No action required.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_42	Paragraph 3.10	Not stated	The Design Strategy SPD seeks to “ensure that the Borough’s biodiversity and habitats are protected and enhanced’. This requirement goes beyond the test in the NPPF, paragraph 109 stating “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising the impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible”. There is no justification within the document for applying a higher threshold than the NPPF.	Comments noted. The Council does not consider the phrasing used in paragraph 3.10 to exceed the threshold stipulated in the National Planning Policy Framework.	No action required.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_43	Paragraph 3.15	Not stated	Paragraph 3.15 requires applications to appraise how proposals can work with existing site features and incorporate them into the green infrastructure that forms a robust landscape framework. Persimmon Homes notes that the Council's evidence base in relation to Green Infrastructure is; a) outdated, b) confusing in so much that there is a variety of Green Grid documents that have contradictory proposals and c) does not explain what will be sought, practically with regards to off-site works. The Council must ensure that the evidence base used to support the SPD document and the emerging Local Plan is up to date. This is a key requirement of paragraph 158 of the NPPF which states that "each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up to date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area". In terms of the bullets under para 3.15, one way in which GI is to be achieved is through the delivery of SUDs and water attenuation. It should be recognised that SUDs are not always achievable, particularly on brownfield sites.	Comments noted. The Design Strategy is intended to guide applicants on the implementation of policies within the Core Strategy and should be read alongside other key documents and evidence. The Council is currently in the process of updating its evidence when finalised these documents will be made available on the Council's website. With regards to the use of sustainable drainage systems, Paragraph 3.63 indicates that applicants should assess the potential it does not require the use of sustainable drainage measures. As such it is flexible enough to respond to concerns raised.	No action required.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_44	Paragraph 3.20	Not stated	Paragraph 3.20 seeks proposals to have regard to the prevailing density of an area. Policy CSTP1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011) prescribes density ranges for new development. The Design Strategy should have regard for these and direct the developer to this policy (see above comments regarding consistency with development plan policies). Paragraph 17 of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land. Whilst this relates to brownfield development, the same approach should be adopted for greenfield sites. This requirement could result in an inefficient use of land, purely on the basis that surrounding development is of a low density. The appropriate density should be informed by the development plan policies. Clearly there is a role for pre-application discussions between the developer and the Council to ensure that paragraph 17 is adhered to.	Agree. Paragraph 3.20 could be expanded to include other aspects that should be considered when determining an appropriate density for a site including aspects such as accessibility and the need to make efficient use of land.	Amend paragraph 3.20 to make reference to other factors that can influence site density.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_45	Paragraph 3.22	Not stated	Paragraph 3.22 refers to 'raising the bar' for design quality in areas that have a 'less distinct' or 'attractive character'. It is not clear what is meant by 'less distinct', less distinct than what? The test for proposals should be about whether the scheme is a 'high quality design' in line with paragraph 17 of the NPPF. The terminology used in the draft Design Strategy would suggest that the design quality would always need to increase from development to development. This is unduly onerous, allows for the shifting of goal posts and may render development unviable.	Agree, in part. The intention of this paragraph is to ensure that new developments in areas of poor and unattractive design promote a higher design quality than the surrounding area.	Amend paragraph 3.22 to ensure that the intention of the paragraph and the implications for development proposals are clear.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_46	Page 28	Not stated	Page 28 of the document describes 'a typical residential neighbourhood'. It is not clear of these 6 points relate to schemes which have been delivered in the borough or whether they are aspirations. We have the following issues: 1. The quantum and type of open space sought is not detailed either in this document or elsewhere in the development plan. 2. The majority of sites identified in the LDF-CS do not overlook the waterside. This is not a typical residential neighbourhood. 3. This point lacks clarity. It needs to recognise that parking is needed and will have an impact on appearance. 5. It should be recognised that the introduction of commercial uses may not be appropriate having regard to; a) location, b) demand and c) viability. There is no Policy support in the LDF-CS requiring the introduction of live / work or mixed use development on residentially allocated sites. 6. The term 'variety of houses' needs further explanation. Does it relate to housing mix, tenure or design?	Comments noted. The image shown is a well designed residential neighbourhood and represents what could be delivered in the borough. The annotation is not intended to be a description of what a typical residential neighbourhood is it is a way of communicating visually how some of the aspects set out in the strategy can be interpreted. However, it is appreciated that this is not necessarily made clear by the title of the image.	Review diagram captions and ensure that the new phrasing highlights the fact that the image is an example of what can be achieved.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_47	Paragraph 3.37	Not stated	Paragraph 3.37 states that it will reject proposals that have not fully considered the importance of open space as an integral part of the development layout. This reads like a policy but provides no basis for making this statement. What does 'fully considered' mean? As detailed above, there is a fundamental lack of guidance in relation to open space requirements both within this document, the development plan and associated evidence base.	Agree, in part. The language used within Objective B5 could be amended to make it clearer what is expected of developers and recognise that on smaller sites it may not be practical or appropriate to include open space on site. It should be noted that the role of a Supplementary Planning Document is to provide additional guidance on the implementation of policy which includes national policy as well as policies within the Core Strategy, where appropriate this can include setting out reasons for refusal.	Review Objective B5 and amend where appropriate.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_48	Paragraph 3.48 and 3.56	Not stated	Paragraph 3.48 and 3.56 requires proposals to incorporate street trees as part of the hierarchy of streets in all developments and reduce the visual impact, particularly for on street parking provision or where substantial areas of car parking are required for a particular use or mix of uses. This requirement is too prescriptive and does not have regard to the sites circumstances and the ability of such an arrangement to achieve the density targets set out in the LDF-Core Strategy (2011).	Agree, in part. It is appreciated that street trees may not be appropriate in every circumstance but the onus is placed on the applicant to demonstrate this. Comments relating to the impact of street trees on density are deemed to be unfounded as there are plenty of examples across the country including Thurrock where street trees have been used in higher density schemes.	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and National Policy.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_49	Section 3 - Part D	Not stated	Section D relates to sustainable design. The requirement for certain design features is not supported by adopted development plan policy and therefore can not be insisted upon. The need for sustainable design features must also have regard for the sites circumstances and adopted development plan policy.	Comments noted. It is recognised that the language within the document could be improved to make clear what is required of developers and what we encourage/promote and support as good practice. With the word	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy and national policy.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
						require used only where a statement is directly linked to policies within the Core Strategy and/or does not place add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.	
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_50	Section 3	Not stated	This section sets out Thurrock Council's requirements regarding assessing the context of a site, including a checklist of key questions that need to be addressed as part of the design process. The section is illustrated with examples from within the Borough and elsewhere. Persimmon Homes has no comments on this section.	Comments noted.	No action required.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_51	Section 4 - Urban Areas	Not stated	A typical secondary street is described as having street tree planting and wide pavements. See our comments in section 2 relating to street tree planting. The presence for wide pavements rules out shared surface streets. This is not necessary, unduly prescriptive and contrary to Manual for Street and the Essex Design Guide.	Comments noted. The image shown is a well designed secondary street and represents what could be delivered in the borough. The annotation is not intended to be a description of what a typical residential neighbourhood is it is a way of communicating visually how some of the aspects set out in the strategy can be interpreted. However, it is appreciated that this is not necessarily made clear by the title of the image.	Review diagram captions and ensure that the new phrasing highlights the fact that the image is an example of what can be achieved.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_52	Section 4 - Residential Areas	Not stated	This section states that residential neighbourhood must provide a range of different housing reflecting local need, include a range of tenure and affordable homes. This is being prescriptive and needs to relate to development plan policies which support this approach. The draft Design Guide does not recognise that development viability can impact on tenure and affordability which is recognised and reflected in adopted policy. The requirement that a range of different housing 'must' be provided is to prescriptive and does not reflect national policy.	Comments noted. It is important that new housing schemes respond appropriately to local housing needs. The latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that there is a need for a mix of house types across the borough with the greatest need being for 2/3 bed terraced/town houses. The Design Strategy is simply reinforcing this message.	No action required.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_53	Section 4 - Residential Areas	Not stated	A higher density development will be acceptable around locations with good public transport accessibility. What is meant by a higher density in this context? The document needs to have regard to Policy CSTP1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011).	Policy CSTP1 indicates that new residential development should be led by the design standards set in a subsequent SPD and that in centres and areas of high public transport accessibility a minimum of 60dph will be sought. The Design Strategy SPD adds additional guidance around how the density of scheme should be determined but does not seek to propose specific targets.	Amend paragraph 3.20 to make reference to other factors that can influence site density.

Consultee	Agent	Comment ID	Consultation Point	Comment Type	Comment justification and suggested changes	Officer Response:	Proposed Actions:
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_54	Section 4 - Residential Areas	Not stated	A typical Tertiary Street is described as having 'parking discretely accommodated'. This is too vague and open to interpretation. The document should not rule out a range of parking typologies. If the document is advocating an approach, it would be useful to set out examples at the density ranges required in the LDF Core Strategy.	Comments noted. The image shown is a well designed tertiary street and represents what could be delivered in the borough. The annotation is not intended to be a description of what a typical residential neighbourhood is it is a way of communicating visually how some of the aspects set out in the strategy can be interpreted. However, it is appreciated that this is not necessarily made clear by the title of the image. Additional more specific standards relating to parking provision and design will be consulted upon in 2017.	Review diagram captions and ensure that the new phrasing highlights the fact that the image is an example of what can be achieved.
Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies)		TDS_55	Full Document	Not stated	The document does not have sufficient regard to development plan policies which should underpin the guidance. The document does not take the opportunity to address fundamental gaps in guidance in Thurrock, such as guidance on open space requirements. It refers to documents that are themselves out of date and do not provide effective guidance as to what is sought (see comments on GI and Green Grid as an example) It is not clear how the document, including the measures sought and prescriptions therein, has had regard to paragraph 173 and paragraph 174 of the NPPF and therefore can not be considered in conformity with national policy.	Comments noted. The Design Strategy is intended to guide applicants on the implementation of policies within the Core Strategy including Policy PMD2. It is recognised that the language within the document could be improved to make clear what is required of developers and what we encourage/promote and support as good practice. With the word require used only where a statement is directly linked to policies within the Core Strategy and/or does not place add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. In determining if financial implications are unnecessary the Council will consider policies within the national policies and guidance and the Core Strategy. With regards to references to specific evidence documents these will be replaced to make the document more flexible and response to emerging evidence as it is published.	Review document and ensure that the language used is consistent and appropriate in the context of the Core Strategy, national policy and emerging evidence.

5 January 2017	ITEM: 9
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Highways and Transportation Capital Programme 2017/18	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key Decision
Report of: Les Burns, Chief Highways Engineer, Transportation & Highways	
Accountable Head of Service: Ann Osola, Head of Transportation & Highways	
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Corporate Director of Environment & Place	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

This report sets out the proposed programme of work which will utilise the capital funding allocations available to the Highways & Transportation Service within the 2017/18 financial year, for Scrutiny Committee comment.

The report covers the funding allocations to be received from the Department for Transport (DfT) annual capital settlement, Council's own investment, schemes funded by local development and the Local Growth Fund (LGF). It sets out the proposed programme of approximately £38.5 million that the Highways & Transportation Service plans to deliver in the 2017/18 financial year.

1. Recommendation(s)

That the Committee:

- 1.1 Considers the proposed Highways and Transportation Capital Programme 2017/18 (as detailed in Appendix 1) and comments with a view to informing the final programme.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 This report seeks comments on the 2017/18 Highways & Transport Capital Programme to inform the preparation of the final programme. The programme is to maintain and enhance the highways, transport infrastructure and service provision within Thurrock.
- 2.2 The programme set out in the Appendix 1 presents the prioritised list of projects funded from the Department for Transport (DfT) allocation, Thurrock

Council's Highways Asset Capital Allocation (as approved by February 2015 Cabinet), Local Growth Fund (LGF) allocations of £1.67 million to deliver the second tranche of the cycling infrastructure plan, £3 million for Stanford-le-Hope Interchange and £28 million for A13 widening (subject to funding body approval of full business cases) and various s106 funded schemes.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 3.1 The proposed programme of work is funded from a number of different sources. The DfT annual settlement provides allocations for Maintenance and for Integrated Transport schemes. Local Growth Fund schemes are allocated separately on the basis of successful bids. Section 106 developer contributions for capital highway schemes are included. The total capital programme allocation amounts to approximately **£38.5 million**.

Department for Transport Capital Settlement

- 3.2 The Department for Transport (DfT) have allocated a total capital settlement of **£2,892,000** for transport improvements in the 2017/18 financial year to Thurrock Council. This settlement is allocated as **£971,000** for Integrated Transport schemes (e.g. bus priority, safety management and cycling schemes) and **£1,921,000** for Maintenance.

Thurrock Council Investment

- 3.3 Historically, the Council has relied upon its Department for Transport (DfT) capital funding allocation for providing capital improvements to its highway infrastructure. Following a review of highways asset conditions in line with 'whole life costing' principles, in February 2015, Council approved an allocation of **£4 million** over 3 years of its own capital funding to undertake preventative maintenance as a means of alleviating pressures on revenue budgets. The 2017/18 capital programme includes the allocation of **£1,550,000** of this allocation.

Scheme Outcomes

- 3.4 The benefits of some schemes will overlap due to the nature of work delivered to assist in the delivery of Council and service objectives. For example, traffic management schemes will deliver air quality benefits while walking and cycling schemes can help to reduce congestion, improve local air quality and assist healthy options.
- 3.5 Table 1 below provides a summary of how the DfT Capital Settlement and Council Capital Allocation funding is allocated across the works programme amounting to a total of **£4,442,000**. (Further detail is provided in Appendix 1)

Table 1

Maintenance	
Bridge Repair and Strengthening	£750,000
Principal Road Maintenance A class roads	£700,000
Other Classified Road Maintenance B & C class roads	£472,000
Unclassified Roads Maintenance	£422,000
Footway / Cycleway Maintenance	£275,000
Street Lighting	£75,000
Other Infrastructure (drainage)	£327,000
Traffic Signals upgrades	£300,000
Road Markings	£75,000
Safety Barriers	£75,000
Total	£3,471,000
Integrated Transport	
Freight Management	£200,000
Traffic Management	£200,000
Road Safety Engineering	£200,000
Public Transport Infrastructure	£55,000
Safer Routes to Schools	£60,000
Public Rights of Way	£25,000
Parking	£231,000
Total	£971,000

Local Growth Fund (LGF) schemes

3.6 Following the bidding process for the Local Growth Fund, Thurrock Council has a further £32,670,000 capital budget allocation to be delivered in 2017/18. The funding for this year includes:

- Confirmed allocation of:
 - **£1.67 million** of Tranche 2 Cycling Infrastructure delivery programme; and
- Provisional allocation:
 - **£3 million** of £12.5 million Stanford-le-Hope Infrastructure scheme;
 - **£28 million** of £75 million A13 widening scheme.

The business case for Stanford-le-Hope Interchange is currently being progressed for South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) approval with a decision to be confirmed at the February 2017 Accountability Board.

The business case for A13 widening is in the process of Department for Transport (DfT) approval with decision expected at the end of January 2017.

The precise 2017/18 allocation will depend on the date of any decision and the financial profile for each scheme.

Developer Contributions (Section 106)

- 3.7 The Council will also receive approximately **£1.5 million** of developer contributions for the 2017/18 programme. Contributions are received from developers in order to enhance the transport network and to fund required infrastructure. There is some flexibility in the final allocations, due to the nature of the developer agreements. Details of the schemes programmed for delivery in 2017/18 are set out in Appendix 1.

Variations

- 3.8 The Council receives regular requests for maintenance and improvements to be carried out on the transport network. These requests are prioritised using the agreed scheme determination process with the responsibility to authorise recommendations delegated to the Corporate Director of Environment & Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Highways & Transport.
- 3.9 Capital maintenance allocations may need to be revised to address issues such as urgent work following problems on the network or to quickly respond to investigation reports. This could include works to protect the public from risk of injury.
- 3.10 Similarly, schemes that are listed within the approved composite programme may be subject to cost changes. This might occur for a number of internal or external reasons, including increase to the scope of a project (to enable better outcome or value) and reassessment of the cost estimate for the works following local investigation or from stakeholder consultation. The programme is managed so that the level of the total expenditure is within the funding allocation.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 This Committee's consideration of this report and the provision of comments on the proposed programme and governance arrangements will inform the finalised delivery programme.
- 4.2 These proposals will enable the 2017/18 Highways & Transportation Capital Programme, including the LGF programme and S106 measures, to be implemented. The delivery of the programme will ensure the ongoing maintenance of the highway network and improvements to transport infrastructure and service provision within the Borough.
- 4.3 Delivery of the LSTF, Cycling Infrastructure and Stanford-le-Hope Interchange section of the LGF schemes will support the Council's ongoing commitment to sustainable travel and Smarter Choices by enhancing key locations and public transport routes across the Borough. The A13 widening scheme would mark

the start of the construction works which would help Thurrock and the South East enable economic growth and regeneration.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 The capital programme has been developed as a result of the extensive community and stakeholder engagement process for the Thurrock Transport Strategy and the Implementation Plan. The maintenance element of the programme has been developed in response to findings of inspections and specialist surveys relating to the highway network prioritised in accordance with HMEP process.
- 5.2 Local residents, interest groups and key stakeholders have been influential in providing the evidence base that has informed the development of the Highways and Transport Capital Programme, and all Ward Members will be advised of works affecting their respective wards.
- 5.3 The LGF element of the programme was subject to extensive consultation with local residents, key stakeholders, transport user groups and neighbouring authorities as the LGF bids were developed.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 The Highways and Transportation Capital Programme will have a positive impact upon the local community within Thurrock. It will improve and enhance the transport network across the borough making it safer, less congested and more accessible to local people thereby promoting investment, job creation and access to skills and learning. Delivery of the programme will assist Thurrock's aspiration to create a great place for learning and opportunity, fulfilling its socio-economic potential and enhancing its sense of 'place' where businesses and retail grow and where vibrant and diverse communities live, meet and do business.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Mark Terry**
Senior Financial Accountant

The Department for Transport (DfT) have allocated a total capital settlement of **£2,892,000** for transport improvements in the 2017/18 financial year to Thurrock Council. The cost of implementation will be contained within the funding announced by Government or built into future capital programmes.

The report also includes Thurrock's own capital funding allocation of £1.55 million for 2017/18, as part of the allocation of £4 million over 3 year spending approved by Council in February 2015.

The Council's LGF allocation has also been identified within this report which includes: £1.67 million of Cycling Infrastructure delivery programme, £3 million of Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project and £28 million of A13 widening scheme.

Section 106 schemes will be delivered within the budgets identified.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Vivien Williams**
Planning & Regeneration Solicitor

The proposed programme supports the Council in discharging its obligation for the maintenance of its highways asset as set out under the 1980 Highways Act.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Warren**
Community Development and Equalities Manager

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the 2017/18 Highways & Transport Capital Programme. It recognises the transport interventions that will support improved quality of life in the Borough and its social and economic regeneration as well as transport priorities for, congestion & CO2 mitigation, accessibility, safety, air quality and climate change adaptation.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None

8. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

February 2015 Capital Programme Bid Cabinet report.

9. Appendices to the report

Appendix 1 – 2017/18 Highways & Transportation Capital Programme.

Report Author:

Les Burns
Chief Highways Engineer
Transportation & Highways

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1 - Highways & Transport Capital Works Programme 2017-18			
Allocations	DfT Maintenance block allocation	DfT	1,921,000
	Thurrock Council Maintenance Capital (£4M 2015/16 - 2017-18) 2017/18 allocation	TC	1,550,000
	Total Maintenance		3,471,000
	Integrated Transport Block allocation.	ITB	971,000
	Section 106	S106	1,453,613
	2017/18 LGF allocation	LGF	32,670,000
	TOTAL		38,565,613
Cost Code	Project	Funding Source	Budget
E2828	LTP Maintenance - Bridges		
	No 1076 Derby Road parapet repairs	TC	150,000
	No 1771 Corringham Road Bridge edge protection	TC	150,000
	No. 1028 Larfarge - Brick repair	TC	100,000
	No 194 Stanford le Hope - Concrete repairs	TC	100,000
	Sifford Road - HGV restriction	TC	50,000
	Fenner Road, Chafford Hundred	TC	100,000
	Botany Way, Purfleet	TC	100,000
Sub Total			750,000
E2826	LTP Maintenance - Principal Maintenance (Resurfacing / Reconstruction)		
	A126 Marshfoot Road	TC	12,800
	A1306 Arterial Road	DfT	189,000
	A126 Eastern Way	TC	12,800
	A1089 Ferry Road	DfT	35,800
	A126 Dock Road/ Calcutta	TC	43,500
	A1013 Palmers Avenue	DfT	54,700
	A126 Bridge Road, Grays	DfT	28,800
	A1012 Elizabeth Road, Grays	DfT	67,700
	A126 London Road,	DfT	56,289
	A1306 Arterial Road	TC	12,800
	A1013 Stanford Road, Linford	DfT	74,000
	A1013 Stanford Road, Grays	TC	30,511
	A1014 Corringham	TC	25,500
	A1014 Manorway, Fobbing	TC	15,500
	A1090 Tank Hill Road	TC	12,300
	A126 London Road, South Stifford	DfT	28,000
Sub Total			700,000
E2827	LTP Maintenance - Other Classified Road Maintenance (Resurfacing / Reconstruction)		
	Church Road, Bulphan	DfT	80,700
	Lower Dunton Road	DfT	10,100
	High Road, Fobbing	DfT	30,500
	Southend Road, Stanford-le-Hope	DfT	15,200
	B149 Chadwell Hill	DfT	11,200
	B149 Woodview	DfT	15,800
	B188 Conways Road	DfT	12,300
	B1335 Stifford Road, South Ockendon	DfT	16,300
	Lodge Lane, Grays	DfT	15,211
	Dock Road, Tilbury	DfT	11,200
	Brentwood Road, Chadwell St Mary	DfT	74,100
	Riverview, Chadwell St Mary	DfT	35,800
	Linford Road, Chadwell St Mary	DfT	16,300
	Muckingford Road	DfT	12,800
	Stifford Clays Road	DfT	19,400
	Corringham Road	DfT	14,300
	Princess Margaret Road, East Tilbury	TC	11,200
	Orsett Road, Orsett & Horndon	TC	54,200
	High Road, Horndon	TC	15,389
Sub Total			472,000
E2874	LTP Maintenance - Unclassified (Resurfacing / Reconstruction)		
	School Lane, Orsett	DfT	52,000
	Lodge Lane, Service Road	TC	23,500
	Grove Road, Grays	DfT	36,500
	Dunnings Lane	DfT	50,000
	Motherwell Road	DfT	40,000
	Godman Road	DfT	50,000
	Cedar Road	TC	30,000
	Feenan Highway	DfT	50,000
	King Edward Drive	DfT	30,000
	Buckingham Hill Road	DfT	60,000
Sub Total			422,000
E2876	LTP Maintenance - Footway & Cycleway Maintenance		
	Godman Road, Chadwell St Mary	DfT	40,000
	Cedar Road, Chadwell St Mary	DfT	35,000
	Waldon, East Tilbury	DfT	20,000
	Clyde, East Tilbury	DfT	20,000
	Windsor Ave, Grays	DfT	15,000
	Selwyn Road, Tilbury	DfT	15,000
	Heathview Road, Grays	DfT	15,000
	East Thurrock Road, Grays	DfT	15,000
	Service Road (Sydney - Calcutta), Tilbury	TC	20,000
	Spindles, Tilbury	TC	20,000
	Langland Close (Rear), Corringham	TC	20,000
	Arkwright Road, Tilbury	TC	30,000
	Birchwood, Corringham	TC	10,000
Sub Total			275,000
E2877	LTP Maintenance - Streetlighting		
	Borough wide lamp column replacement	DfT	75,000
Sub Total			75,000
E2878	LTP Maintenance - Other infrastructure (drainage)		
	Muckingford Road	TC	50,000
	Ship Lane	DfT	18,000
	Dartview Close	DfT	17,000
	London Road Purfleet	DfT	20,000
	Lower Dunton Road	DfT	20,000
	Benson Road/Salisbury Road	DfT	20,000
	Fenner Road RAB	TC	20,000
	Buckles Lane	TC	20,000
	Oliver Road - Basin	TC	60,000
	Rectory Road, S.L.H. (Copland Road)	DfT	20,000
	Princess Margaret Road - Bata area	DfT	27,000
	Gulley Remedials - Boroughwide	DfT	35,000
Sub Total			327,000
	LTP Maintenance - Traffic Signals		
	Boroughwide signal upgrades - DfT funded	DfT	200,000
	Boroughwide signal upgrades - Thurrock funded	TC	100,000
Sub Total			300,000

Cost Code	Project	Funding Source	Budget
	LTP Maintenance - Other Road Markings		
	Boroughwide Road Marking Replacement (key strategic junctions etc)	TC	75,000
Sub Total			75,000
	LTP Maintenance - Other Safety Barriers		
	A13 Eastbound and Westbound - Barrier repairs	TC	75,000
Sub Total			75,000
	MAINTENANCE TOTAL		3,471,000
E1825	Integrated Transport - Freight Management		
	HGV Weight Limit Review by area - Feasibility study	ITB	10,000
	HGV Parking ban	ITB	10,000
	Prescribed routing for HGV's - Stanford-Le-Hope	ITB	30,000
	Prescribed routing for HGV's - Purfleet	ITB	30,000
	Prescribed routing for HGV's - West Thurrock	ITB	30,000
	Prescribed routing for HGV's - Little Thurrock	ITB	30,000
	Prescribed routing for HGV's - Horndon / Orsett / Bulphan	ITB	30,000
	A128 Lay-by removal	ITB	15,000
	Lay-by closure investigation, design and build	ITB	15,000
Sub Total			200,000
E1829	Integrated Transport - Traffic Management Schemes		
	Minor Works Service Requests - Area 1 - Aveley & South Ockendon	ITB	30,000
	Minor Works Service Requests - Area 2 - Orsett	ITB	30,000
	Minor Works Service Requests - Area 3 - Stanford & Corringham	ITB	30,000
	Minor Works Service Requests - Area 4 - Purfleet and West Thurrock	ITB	30,000
	Minor Works Service Requests - Area 5 - Chafford Hundred and Grays	ITB	30,000
	Minor Works Service Requests - Area 6 - Chadwell, Tilbury and East Tilbury	ITB	30,000
	Reduction of speed limits in rural areas	ITB	10,000
	Reduction of speed limits at school locations	ITB	10,000
Sub Total			200,000
E1830	Integrated Transport - Road Safety Engineering		
	AIP site 1 - Feasibility	ITB	15,000
	AIP site 2 - Feasibility	ITB	15,000
	Southend Road - Stanford Le Hope - speed reduction scheme	ITB	100,000
	2016 identified scheme 2	ITB	70,000
			200,000
E3004	Public Transport Infrastructure		
	Bus Infrastructure	ITB	20,000
	Bus Shelters / stops	ITB	20,000
	Flags and timetable cases	ITB	15,000
Sub Total			55,000
E1832	Safer Routes to Schools		
	Purfleet Primary School - Tank Hill Lane (Parking review and footway improvements)	ITB	15,000
	Aveley Primary School - Stifford Road (Parking review and lay-by provision)	ITB	15,000
	St Josephs School - Scratton Road (Zebra crossing and parking review)	ITB	15,000
	Site 4 - TBC	ITB	15,000
Sub Total			60,000
E1841	Rights of Way		
	Boroughwide Rights of Way accessibility improvements	ITB	25,000
Sub Total			25,000
E1843	Parking		
	Tilbury CPZ	ITB	125,000
	Grays CPZ Extension	ITB	42,000
	Stanford-Le-Hope CPZ extension	ITB	42,000
	East Tilbury CPZ - Feasibility Study	ITB	10,000
	South Ockendon CPZ - Feasibility Study	ITB	10,000
	EV Bay upgrade - off street parking bays	ITB	2,000
			231,000
Integrated Transport Sub Total			971,000
	S106 Funding		
	Highways improvements to Oliver Road	S106	633,900
	Bus Link between Tesco and INTU Lakeside	S106	64,300
	Little Thurrock to Thurrock Park Way	S106	673,100
	Mayflower Road Parking Management and Highways Capacity improvements	S106	61,223
	East Tilbury 1st payment (CCTV / Anti-Skid / VAS / Bus Stop upgrade)	S106	11,090
	Butts Lane improvement works	S106	10,000
Sub Total			1,453,613
	LGF Funding		
	Cycling infrastructure delivery programme - Tranche 2 delivery programme	LGF	1,670,000
	Stanford-le-Hope Interchange / Hub	LGF	3,000,000
	A13 Widening construction	LGF	28,000,000
Sub Total			32,670,000
	TOTAL COST OF SCHEMES		38,565,613

**Planning Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Work Programme
2016/17**

Dates of Meetings: 18 July 2016, 13 September 2016, 8 November 2016, 5 January 2017, 7 March 2017.

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
18 July 2016		
C2C Update Report	Ann Osola	Officer
Local Growth Fund Round 3	Matthew Essex	Officer
13 September 2016		
Feedback on responses to Local Plan Issues and Options 1 consultation	Andrew Millard/Sean Nethercott	Officer
Draft Parking and Policy Refresh and Parking Strategy	Ann Osola	Officer
Purfleet Update	Matthew Essex	Officer
Grays South: Delivering the Pedestrian Underpass	Matthew Essex	Officer
8 November 2016		
Cycling Update Report	Ann Osola	Officer
Tilbury Community Led Local Development	Matthew Brown	Officer
C2C Update Report	Ann Osola	Member
Air Quality Strategy	Ann Osola	Officer
Council Spending Review Update	Laura Last	Officer

5 January 2017

Tilbury Port Expansion Update	Andy Millard	Officer
Fees and Charges 2017/18	Laura Last / Carl Tomlinson	Officer
Congestion Task Force Update (including Highways Permitting Proposal)	Ann Osola	Officer
Thurrock Design Guide	Andy Millard	Officer
Capital Programme	Ann Osola	Officer

7 March 2017

A13 Widening	Ann Osola	Officer
C2C Update Report	Ann Osola	Member
Aveley Hub	Jacqui North	Officer