

Thurrock - An ambitious and collaborative community which is proud of its heritage and excited by its diverse opportunities and future

Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting will be held at **7.00 pm** on **9 October 2019**

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

Membership:

Councillors Martin Kerin (Chair), John Allen (Vice-Chair), Alex Anderson, Oliver Gerrish, Andrew Jefferies and David Van Day

Substitutes:

Councillors Steve Liddiard, Sue MacPherson, Gerard Rice and Luke Spillman

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Minutes	5 - 12
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 9 July 2019.	
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. Thurrock Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 2) Report of Consultation	13 - 36

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Wendy Le, Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **1 October 2019**

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.

Our Vision and Priorities for Thurrock

An ambitious and collaborative community which is proud of its heritage and excited by its diverse opportunities and future.

1. **People** – a borough where people of all ages are proud to work and play, live and stay
 - High quality, consistent and accessible public services which are right first time
 - Build on our partnerships with statutory, community, voluntary and faith groups to work together to improve health and wellbeing
 - Communities are empowered to make choices and be safer and stronger together
2. **Place** – a heritage-rich borough which is ambitious for its future
 - Roads, houses and public spaces that connect people and places
 - Clean environments that everyone has reason to take pride in
 - Fewer public buildings with better services
3. **Prosperity** – a borough which enables everyone to achieve their aspirations
 - Attractive opportunities for businesses and investors to enhance the local economy
 - Vocational and academic education, skills and job opportunities for all
 - Commercial, entrepreneurial and connected public services

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 9 July 2019 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Martin Kerin (Chair), John Allen (Vice-Chair), Alex Anderson, Oliver Gerrish and David Van Day

Apologies: Councillors Andrew Jefferies

In attendance: Andrew Millard, Interim Director of Place
Leigh Nicholson, Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Mat Kiely, Transportation Services Strategic Lead
Peter Wright, Strategic Lead of Highways and Infrastructure
Wendy Le, 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.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 12 March 2019 was approved as a true and correct record.

2. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

3. Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Integrated Transport Block Capital Programme 2019/20

Andrew Millard, Interim Director of Place, introduced the report which covered the Council's Integrated Transport Block (ITB) Capital allocation and the Maintenance Block (MB) allocation that was assigned to the Council through the Department for Transport's (DfT) annual settlement of £971,000 (for ITB) and £1.938 million (for MB). He highlighted the key drivers as the bullet points at the top of page 12 of the agenda.

Mat Kiely, Transportation Services Strategic Lead, highlighted the areas of spending in appendix 1 of the report and pointed out that the priority areas

included congestion, road safety and tackling air quality issues in the borough. Table 1 on pages 13 and 14 of the report identified the funding allocation of £971,000 spread across 7 areas of the ITB works programme. The service was looking to identify a long term programme particularly in Safer Routes to Schools (SRTS)

Peter Wright, Strategic Lead of Highways and Infrastructure, highlighted the MB programme in appendix 4.

Councillor Gerrish questioned how the ITB and MB Capital allocations fitted in with other funding allocations that related to Highways. Mat Kiely explained that other funds could be made available and gave the example of section 106 (s106) funding (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that was processed through planning obligations). S106 funding could be used to mitigate some of the highway works and programmes. There were also internal capital bids that could be used for traffic congestion issues and the surplus funding from capital programmes could be used to apply to other works.

Adding to this, Peter Wright said that the MB had been successful in acquiring bids which had been allocated to schemes such as 'Tidy Up' and to areas such as Stonehouse Lane. DfT had also provided a funding allocation, with a figure around £100,000, for fixing potholes and the service had recently run jet patching programmes to fix potholes.

Councillor Gerrish commented that a broader set of works was likely to be a part of the capital programmes indicated in the appendixes and that what was provided was a general overview. He went on to say that £971,000 sounded like a lot of money but did not stretch very far. Councillor Gerrish mentioned discussions in previous years regarding the deficit in bringing highways up to date and asked for an update. Peter Wright replied that nationally there was a deficit on highways judging from reports from organisations such as RAC and so far, 1.7% of carriageways works had been undertaken and 2.5% of footways works had been undertaken. He went on to say that the service had been successful in demonstrating the need for funding of Stonehouse Lane through capital bids.

Councillor Gerrish thought that bids could be pursued in certain areas and asked what the sufficiency of funding and capital bids were. From a maintenance perspective, Peter Wright said there were discussions on how funding and bids to services could be allocated. Adding to this, Andrew Millard said that from a capital perspective, the funds were drawn in from capital funds and allocated to schemes such as the A13 Widening and the Stanford-le-Hope Interchange Hub and other big capital allocations. Andrew Millard went on to agree that Councillor Gerrish made a good point on how bids could be pursued and that if the Committee wanted a particular avenue pursued, the service could consider this.

Referring to appendix 1, Councillor Gerrish thought that the schemes mentioned looked sensible but felt that the report did not provide details on

what schemes had not met the criteria of the fund allocations. He questioned the processes that were in place for decision making on funding allocations for the schemes indicated and whether these were made in consultation with the Portfolio Holder. In answer, Mat Kiely explained that a protocol led approach was used and discussions were held with the Portfolio Holder on how each scheme aligned with the plans of the borough or area. If there was an underspend in an area, a lower scheme could be brought forward if it was identified that it fitted in with the plan of the area.

Regarding s106 funding, the Vice-Chair said that there had been a lot of s106 contributions through projects in Tilbury such as Amazon. Speaking on behalf of the residents of his ward, Tilbury St Chads, he questioned what and how s106 contributions were spent and that this detail be provided through a breakdown of the spend. He went on to say that Amazon had provided half a million pounds towards Tilbury and that half of that contribution had been used towards the operations of the ferry in Tilbury and the rest was to be used towards cycling and walking paths.

Continuing on, the Vice-Chair referred to jet patching around Tilbury and said that there were still loose bits of debris despite the use of jet patching. He thought jet patching was a quick fix for repairs of potholes and questioned the longevity of jet patch repairs.

In answer to the Vice-Chair's query on s106 contributions, Andrew Millard said that s106 itself was a separate report to the ITB Capital Programme report. He explained that s106 contributions were allocated to a specific programme and that a tariff based report would not be allowed. Adding to this, Leigh Nicholson, Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection, said that there was transparency around s106 contributions which was accessible online so the information could be pulled and provided to the Committee. The Vice-Chair asked that the s106 contributions regarding Gloriana (now known as Thurrock Regeneration Limited) at the former Tilbury St Chads site also be included in the information.

Answering the Vice-Chair's query on jet patching, Peter Wright said that jet patching was not a quick answer and was part of a variety of repairs that the service could undertake. The right repair had to be used for the right situation. In terms of longevity of jet patching, some repairs had lasted a long time and there were some that only lasted 6 months so was dependent on road and area conditions. With some jet patched roads, these were temporary and were scheduled for resurfacing at a later date. Jet patching was cheaper and quicker than undertaking an inlay repair and Peter Wright offered to take Members out to show how and why certain repairs were carried out.

Councillor Anderson asked whether there was a process in place to scrutinise the spending of s106 contributions. Referring to the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee that was held on 12 March 2019, Leigh Nicholson, replied that a report on Planning Obligations had detailed s106 contributions and could be circulated to Members again for information.

On SRTS, Councillor Gerrish asked how routes were prioritised. He went on to mention the new Harris Primary Academy which was not listed in appendix 2 along with other schools that were relevant. He sought reassurance around the process of identifying SRTS. Mat Kiely answered that this information would be fed back to the team and explained that measures and mitigations were part of the improvements to be made. He went on to say that SRTS were identified through accident data around school areas and a travel provision plan was sought from schools. Some schools required waiting areas whereas some did not have this.

On air quality and congestion, the Chair questioned how the success of reduced air quality and traffic congestion could be measured and what this should look like in 5 years' time. He referred specifically to his ward, Grays Riverside. Mat Kiely explained that many programmes would give an indication of improved air quality and with SRTS, there were cycling routes that would reduce traffic congestion. The most congested areas were caused by freight vehicles and the plan was to take freight vehicles out of certain areas in the borough. In 5 years, the idea was to have more walking and cycling route or other sustainable modes of transport.

The Chair asked how the 5 year time scale would fit in with the Local Plan. Mat Kiely replied that the service would be able to identify where potential new development could be built and would give an indication of where vehicle movements would be through consideration of the new air quality management model and this could be applied to where the Local Plan would be. This would highlight which areas needed air quality management and could identify better sustainable provisions.

Referring to Aveley, Councillor Van Day mentioned the amount of HGV movements throughout the area and asked how this could be resolved. Explaining that the service had been in consultations with Aveley, Mat Kiely said that Aveley had been identified as a potential area for development and it was a matter of what schemes could be delivered in the area. Over time, there may be other funding opportunities such as s106 funding. He reiterated that the service only had £971,000 to deliver the programme of works identified within the borough and that the delivery would be over a period of time.

Councillor Van Day sought clarification on the number of years the delivery of works could and also who requested s106 funding. Mat Kiely explained that s106 was sought through the Planning process if a need for it was identified. From the Aveley consultation, Mat Kiely said that the s106 funding had been considered. Councillor Van Day followed up by asking if there were other priorities in Aveley through s106 funding. In response, Mat Kiely said that there were many areas identified through the s106 funding and the priority in Aveley was freight management and that s106 would be added to this if the opportunity arose.

Andrew Millard added that s106 funding could be sought but if there was no potential development identified in an area, then s106 could not be gained. On a large scale locality, s106 could be obtained and in low levels of growth, there would be trickles of funding from other sources. In areas with low levels of growth, the borough would then be looked at as a whole to obtain s106 funding and potential development could be applied throughout the borough as a whole in terms of interrelationships and infrastructure.

The Vice-Chair said that the Council aspired to be a clear and green council but there were issues such as the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) which he felt would be an ecological and environmental disaster. He went on to mention that most of the developments in the borough was in the west of the borough which was densely packed thus adding to the congestion in the area, particularly around Lakeside shopping centre. On air quality, the Vice-Chair said that where air quality was monitored in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA), only Particulate Matter (PM) particles were monitored.

Continuing on, the Vice-Chair said the Local Plan identified a number of 32,000 homes to be built and this would increase the rate traffic and pollution in the borough. He went on to say that Highways England's intention was to open the LTC in 2027 with the presumption that electric vehicles would be in use by then but this may not be the case and thus the crossing would also add to the traffic and pollution. He questioned what strategies would Officers employ to minimise air quality problems to improve people's health.

Andrew Millard referred to the 'Update on Air Quality and Health' report that had been brought to the Cleaner, Greener and Safer Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 7 February 2019 which would address the Vice-Chair's concerns. This would be circulated to Committee Members. Currently, the service was reviewing consultation responses from the recent Issues and Options Stage 2 (IO2) Consultation for the Local Plan and air quality had been identified as one of the biggest concerns of Thurrock residents. He went on to explain that if development was placed in the right areas with the right infrastructure and investment was acquired in those areas, the result would be an increase in growth and an improvement in air quality.

The Vice-Chair felt that the identified areas for potential development were already densely populated and thought the Council should identify less populated areas. There were good plots of land in Thurrock suitable for development where new homes, schools and health facilities could be introduced. In response, Andrew Millard said that potential areas of development would be identified through the IO2 once the responses were reviewed. The current plan was to continue investment into existing areas and protecting the Green Belt. Housing options would be assessed in a number of areas and the IO2 had sought people's views and from that, the next stage of the Local Plan would be identified. Once the issue of the LTC was resolved, the Local Plan would also be able to identify where sites of potential development could be. The Vice-Chair stated that the importance of air quality had to be highlighted and ensure traffic continued to flow.

Looking at the report recommendations, the Committee referred bullet points 2 and 3 and asked that an update was fed back to the Committee after consultation was undertaken with the Portfolio Holder and once the process was completed.

RESOLVED:

1.1 That Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented on the report and the Cabinet recommendations:

- **Approves the Integrated Transport Block Capital Programme and the Highways Maintenance Capital Programme for 2019/20 (as detailed in Appendices 1 and 4).**
- **Note and approve the process by which the Safer Routes to School and Road Safety Engineering programme (as detailed in Appendix 2 & 3) is assessed and prioritised for implementation over the next 5 years through the delegated authority held by the Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**
- **Delegates the authority to the Director of Place and the Director of Environment and Highways, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, to review and make local changes to these programmes during the course of the year taking into account local views and priorities.**

5. Work Programme

The work programme was updated as follows:

- An updated air quality report that incorporated past actions and their outcomes (Andrew Millard stated that The Local Development Plan Task Force Update – Issues and Options 2 Consultation Report would incorporate air quality management).
- Freight Services report to be amended to Freight Strategy and to encompass how this was applied throughout the borough.
- Parking hotspots.
- An update on the modes of transport – identify what trends and changes there has been.
- c2c update.
- Delivering the Homes Thurrock Needs report – to include the case study of Belmont Road with detail on engagement strategies and protecting open and green spaces.

Voicing further concerns on air quality, the Vice-Chair said that Tilbury had a big issue of dust and through an independent survey, a magnetic substance had been identified. He went on to say that Tilbury was surrounded by industries and questioned how other particles in the air could be monitored

when monitoring equipment monitored pollution. In response, Andrew Millard said that he was aware that there may be new monitoring equipment for air quality and he could liaise with the Environment Team on the Committee's concerns. A note would be circulated to the Committee to address those concerns.

The meeting finished at 8.02 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**

This page is intentionally left blank

9 October 2019		ITEM: 5
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee		
Thurrock Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 2) Report of Consultation		
Wards and communities affected: All		Key Decision: N/A
Report of: Sean Nethercott, Strategic Lead – Strategic Services		
Accountable Assistant Director: Leigh Nicholson, Interim Assistant Director – Planning, Transport and Public Protection		
Accountable Director: Andy Millard, Interim Director Place		
This report is Public		

Executive Summary

This report provides an update on the preparation of the Thurrock Local Plan and sets out the key messages received in response to the Thurrock Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 2) Consultation Document that was published for consultation on 12 December 2018.

1. Recommendation(s)

- 1.1 That the Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee provide comment on the contents of this report and the approach to preparing a new Local Plan.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1** The Council's approach to growth is that it should be community-driven, infrastructure-led and make a key contribution to high quality place making. The need to plan for future housing and economic provision due to population growth and the impact of wider socio-economic factors means that Thurrock and South Essex will change considerably over the next 20-30 years. Having an up-to-date Development Plan is a key component in ensuring that the borough grows in a sustainable way with the necessary supporting infrastructure in place.
- 2.2** The Council has an adopted Local Plan in the shape of the Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development DPD (Adopted in 2011 and updated

in 2015). In February 2014, the Cabinet gave approval to undertake a review of the Core Strategy and begin the preparation of a new Local Plan.

2.3 A key principle underpinning the operation of the planning system is the requirement that local authorities must have an up-to-date Local Plan for their area. The February 2014 Cabinet resolution recognised that a review of the Core Strategy was required in order to address the impact of economic change and a number of significant changes to the planning system at the national, regional and local levels. These included:

- The need for a more up-to-date statutory planning framework to coordinate the delivery of the Council's ambitious growth strategy for Thurrock;
- The revocation of the East of England Plan and the requirement for local planning authorities to undertake a fresh assessment of their future development needs;
- A requirement for the Council to identify a deliverable five-year housing land supply and to bring forward more sites for development to support long term economic growth;
- Legislative changes that fundamentally affect the form, content and process for preparing a Local Plan; and
- A need to plan for a decision by Government on the route and location of the Lower Thames Crossing and its potential economic, transport and environmental impact on the Borough.

2.4 The first consultation on the new Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 1) Document (I&O1) was undertaken in February and March 2016 and focused on thematic policy areas. During the 6-week public consultation, 70 organisations made formal responses raising 548 separate comments. An additional 500 comments were received from Members of the Community at events organised to promote and raise awareness of the Consultation.

2.5 Based on the responses received from those who made representations on the I&O1 Consultation Document, the following key challenges for the Local Plan to address were identified:

- Reduce inequalities and create more balanced communities;
- Allocate enough land to meet our housing needs in full in particular affordable housing that meets local needs;
- Secure sustainable economic growth and create a wider range of local employment opportunities;
- Ensure that our centres are vibrant and remain relevant to the communities they serve;
- Create welcoming and engaging spaces and places for young people;
- Plan for healthier places that encourage people to be active and have a positive effect on the mental wellbeing;
- Deliver essential strategic and local infrastructure to support new development and regeneration; and
- Protect the integrity of the green belt.

Issues and Options (Stage 2) Public Consultation

- 2.6 The spatial strategy set out in the adopted Core Strategy (2015) focuses the majority of new housing development on previously developed land in the urban area. To meet some of the challenges set out earlier in this report the emerging Local Plan will need to look at the possibilities of a combination of denser urban development and the potential of releasing Green Belt sites to meet our housing needs over the next 20 years. This approach would represent a significant change from the Council's current Local Plan.
- 2.7 In this context, the purpose of the Issues and Options (Stage 2) consultation document (I&O2) was to seek views from communities and key stakeholders on how Thurrock should develop and grow in the future and where, in broad terms, new development could be located to meet identified needs. The range of issues consulted on included the following:
- The key challenges and objectives underpinning the development of the Local Plan;
 - The future scale and distribution of new housing, employment, retail and leisure development needed in Thurrock over the plan period up to 2038;
 - The range of broad alternative spatial options and approaches available to accommodate the Boroughs future development requirements;
 - The opportunities available to improve the range and quality of sporting, leisure and recreational facilities, including public open space to meet community needs both now and in the future; and
 - Call for Sites 4 – a further request for landowners to submit sites for assessment and possible allocation for development through the plan making process.
- 2.8 In addition to looking at potential spatial options to accommodate housing and economic growth, the consultation document also sought views on a range of policy options to address a range of locally important issues. These included issues such as housing for older people and specialist needs, hot food takeaways and the need to protect locally important green spaces and buildings.
- 2.9 To ensure that stakeholders were able to make informed responses to the consultation the Council published a number of supporting technical evidence documents including an Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) alongside the consultation document. These together with the main consultation documents were made available on the Councils website and in hard copy at various locations across the Borough.
- 2.10 The consultation commenced on Wednesday 12th December 2018 and ran until Friday 8 March 2019. Following requests from a number of parties for additional time to respond, the deadline for responding to the consultation was extended beyond the original date to the 29th March.

- 2.11 The consultation events were delivered through a mixture of community-based sessions and ‘Your Place, Your Voice’ events organised across the borough on the dates and locations set out below. In addition to the Consultation events, Officers also attended a number of Community Forum Meetings and held Duty to Cooperate Meetings with neighbouring authorities. These included the London Boroughs of Barking and Dagenham, and Havering with further meetings organised with Dartford Borough Council, Essex County Council and the adjoining South Essex authorities of Basildon, Brentwood, Rochford and Southend.

Principal Community Planning Events

Event Location	Time and Date
South Ockendon – Lime Close Club	Sat 19 Jan 1pm – 5pm
Corringham – Corringham Library	Thurs 24 Jan 5pm – 9pm
East Tilbury – East Tilbury Village Hall	Sun 27 Jan 2pm – 5pm
Tilbury - Tilbury Hub	Mon 28 Jan 5pm – 9pm
Orsett – Orsett Churches Centre	Fri 15 Feb 4pm – 8pm
Grays - St Clements Church and Surgery	Sat 16 Feb 1pm – 5pm
Grays - St John’s Church Hall	Sat 23 Feb 1pm – 5pm
Chadwell St Mary - Chadwell Library	Tues 26 Feb 3pm – 7pm
South Ockendon – South Ockendon Centre	Sat 2 Mar 12 – 3.30pm

Informal Drop-in Sessions

South Ockendon Centre Derry Avenue, South Ockendon	Tuesday 15 January
Aveley Library Purfleet Road, Aveley	Thursday 17 January
Tilbury Hub Civic Square, Tilbury	Monday 21 January
Hardie Park Hardie Park, Stanford Le Hope	Tuesday 22 January
Chadwell Centre Brentwood Road, Chadwell St Mary	Tuesday 22 January
Bulphan Village Hall Church Road, Bulphan	Friday 1 February
The Beacon Centre Drake Road, Chafford Hundred	Thursday 7th February

Purfleet Community Hub 53-54, River Court, Centurion Way, Purfleet	Tuesday 12 February
Acorns Community Centre, Headon Hall, Crawford Avenue, Stifford Clays	Wednesday 20 February
The Beehive Centre West Street, Grays	Thursday 21 February

- 2.12 A full Report of Consultation is currently being prepared and will be made available to view on the Councils Local Plan website. (www.thurrock.gov.uk/localplan). This will provide details of the representations made and set out how the Council will respond to the views of the community and stakeholders in progressing the Local Plan through to preparation of a full Draft (Regulation 18) Local Plan.

Consultation responses – The key messages

- 2.13 By the close of the consultation period on the 29th March around 700 organisations and individuals had responded to the Issues Options (Stage 2) Consultation with nearly 3,000 separate comments having been made in response to the 40 questions set out in the Consultation Document. This included over 400 representations in the form of a signed standard letter requesting the allocation of land in the North Grays / Blackshots area, to include a new community football facility for the use of local teams including Grays Athletic.
- 2.14 Given the volume of representations received, this report only sets out the key messages arising from the consultation. Further information will be made available in the Report of Public Consultation that is currently under preparation and it is intended to provide more detailed information on the responses received on a thematic basis.

Issues and Options 2 – Key Responses

Introduction

- The evidence base underpinning the plan needs to be up-dated in order to ensure that the Council plans to meet the full future development needs of the Borough.
- The Council needs to undertake a further more fine grained Green Belt Assessment when considering the future allocation of sites for development.
- There needs to be more consideration of the cross boundary implications of development and its impact on public rights of way; biodiversity and water bodies including the Mardyke and the River Thames; marine planning considerations; and on the need for essential community infrastructure.
- The Council should consider the need to plan to accommodate any unmet housing and employment needs arising from London and neighbouring South Essex authorities through the Duty to Co-operate and the emerging South Essex JSP.
- Consideration should be given to the provision of a new general hospital rather than local hubs given the scale of new development proposed across South Essex.

Challenges for the Future

- The key issues and challenges identified in the IO2 Consultation Document although comprehensive should be expanded to take into account and/or provide better recognition of the wider aims and objectives of statutory consultees and key delivery partners and stakeholders.
- The Local Plan Vision is broadly supported but should be recast to better reflect the need to address climate change and the wider aims and objectives of statutory consultees and key delivery partners and stakeholders.
- The Draft Strategic Objectives underpinning the plan should be expanded to better reflect the wider aims and objectives of statutory consultees and key delivery partners and stakeholders.

What level of growth is needed – Housing?

- Strong support from the development industry and local businesses for the Local Plan to set a housing target higher than Thurrock's objectively assessed housing need calculated using the standard method to support increased economic growth.
- Strong support for increasing the delivery and mix of affordable, Self-Build and Custom Build housing and specialist housing products subject

to viability considerations being taken into account.

- Recognition that the Borough would not be able to meet its future housing needs by relying on any one Spatial Option including Urban Intensification.
- Support for a 'mix and match' approach utilising a range of spatial options depending on sustainability, deliverability and infrastructure considerations.
- Unlikely that Thurrock would be able to meet any part of its future housing needs through the Duty to Cooperate due to the perceived difficulties that neighbouring authorities were facing in meeting their own needs first.
- Little support for the development of a new settlement at West Horndon beyond the scheme promoters. This is due to its location – better placed to meet London housing needs by virtue of good east- west rail connectivity; the adverse impacts of development on this scale for the Green Belt in this location; the high infrastructure costs associated with developments of this nature; potential adverse impacts on the rate of housing delivery over the plan period elsewhere in Thurrock; and a lack of regeneration/positive economic spin-off benefits for existing Thurrock communities.
- Development of a new settlement at West Horndon opposed by Brentwood Borough Council and West Horndon Parish Council due to impact on the character of the existing settlement.
- General support for the development of urban extensions (major/small) from landowners and developers but needs to be balanced against concerns over long lead-in times for delivery and the availability of funding for strategic infrastructure provision.
- Support from landowners and developers for the village expansion option but less so from members of the community. Concerns arising over impact of development on the character of the villages and a lack of infrastructure to support growth.
- Support for isolated site allocations from landowners and developers with an interest in the land on the basis of their ability to support the delivery of housing early in the plan period and/or reuse previously developed land in the Green Belt.
- Recognition of the need/opportunities available from locating development around the urban fringe in providing existing communities with better access to the green belt and new leisure and recreation opportunities.
- Although numbers responding were small, strong community concern over the need to ensure infrastructure improvements come forward in advance of new development irrespective of the spatial option(s) being promoted.

What level of growth is needed – Employment Growth

- The Local Plan should consider allocating additional employment land to diversify the Boroughs economic base and attract further investment in

growth sectors and provide some flexibility to meet changing market requirements.

- The Thurrock Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA) (2017) and Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA)(2017) underestimate the future need/demand for employment space in Thurrock and need to be updated.
- Additional land should be identified to support port and logistics related growth in close proximity to the ports and with good access to the strategic road network and Lower Thames Crossing.
- Need to plan for additional local employment 'grow on' space provision in town centres, established employment areas and in new strategic growth locations
- No clear view from respondents on the most appropriate option or options suggested to manage the supply and development of employment land over the plan period.
- Further investment in the transport infrastructure both within and outside the Borough is required to improve access to the strategic economic hubs.
- No clear view from the respondents on the need for additional lorry parking facilities, the benefits associated with their provision or the most appropriate locations to accommodate their development.
- The Council should not be overly protective of poor quality employment sites and premises where there is potential to secure their redevelopment for a range of uses including housing.
- The Council should develop a programme for the voluntary "lifting and shifting" of bad neighbour uses from existing urban area. This should be coupled with the stricter enforcement of planning conditions to ensure that the residential amenity of exiting communities is protected.
- Need to take care not to lose existing and viable businesses through the adoption of a restrictive approach to managing established industrial areas.
- New employment or housing areas should be segregated in order to avoid any adverse impacts upon each other.
- Viable waterside industrial developments, including wharves and port facilities should be provided with a level of safeguarding to ensure that they are protected from adverse impacts of surrounding uses.
- The improvement of digital infrastructure serving Thurrock is strongly supported but concerns over who should cover the cost of it's installation.
- Section 106 and CIL contributions should help cover the cost of new digital provision.

What level of growth is needed – Retail and Leisure?

- Intu Lakeside should continue to be the principal focus for comparison shopping and leisure in Thurrock.
- The future scale of development at Lakeside should not have an adverse impact on town centres within Thurrock and neighbouring

authorities

- Transport and access issues at Lakeside will need to be addressed before further development is permitted.
- Gridlock and congestion are having an adverse impact on local communities. Infrastructure improvements need to be assessed and upgraded to meet additional demand.
- Need to ensure Grays is not neglected.
- Agree that future convenience floorspace should be directed to growth locations.
- The redistribution of convenience floorspace provision should not occur in a way that undermines existing centres.
- Town centre planning policy needs to be more flexible so that better use can be made of surplus floorspace.
- Smaller town centres such as Stanford-le-Hope and Corringham need to be supported and improved.
- Lakeside already functions as a town centre and preconditions which seek to limit its potential development are unnecessary. The emphasis should be on facilitating and guiding development in a positive way. The idea of an Inset Plan or similar for the northern part of the Lakeside Basin is therefore supported.
- Scale nature and timing of any further development at Lakeside should be subject to the delivery of suitable infrastructure needs.
- Future development at Lakeside should not have an adverse impact on Borough Centres in Havering, particularly the Metropolitan Centre of Romford.
- Any significant further development at Lakeside should consider the relationship with and impacts on London's Town Centre Network.
- Need to improve the range and quality of retail and other service provision in Grays Town Centre.
- Supportive of concept of reconnecting Grays Town Centre to the River Thames and provides an opportunity to develop a riverside strategy approach as set out in the TE2100 Plan.
- Access to and around Grays Town Centre needs to be improved.
- A series of Place Studies should be prepared for locations such as Stanford-le-Hope, Corringham, Aveley and Ockendon.
- New urban extensions may require policies that identify suitably scaled centres.
- High Streets need to evolve into multi-use facilities to attract more people to visit.
- Strong support for limiting/restricting the growth of hot food takeaways and betting shops.
- Access to and around Grays Town Centre needs to be improved as the one-way system is ill thought out.
- To maintain the viability of smaller town centre retail offerings adequate short to medium stay parking should be maintained to prevent residents traveling further afield for their requirements.
- The aim to reduce the use of private cars is commendable but impractical in the short to medium term. Need for better parking

provision in all shopping centres outside Grays to ensure their viability. Any major new facilities should have adequate parking and a robust travel plan.

- The improvement of riverfront cycling from Southend to London is a favourable ambition due to the benefits associated with it. Need for better connectivity between Five Bells and Corringham.
- Need for a Park and Ride Scheme to serve Basildon Hospital.
- Need for edge of town park and ride facilities to serve Corringham and Stanford –le-Hope
- More parking (and affordable parking) in the vicinity of railway stations would encourage people to limit car use.
- Essex County Council would welcome an exploration of the effect of free car-parking at Lakeside on the wider transport network.

Health & Well-Being

- The main leisure centres have a good spread across Thurrock which should be retained and improved. New centres should be placed in and around these and incorporate other community facilities.
- Leisure facilities at Blackshots are dated and old fashioned and new residential development in North Grays could help fund improvements.
- Leisure facilities at Corringham are dated and old fashioned and new residential development in Corringham and Stanford-le-Hope could help fund necessary improvements.
- New facilities should be located in North Grays/Blackshots area to include a new community football facility that will facilitate the relocation of 32 teams including Grays Athletic as well as complementing the proposed Orsett Heath Academy School.
- The LP should improve spectator sporting facilities including the construction of high class outdoor stadia capable of hosting national/international/elite sport. There should be a specific focus on upgrading the amenities for motor sport as a planned development of the Arena Essex site. The Local Plan should seek to support the future viability of the 'Hammers'.
- The closure of Essex Arena is a great loss. Encourage the Council to look at what Peterborough have achieved and aim for same. An Essex showground with speedway track, other sports facilities, a conference centre and a meeting/social event space.
- Please find an alternative location so that speedway can continue in the Borough.
- Policies that support the development and maintenance of new and existing riverside and on-river leisure activities such as rowing clubs etc must be encouraged.
- Priority should be given to new and improved open space, sporting and leisure development alongside existing and planned new residential areas.
- Sport and leisure development and open spaces in coastal locations connected by estuary side routes will help promote riverside routes for

leisure side activity and sustainable movement patterns.

- New residential development in Orsett could contribute towards improving existing leisure facilities in the area.
- There is an opportunity within the Green Belt at Little Thurrock Marshes to provide a significant area of new open space and recreational land which could be delivered by planning for new housing/mixed use developments in the Green Belt.
- Improvements to Belhus Country Park could be supported by contributions arising from the development of land at Avontar Road for housing.
- The former private sports ground adjoining ICLs West Thurrock Works should be re-allocated for employment use.
- The Active Place Strategy (APS) should be published before the next stage of the Local Plan, in order for landowners and developers to assess the implications for delivering their sites and addressing wider needs.
- Need to update the local plans evidence base (playing pitch, indoor/built sports facilities strategies) and the development of long term commitment by the Council to coordinating the development of action plans to implement these strategies.
- Need to take a positive approach to the principle of new and enhanced facilities that meet the needs of clubs.
- Need to secure provision of provision of new facilities through development and use of Section 106 agreements. The Council's current approach is reactive ad hoc and is not considered appropriate. Where areas of major growth are proposed a strategy should be prepared for each setting out how provision for sport and recreation will be made.
- Need for a sub-regional approach to planning for the delivery of new indoor and outdoor sports facilities across local authority boundaries.
- Thurrock Council is asked to complete its evidence work (Active Place Strategy) to allow for cross boundary opportunities to be identified (with Basildon Council).
- Support for incorporation of Sport England's Active Design Principles in the Local Plan. These can be applied at a strategic scale in the master planning of major new developments or at the local scale in the detailed design of new developments.
- The proposal to incorporate Active Design Principles within Local Plan policy is supported but it must be done in a flexible way.
- The adoption of Sport England's guidance would give more weight to any decisions the Council make with regards to improving the supply of sporting facilities by way of contributions. The Council should encourage competition in the sports market and consider different delivery models.
- Needs of equestrians should be addressed in the Local Plan.
- Health Impact Assessments should be submitted as part of large and/or sensitive applications to ensure that the health impacts of developments are fully considered.
- Disagree with need for HIA for each application. This should be done through the plan-making process which should set out how health

impact related considerations will be addressed over the plan period.

- A number of local green spaces were suggested to be protected and designated Local Green Space.
- A number of local buildings and features were suggested for inclusion on the Local List.

Your Place, Your Voice

- 2.15 As set out above, community and stakeholder engagement is an important and central feature of the planning system and in order to engage with as many people as possible the Council launched a series of Your Place, Your Voice (YPYV) community planning events. These events were devised in response to comments that residents felt overwhelmed by the technical nature of planning consultations and the volume of Council consultations that all seem to ask similar questions. The community planning events were run on a drop in basis giving local communities the opportunity to feed into the Local Plan and other Council documents and strategies by participating in a range of informal and highly interactive consultation activities.
- 2.16 In total 17 events were held across the borough between February and April 2018. Across all of the events, there were a number of issues consistently raised by local communities. These included:
- Poor and failing infrastructure;
 - Lack of affordable homes and homes for older people;
 - Anti-social behaviour, drugs and crime;
 - Neglected open spaces; and
 - Congestion and poor air quality.
- 2.17 A number of the issues raised by residents at the YPYV events fell outside the remit of the Local Plan so these issues were relayed to other relevant services to consider and address as appropriate. Some progress on these issues has already been made and includes:
- To address concerns over community safety, additional funding to increase police resources in the borough has been provided by the Council;
 - To address issues with HGV parking in inappropriate locations, laybys have been closed at night and dedicated HGV parking facilities have been provided;
 - To address concerns regarding parking around schools, a school road safety review is underway.
- 2.18 A series of follow up YPYV events were programmed to run alongside the Issues and Options (Stage 2) Consultation in order to provide local residents with greater range and more accessible means of engaging with and influencing the plan-making process. As part of the IO2 consultation process,

nine events were held on evenings and weekends. In addition to these, 18 drop in sessions at libraries and community hubs across the borough were organised to raise awareness of the Local Plan process and to promote the YPYV events. While the questions in 2018 were designed to solicit the public's priorities and issues, the events in 2019 focussed on the ways the Council could potentially address those priorities through the Local Plan and other services. Some of the responses highlighted ongoing issues but most related to opportunities for housing and community facilities. Again, the main issues were:

transport	224
open spaces, sports & leisure	199
housing	94
community cohesion	91
crime, ASB, litter	82
health care	81
other	72
employment and shopping	71
education	43

2.19 The top 10 comments made by the community during the YPYV process related to the following matters:

- the need for housing (specifically affordable, social, and adaptable for older residents);
- concerns over air quality;
- the desire for more or better gym and sport facilities;
- the need to address traffic congestion and gridlock;
- the need to protect natural landscapes for enjoyment and for ecology;
- the desire for better community facilities including more GP services;
- A greater and more visible police presence including an increased frequency of police patrols in the evenings;
- The re-routing of HGV's away from residential areas and village centres;
- An improved network of walking and cycle paths;
- Additional bus routes, more frequent services and increased rail capacity.

2.20 A more detailed summary of the comments made at each of the Community Planning Events is set out in Appendix 1 to this Report.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

Thurrock Local Plan - Next Steps

3.1 The ability of the Council to make further progress on the preparation of the Local Plan is severely constrained by the need to await the outcome of the Lower Thames Crossing Development Consent Order (DCO) process. Having taken advice from leading Counsel it is now clear that while the Council

should proceed with the preparation of a draft plan, it will not be possible for Thurrock to submit a Local Plan to the Secretary of State until after the conclusion of the DCO process (expected at the earliest in 2021). This arises due to the potentially adverse impacts of the scheme, including any future design changes, on the ability of the Council to prepare a sound and deliverable Local Plan.

- 3.2 On the 27th June 2019, the Council was contacted by the Ministry of Housing Communities, and Local Government (MHCLG) requesting a meeting to discuss progress with the Local Plan and to explore whether there was any additional support or assistance that Government could provide to Thurrock to help it progress the plan to adoption.
- 3.3 As a follow up to this, Officers met with officials from MHCLG to discuss the following key matters:
 - The Council's ambitions to deliver significant numbers of high quality homes and jobs;
 - The Lower Thames Crossing and its impact on the plan-making process;
 - Improving housing delivery in Thurrock; and
 - The opportunities for support from Government.
- 3.4 Following a very positive meeting, MHCLG immediately confirmed its willingness to assist Thurrock in addressing the issues associated with the LTC and to help facilitate the earliest possible adoption of a new Local Plan.
- 3.5 Following this meeting, the Council also met with Homes England to discuss ways in which they could assist the Council. This included the potential for Homes England to use their influence to promote within Government a greater recognition of the need to support housing and economic growth in Thurrock, as well as their own direct involvement in the Local Plan process and the opportunities to secure their involvement in the possible delivery of strategic developments across the Borough.
- 3.6 In August following further discussions with the Council, MHCG were able to confirm the following arrangements were being put in place to support the delivery of the Local Plan:
 - A senior Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate would meet with Council Officers to discuss the Local Plan related matters including the impact of the LTC and housing delivery;
 - DfT would write to the Council to invite Officers to attend regular meetings with MHCLG, Highways England, and Homes England to help find a resolution to the LTC and M25 Jct30 issues which are preventing the early delivery of development and the progress on the Local Plan;
 - DfT would also write to the Council to set up meetings at a senior political level to discuss outstanding issues between the parties;

- MHCLG's Housing Delivery Team will arrange a meeting with the Council Officers to explore the scope for agreeing a bespoke Housing Growth deal with the Council to support the delivery of strategic development locations
 - The Planning Advisory Service would contact the Council to set up a meeting to discuss how they could further assist the plan-making process with advice and guidance to the Council
- 3.7 It is hoped that the outcome of these meetings will be an increased willingness on the part of Highways England to work with the Council to help support the Local Plan process and greater collaboration and support from the Government on the delivery of critical infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the Local Plan.
- 3.8 The next stage of the plan-making process is to prepare a full Draft (Regulation 18) Local Plan. It is anticipated that this will take 16-18 months to produce the document and at the conclusion of this process Council will be asked to authorise the publication of the draft plan for public consultation.
- 3.9 It is a key principle of the plan-making process that all local plans should be supported by an up-to-date evidence base. In order to comply with this requirement the Council has commissioned a number of technical studies to help inform the preparation of the plan to ensure that the emerging spatial strategy and policy framework will be effective in delivering the Council's vision and priorities for Thurrock over the plan period. As part of the process of evidence gathering the Council has recently commissioned a series of Infrastructure Baseline studies which reflect the fact that the Local Plan is an infrastructure led plan. These studies will identify the Borough's future infrastructure needs based on different levels of growth and will be strongly informed by the community feedback received in response to the YPYV consultations.
- 3.10 In addition to a number of borough wide technical studies it is also intended to commission a number of 'Place Based' strategies which will also be used to inform the preparation of area based Inset Plans for incorporation in the Local Plan. The proposed scope of this work is set out in the table below.
- 3.11 One of the next key stages in the preparation of the Local Plan will be the rollout of Design Charrettes across numerous settlements in the borough. Design Charrettes are a planning tool that bring together key stakeholders (including local communities, businesses, built environment professionals and other stakeholders) to collaborate on a place-making vision for a new, or existing, neighbourhood that will guide the regeneration and future development of that area. The outcome of the Charrettes will include a set of principles that will shape the overall development strategy to be identified in the Local Plan, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and site specific detailed masterplans. As key stakeholders are actively engaged in the planning and design of their community, the design charrettes help to build confidence and collective enthusiasm for the vision to be taken forward through the Local Plan.

- 3.12 MHCLG and the chief planner are supporting this approach to promote development and growth in the borough, with high-quality place-making at the heart of the process. Thurrock has been successful in receiving support from MHCLG to pilot this process and it is proposed that the rollout of the scheme to the first settlements in the borough to benefit from this approach will begin in November 2019.

Further development of the Local Plan Evidence Base includes:

- Detailed assessment of sites and ranking/prioritisation of sites for possible allocation in the Local Plan
- Preparation and completion of Infrastructure Delivery Baseline Study to identify existing/future infrastructure needs.
- Preparation and completion of Transport Delivery Baseline Study to identify existing/future infrastructure needs.
- Climate Change Scoping Study – Baseline Study to identify existing/future conditions/mitigation required and best practice and options

Area Frameworks to include:

- Aveley and Ockendon (including the Mardyke Valley
- The Fens – land north of the A13/Lower Thames Crossing
- Tilbury and Chadwell St Mary – land west of the Lower Thames Crossing
- East Tilbury, Linford and Southfields – land east of the Lower Thames Crossing
- Stanford-le-Hope, Corringham and London Gateway/Thames Enterprise Park

Master Plans to include:

- Grays Town Centre
- Lakeside – including West Thurrock & Chafford Hundred

Design Charrettes/Development Frameworks/Settlement Studies to include:

- Aveley
- Bulphan
- Chadwell St Mary
- Corringham and Fobbing
- East Tilbury and Linford

- Grays
- Horndon on the Hill
- Orsett
- South Ockendon
- Stanford-le-Hope
- Tilbury

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 it is essential that the Council has an up-to-date Development Plan in place and the supporting documentation that will help drive its delivery.

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

- 5.1 The Local Plan has been previously subject of formal consultation (Issue and Options 2) and engagement with Planning, Transport and Regeneration Committee, the Local Plan Group, All Member Briefings, and Group and Ward Member Meetings.

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

- 6.1 The Local Plan has an impact on the delivery of all of the Council's corporate objectives.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Rosie Hurst**
Interim Senior Finance Manager

There is a dedicated budget for plan making to cover the basic costs of preparing planning policy documents.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Tim Hallam**
Acting Head of Legal and Governance and Monitoring Officer

The current system of plan making is contained in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 ('2012 Regulations') and supported by

the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. The Issues and Options Consultation Stage 2 is a preparatory step for the production of a draft Local Plan as required under Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations. In due course, the draft Local Plan shall be prepared and publicised in accordance with the statutory and policy frameworks.

The Authority has a statutory duty pursuant to Section 13 of the PCPA 2004 to keep under review matters which may affect the development of its area. It should be noted that the Secretary of State has intervention powers under section 21 PCPA 2004 and default powers under Section 27 of PCPA 2004 where he thinks that the Authority are failing or omitting to do anything necessary in connection with the preparation, revision or adoption of a development plan document. In such cases, the Secretary of State may, under section 27, prepare or revise the document or direct that the Authority do so.

Under the Council's Constitution and in accordance with the statutory provisions contained in section 9D of the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, Full Council has the power to make decisions in relation to the preparation and adoption of the Development Plan.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Warren**
Strategic Lead, Community Development and Equalities

The Council has a statutory duty under the Equality Act 2010 to promote equality of opportunity in the provision of services and employment opportunities. Through a process of proactive engagement, the Council will ensure that the consultation process associated with the emerging Development Plan will provide an opportunity for all sections of the community, including harder to reach groups, to become fully involved in helping to shape the future planning and development of Thurrock.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder, or Impact on Looked After Children)

There are no other implications associated with the report.

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):

- None

9. Appendices to the report

- Appendix 1 - Summary of Comments From YPYV Community Planning Events

Report Author:

Sean Nethercott

Strategic Lead – Strategic Services

Place Directorate

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1

Summary of Comments From YPYV Community Planning Events

Chadwell St Mary
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Anti-social behaviour is a big issue here• There is a need for a visible police presence• There is an opportunity for a new community centre here• More facilities for young and old needed here• Children's play areas need to be improved• Opportunity for a new / need to extend existing GP surgery here• Congestion / air quality are issues along the SRN, Lakeside, N Chadwell• HGV movements are an issue in the village• Local spots offer opportunities for trim trails, a BMX or skate park, and community events / festivals• Open land around the village needs to be protected to prevent conurbation• Bus service need to be improved and more cycle and walking links• Housing appropriate for young and old needed, social housing for locals• Opportunity for pop-up retail and cafes, fewer takeaways• Opportunity to improve public realm• Opportunity for more allotments / places to grow food
Corringham
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A visible police presence is needed• High need for affordable housing• There is a desire for more highly skilled and/or professional jobs here• More GP coverage is needed• There is still concern that IMC will not provide the same services as Orsett Hospital or that, if they do, services will not be at an IMC which is easy to access• Secondary schools need to be extended• Parking is an issue• Protect local green spaces• Green Belt could provide better / more open spaces• More facilities for young people needed (BMX / skate park could be located in Old Corringham)• Need to improve bus service, walking and cycling links• Concern over the effects Dunton Hills will have on countryside• Leisure centres are good but expensive• Concern that homes built in the Thames Flood Plain reduce marshland and result in increased flooding elsewhere• Bungalows should not be extended as this reduces the number of available retirement properties• Support for multi-generational properties and granny flats to allow people to age in their own homes• Many objections to Lower Thames Crossing

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No desire for more large industrial units but support for live-work units and more local employment
East Tilbury
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses in multiple occupancy are an issue here • Need more starter homes and homes for older residents • Opportunity to convert empty buildings to housing • Air quality is an issue here • A visible police presence is needed here alongside more CCTV • Congestion and HGV movements are an issue here and traffic makes roads unsafe • Bridge required over the railway • Bus routes need improvement as well as better walking and cycling links • There is a need for new or extended GP facilities • Pharmacies could offer more services here • There is an opportunity for an IMC here • Need more early years, primary, and secondary school facilities • A further education facility or college is desired here • Start up spaces, pop up shops, and more offices could be accommodated here • Highly skilled and/or professional jobs are desired here • More leisure and entertainment facilities are desired • Community cohesion is an issue • More facilities for young and old needed • More space required for community activities; good location for a community theatre • Library / hub needs improvement • Opportunity for a local gym and more sports pitches • The green space around East Tilbury should be protected from development • Strategic urban green spaces should be protected and used better • More allotments wanted • There are opportunities for trim trails here • Nature conservation is important to residents • Children's play areas need improvement • The village's unique character must be preserved • An emergency services depot was suggested several times, potentially related to concerns over the only access being routinely closed by trains • Land at West Tilbury Marshes, Tilbury Port, Coalhouse Fort and Mucking Marshes requires clean-up • S106 projects not progressing • Need for better internet service • No desire for travellers pitches here
Grays
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion and parking are issues, particularly near schools • Opportunity for river taxis • Bus service improvements needed

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A visible police presence is needed • Opportunity here for a new community sport / leisure facility to serve as home for Grays Athletics • Air quality is an issue • More affordable swimming facilities needed • More facilities for young people are needed • More professional / highly skilled jobs and creative industries needed • Incubator spaces for start-ups needed • Empty shops are an issue • Opportunity for a night-time economy with more leisure and entertainment • Town centre needs a wider variety of shops and a farmer's market • Orsett Hospital should be expanded, not closed • More GPs and better mental health services needed • Need more housing for older people, students, locals • Opportunity for riverside housing in Purfleet • Opportunity for short-term travellers pitches here • A new primary school is needed • Tech education required (web design, video editing, social media)
Orsett
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion is a big issue here • HGV movements are an issue here • A128 is dangerous – traffic is too fast to allow cars to enter or cross • Air quality is an issue here • The area is important for nature conservation and includes strategic green space • The historic character of the area must be protected • Opportunity for an IMC here but keep the hospital • Opportunity for a new primary school here • Concern that additional development creates more environmental damage • River could be used for more transport to relieve roads
South Ockendon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High need for more affordable housing, particularly social housing to ensure local needs are met • Need more houses for older residents (and ensure new housing is adaptable), sheltered housing, key worker housing • Opportunity to regenerate here • Anti-social behaviour is a big problem here • There is a great need for a visible police presence • Significant need for new or extended primary and secondary schools • Attracting good teachers is an issue here • New / extended GP services should be a priority here • Pharmacies could offer more services • Utility infrastructure including drainage must be upgraded to accommodate growth

- A new supermarket is needed here
- Air quality is an issue here
- Parking, congestion and HGV movements are issues here
- Walking and cycling links could be improved
- Transport needed to get students to secondary schools
- Social spaces – restaurants, cafes, better public areas – needed
- Culver Playing Fields should be protected
- Need more sports pitches
- More facilities for young and old needed
- Allotments should be retained
- Opportunity for incubator / start up spaces

Tilbury

- Parking is an issue here
- Need to improve walking and cycling links
- Anti-social behaviour is an issue
- High need for affordable housing for local people
- Opportunity for short- and long-term traveller / gypsy pitches
- Basic literacy courses need to be taken into traveller sites
- Fly tipping is a problem (attributed to costs to use amenity with a van)
- Strategic green spaces – could be better used
- More activities for young and old
- More facilities needed for community events – community centre should have longer hours
- Community unrest is an issue here
- Unemployment is an issue here
- Need a wider variety of shops here, i.e. fishmonger, butcher, and more restaurants and bars
- Empty shops are an issue
- Opportunity to improve public spaces
- No more takeaways or industrial units
- Locals desire more input into how their town is managed

Work Programme

Committee: Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Year: 2019/2020

Dates of Meetings: 9 July 2019, ~~17 September 2019~~ - postponed to 9 October 2019, 12 November 2019, 21 January 2020, 17 March 2020

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
9 July 2019		
Integrated Transport Block Capital Programme 2019/20	Mat Kiely/Leigh Nicholson	Officer
17 September 2019 (postponed)		
Local Development Plan Task Force Update - Issues and Options 2 Consultation	Sean Nethercott/Leigh Nicholson	Chair
9 October 2019		
Thurrock Local Plan Issues and Options (Stage 2) Report of Consultation	Sean Nethercott/Leigh Nicholson	Chair
12 November 2019		
Grays Town Centre Update	Ayesha Basit	Chair
Delivering the Homes Thurrock Needs	Andy Millard	Chair
Fees and Charges 2019/20	Kelly McMillan	Officer
Stanford le Hope Hub Interchange Update	Paul Rogers/Ayesha Basit	Members
A13 Widening Scheme Update	Paul Rogers	Chair

Work Programme

21 January 2020		
17 March 2020		
TBC		
Freight Strategy Update	Andrew Millard	
Parking Hotspots		Members
Modes of Transport – trends and changes		Members
c2c Update	Chris Atkinson (external)	Members