

Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 15 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Fraser Massey (Chair), Gerard Rice (Deputy Chair), Luke Spillman, John Allen, Sara Muldowney and Sue Shinnick

Apologies: Councillor Andrew Jefferies
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative
Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director LTC and Project Delivery

In attendance: Helen Horrocks, Strategic Lead Public Health
Steve Plumb, Ecology and Biodiversity Officer
Lucy Tricker, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Chris Stratford, Senior Consultant

Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Robert Quick, Resident Representative
Peter Ward, Business Representative

Before the start of the meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being live-streamed and recorded, with the video recording to be made available on the Council's website.

48. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Andrew Jefferies; Westley Mercer, the Thurrock Business Board Representative; and Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director LTC and Project Delivery.

49. Minutes

The minutes from the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) meeting held on 15 February 2021 were approved as a true and correct record.

50. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

51. Declaration of Interests

No interests were declared.

52. Environmental Impact Assessment Update

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that it was divided into four sections: stakeholder engagement; Thurrock's past concerns; Thurrock's current concerns; and next steps. He explained that Highways England (HE) were currently revising the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), but that the table on the front page of the report outlined the process so far. He stated that the eleven topic chapters of the EIA document had been received from HE in July 2020, and the other technical documents had been received in August 2020. He described how Thurrock had commented on all these documents in October 2020, and HE had responded to these comments in February 2021, which Thurrock's LTC team were still digesting and comparing to the EIA, within the Development Consent Order (DCO) Version 1. The Senior Consultant explained that the second page of the report included a table, which outlined the 11 topics that formed the EIA on the left-axis, compared to the stages of reporting on the top-axis. He stated that the team could then use this table to understand the Council's issues with the EIA at that time. He explained that the table used a RAG system of reporting, with green boxes indicating that this area was satisfactory with no action needed; amber indicating there further work to be undertaken; red indicating there were some matters that require amendment; and purple indicating there were some priority matters that require urgent attention. He stated that all red and purple areas had been summarised in section four of the report, but many of the issues were within the amber category. He stated that those areas graded red or purple had been graded based on the information received in October 2020, and some progress had been made on some of these areas since then.

The Senior Consultant then outlined the rest of the paper, which covered four key issues, including air quality. He outlined the major issues surrounding air quality which included: emissions not being included from barges or non-road mobile machinery (NRMM); and, levels of PM10 and PM2.5 not being included for assessment or monitoring. He described how the team had not yet considered HE's response to these issues, so the team were not yet sure if potential mitigation would take place or the right assessment had been undertaken. The Senior Consultant moved onto discuss cultural heritage and explained that HE had undertaken a full heritage assessment across Thurrock, but that Thurrock had questioned its methodology, and so HE were now re-doing the desk-based assessment. He added that there had also been incomplete archaeological surveys undertaken near the portal entrance. The Senior Consultant then explained that the team were currently assessing HE proposed landscape and biodiversity mitigation, but the team were unsure that the proposed mitigation would be adequate. He stated that the team were looking at the strategic area between Tilbury, Coalhouse Fort and Stanford-le-Hope, as this had an increased level of cultural heritage, as well as being environmentally important. He stated that HE believed the LTC scheme would create a biodiversity net gain of 15%, which Thurrock were also questioning, especially how it would be secured within the DCO Version 2.

The Senior Consultant moved on and discussed HE's materials and waste strategy. He stated that HE had recently released a new site waste management plan, which the team were reviewing. He stated that the team are likely to encourage increased use of river traffic to transport materials, as

this would reduce HGV traffic on local roads. He stated that the team were also pushing for more information regarding noise barriers, and were also trying to push for additional noise barrier locations along the route. He then explained issues surrounding population and human health, and felt that HE were now likely to be more transparent in this area. He described how the Community Impacts and Public Health Advisory Group (CIPHAG) would potentially be reformed, which could provide Thurrock and other local authorities with additional information regarding health impacts. He stated that Thurrock had published the Hatch report and non-technical summary that included 57 recommendations for mitigation, and early indications showed that HE would already accept and include two thirds of these within the DCO Version 2, subject to more detailed scrutiny. He stated that discussions regarding employment and skills were going well, and meetings were taking place regularly to discuss this. The Senior Consultant added that Thurrock were also seeking advice from Essex County Council regarding road drainage and water environment along the route, and the teams would be meeting next week to further this discussion. He summarised and explained that the cumulative assessment, which took into account all confirmed developments near the site, was also being developed, and the cut-off for such schemes is likely to be extended due to the DCO not being submitted until later in 2021.

The Chair thanked the Senior Consultant for the report and felt the team needed to push HE to include barges and non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) as part of their air quality assessment. Councillor Rice highlighted the issue of tree planting near the route, and urged the team to push for mature trees rather than whips. He felt that whips would take time to grow and therefore offer little protection, particularly for communities living in Tilbury, Ockendon and Chadwell St. Mary. He added that the trees also needed to be of a good standard to offer the necessary protection as soon as the route was opened. The Senior Consultant replied and stated that the landscape varied across Thurrock, and not all areas would be suitable for tree planting. He added that tree planting along similar routes usually consisted of standard or tall standard trees and whips, and stated that it would be unusual to plant semi-mature or mature trees, as they were expensive and were more likely to fail. He highlighted that the team were pushing HE on the issue of tree planting and would continue to do so. The Ecology and Biodiversity Officer added that HE would be considering different types of screening along the route, which included trees of various sizes. He explained that larger trees had an increased failure rate and were also slower to establish and grow. He stated that him and the team were currently working through tree planting along the route, including which mixture of trees to plant and where. He added that it also took greater energy to move larger trees which reduced their climate off-setting impact. He summarised and stated that the team were currently deciding on species choices and were focussing on faster growing trees.

Councillor Muldowney felt it was good to see increased transparency from HE, and thanked the team for their hard work in digesting and responding to the information that HE provided. She felt that although it was good to receive this information before DCO submission, and that the team were moving in

the right direction, no mitigation had yet been confirmed. The Senior Consultant agreed that mitigation included in the Hatch report had not yet been confirmed, but reassured the Task Force that this was normal for this stage in the process. He explained that HE also had to take into consideration the views and mitigation requests of other local authorities, stakeholders, and environmental stakeholders, and highlighted that it could take time to balance these views and reach an agreed level of mitigation. He mentioned that the process surrounding mitigation had not been started in earnest until recently, and the process had only recently become more open, with more information sharing. He added that the LTC team were also paid for through Thurrock's Planning Performance Agreement, which meant that Thurrock did not have to pay for many external consultancy services needed to review the DCO documentation and resolve issues. He summarised and stated that the team were now drilling down into the detail of the Hatch report with HE, and felt that agreement on this could be reached by late spring/early summer. He added that this agreement would then be secured either through the DCO Version 2 or separate legal agreements. Councillor Muldowney added that she felt the report did not consider green infrastructure, such as open and leisure spaces which had been captured as part of the Hatch report. She also highlighted the increased use of bridleways in the scheme and questioned how the team were proposing to stop anti-social behaviour, particularly from motorbikes, in these areas. The Ecology and Biodiversity Officer replied that the team were currently looking at Coalhouse Fort and how to link this to open spaces in the area, as well as focussing on strategic open spaces. He added that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) included many separate routes, which the team were trying to link together, including through inter-directorate working and through external stakeholders. He stated that it would be a balancing act to ensure Public Rights of Way (PRoW) were open enough for all users, but also prevented anti-social behaviour. He explained that a number of barriers and structures could be put in place to limit access, but these were not fool-proof and bikes would still be able to get through. He commented that regular policing would need to take place, but highlighted that the more legitimate users who used the bridleway, the less likely it was to experience anti-social behaviour on motorbikes. The Ecology and Biodiversity Officer summarised and stated that the team were working through all these issues with HE, and were liaising closely with the PRoW team to look at the issue of anti-social behaviour and were working on this in detail.

The Business Representative highlighted the construction impacts of the proposed scheme and felt that by using the river and ports to transport goods, it could reduce construction traffic on Thurrock roads by at least 50%. He stated that the new aggregate terminal in Tilbury 2 would be up and running by quarter 4 2021, and felt that Thurrock should be pushing HE to consider river usage for construction traffic, which would reduce traffic on the roads and improve air quality. He added that if the ports were used for construction traffic, different machinery could be used on the roads, such as muck moving machines, which would also reduce air pollution. He felt that by using the ports, the scheme could also improve local businesses. The Senior Consultant responded and stated that the Planning Inspectorate had expressed concern at the DCO Version 1 regarding the transport assessment,

as this had not been shared with Thurrock and had not been linked to the site waste management plan, Navigational Risk Assessment or the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA). He stated that HE had assessed construction traffic by a worst case of much HGV traffic, and would then need to provide mitigation for this level. He mentioned that any form of construction traffic reduction would be good, as this would also improve road safety, and the team were likely to encourage to increase river transport usage. He summarised and stated that Thurrock would not get involved in commercial discussions, but the DCO Version 2 should secure some level of river transport for materials and waste.

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative highlighted point 12.3 of the report and questioned the figure of £7billion estimated economic benefit. She commented that the last figure given for economic benefit had been in 2017 when the government had announced £8billion of benefit at the preferred route announcement. The Senior Consultant replied that the figure of £7billion had been provided within DCO documentation by HE, but stated that he did not know if this referred to DCO Version 1 or any preceding documents. He stated that he would look into this and reply in writing.

Councillor Allen agreed with the Business Representative that use of the river for construction traffic would be good, but felt that there could also be some negatives, as ships were still large polluters as they could burn large quantities of oil. He stated that detailed work comparing the impact that ships compared to HGVs had on air quality needed to be undertaken. He added that trees along the route would also be important, and felt that juvenile trees would filter more air than adult trees, but required more upkeep. He questioned whether Natural England were involved in discussions regarding biodiversity in Thurrock. He also questioned the economic benefit to Thurrock, and felt that this could not be determined until HE knew how many vehicles would use the route. He queried if the team were working to promote wetland areas to create new habitats. The Senior Consultant responded the worst case scenario had to be mitigated against in the EIA, and this included the worst case scenario regarding construction traffic and plant and equipment. He added that HE employed a large traffic modelling team and stated that traffic modelling followed a strict methodology, for example by using mobile phone data to work out people's journeys and habits, and this was part of how the volume of cars/other vehicles were predicted to use the route was calculated. He stated that although it was scrutinised for accuracy, it was still a model, and open to variation. The Ecology and Biodiversity Officer added that Natural England were involved in discussions regarding biodiversity, on both sides of the river. He stated that he had met with the Natural England team to discuss baseline biodiversity levels and invertebrate levels, and this had been discussed in detail. He added that the team had also considered the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), which considered all of the potentially affected international designated sites, such as Epping Forest, as well as the Thames Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area, , and that Natural England were working with HE on this to be able to inform the Planning Inspectorate. He added that the team were also looking at new wetland areas, for example in the Mardyke Valley, which could mitigate environmental affects

both close to the route and further downstream, for example in Purfleet. He mentioned that there would also be balancing ponds along the route, and Thurrock were pushing to have the final say in the design of these ponds. He stated that the ponds should not be over engineered, and should be in-keeping with the local landscape.

Councillor Shinnick questioned the purple colour-coded areas, and asked how long it would take to receive updates regarding this from HE. She felt that Thurrock already had high rates of air pollution, and echoed comments regarding needing the right number and types of trees. The Senior Consultant replied that there were currently two purple areas and four red areas of concern, which were summarised at point 5.1-5.4 of the report. He commented that it would take some months to get change in these areas, as Thurrock were asking for air quality monitoring along the route, including for barges and construction machinery. He explained that HE only needed to meet certain standards, but Thurrock were pushing for more. He mentioned that if Thurrock could not get this level of mitigation agreed before DCO, then the Council could try again during the Examination phase.

The Chair questioned the baseline air quality conditions, and queried whether the baseline would stay the same or worsen once the route had been opened. The Senior Consultant explained the principle of NEWT, which meant 'Not Environmentally Worse Than' (although termed differently now), and stated that the general rule meant that HE did not have to improve air quality, it just should not worsen it without adequate mitigation. He added that local authorities and central government also had responsibilities for air quality and the government were currently pushing the green agenda. He added that as part of the Hatch report, Thurrock wished to plant an area of willows as a carbon offsetting measure. The Resident Representative asked if any update had been received regarding construction working hours, as previously these had been very long and would affect residents through increased noise and vibration. He also asked if false cuttings along the route could be increased in height using waste material, and if noise barriers would be absorptive or reflective, and how this would be measured. The Senior Consultant agreed that there was concern regarding working hours during construction, and how long HE had defined as the summer. He stated that this had been part of the Hatch recommendations, which had questioned the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), and although working hours had been more or less standard, some proposed working days seemed long. He added that there needed to be a balance between having shorter working days over a longer period, or having longer working days over a shorter period, particularly near communities such as Linford and Chadwell St Mary. The Ecology and Biodiversity Officer added that the team also needed to find a balance between the height of the false cuttings, to ensure they did not have their own visual impact, and landscape planting, as it would be difficult for trees to survive where false cutting was particularly high. He added that there would also be logistical difficulties transporting waste materials to false cutting sites, and this could increase HGV movements. The Senior Consultant mentioned that the team were waiting on the noise assessment results to decide whether absorptive or reflective barriers would be better.

Councillor Spillman joined the meeting – 7.07pm

Councillor Allen stated that there would be no escort for hazardous vehicles in the tunnel, and queried whether this would increase the amount of hazardous goods being transport in the LTC compared to the Dartford tunnel. He added whether firefighting equipment, such as water, foam or dry powder sprinklers would be included in the tunnel. He felt that ideally there should be two new fire and rescue stations at either end of the tunnel portal. He also felt that the LTC tunnel could be the target of a terror attack, and asked if this had been considered. The Senior Consultant responded that Thurrock, Kent and Essex County Councils and Gravesham were in discussion with all blue light response services regarding tunnel safety and emergency service provision. He stated that Thurrock were currently waiting on the emergency services to confirm their requirements, such as cross passage distances and emergency provision. He added that any tunnel safety requirements would need to be legally secured, but the emergency services needed to outline their requirements before this stage. He felt that as the LTC would not require a tunnel escort, the LTC might see an increased number of hazardous vehicles compared to Dartford.

53. Health Impacts Update

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that it was formed of three parts: process; concerns; and next steps. He explained that the HEqIA draft had been received on 3 August 2020, and Thurrock had responded on 1 October 2020 with their comments. He explained that HE had responded to Thurrock's comments in February 2021, and the team were currently looking at HE's response and comparing these to the HEqIA submitted at the DCO Version 1. He stated that this should be completed in a few weeks, and the team would then meet with HE to discuss any concerns. He then described how CIPHAG had held nine meetings between November 2018 and July 2020, and this was now being re-started on a more transparent basis, and included all relevant local authorities and Public Health England. The Senior Consultant explained that the CIPHAG group were currently deciding on who would chair the meeting, but stated that HE senior management would be involved to ensure decisions could be made and move the meetings forward. He mentioned that there would be 4-5 more CIPHAG meetings, with the first one being at the end of March to examine outstanding issues. He also explained that the Public Health Strategic Lead was currently garnering support from other local authorities for a separate independent audit into the HEqIA from the DCO Version 1, and this would be an ongoing process over the next few months. The Senior Consultant explained that Thurrock currently had concerns regarding elements of the baseline data, methodology, results, and mitigation; for example air quality data, access to open spaces, and noise and vibration levels.

Councillor Muldowney questioned the response to the draft HEqIA, and queried whether HE had responded to Thurrock's comments regarding the

lack of baseline data. The Senior Consultant explained that Matt Palmer, the new HE Executive Director, had agreed that any decisions that required resolution could go through him directly, which was a step forward. Councillor Muldowney felt that although it was good to see increased transparency through CIPHAG, there was still a lack of data and monitoring information. She thanked the Public Health team for their hard work on this report, particularly during the pandemic, but questioned whether the HEqIA had moved on since it was last brought before the Task Force in October. She also queried whether air pollution could be mitigated, such as the effects of PM2.5, which the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs had called the 'biggest risk to health'. She stated that Thurrock already had increased incidence of cardiovascular diseases, COPD, and other underlying conditions that would be exacerbated during construction phase and reduce their quality of life and increase likelihood of premature death. Councillor Muldowney felt pleased to see that the team were pushing for HE to monitor PM2.5, and felt that HE should agree to this as part of the governments green agenda. The Senior Consultant stated that the air quality methodology was included as part of specific guidance within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), as well as further requirements in the National Policy Statement (NPS). He explained that although the NPS was the main policy guide for air quality assessment and mitigation, there was often friction between this document and the DMRB, although both were not clear on acceptable levels of PM2.5. He explained that due to staff sickness there were currently no environmental health officers in Thurrock at present to cover this matter, so Stantec were working hard on this issue, to try and ensure that HE monitored PM10, PM2.5 and nitrogen dioxide levels along the route. The Strategic Lead Public Health added that the summary provided in the report were comments relating to the working draft, which did not contain all information required. The version shared recently for DCO version 1 now includes some of the missing information and that the team were working hard to review the HEqIA in detail, including any previously missing information and to understand the remaining issues.

The TCAG Representative echoed Councillor Muldowney's thanks to the Public Health team for their work on the report, and highlighted that the health impacts of the route would affect all residents. She urged residents and Councillors to campaign for the inclusion of the World Health Organisation PM2.5 standards in the new UK Environmental Bill. She also felt pleased to see that the new CIPHAG group would be more transparent, and asked if the public or Task Force Members would be able to view minutes from these meetings, or if the meeting would be live-streamed. The Senior Consultant responded that as CIPHAG meetings were technical, they would not be publicised or live-streamed, but stated that he could provide regular updates on CIPHAG at Task Force meetings. He outlined that the transparency of CIPHAG would be of a technical nature, and would improve information sharing between HE and Thurrock. The Resident Representative questioned if the new CIPHAG would be chaired by an independent person, and if this was an important role. The Senior Consultant responded that the previous Chair had been Dr Karen Lucas of Leeds University, who had been a leading authority. He explained that he did not know who the next chair would be, as

this would be decided by HE. He felt that although an independent chair would be important, if HE were more transparent and responsive to concerns, it might not be as critical as with previous CIPHAG meetings.

Councillor Allen highlighted that Thurrock had increased levels of respiratory illnesses, such as COPD, and stated that increased levels of air pollution could cause diseases such as heart disease, lung disease, and strokes. He stated that air pollution accounted for 40,000 premature deaths across the UK, which equated to 8.3% of all premature deaths and cost the NHS £40 billion per year. He felt concerned regarding PM2.5 and PM10, as well as particulates from brake and tyre dust, which could still be harmful and could come from electric vehicles as well as petrol and diesel vehicles.

54. CO2 Emissions

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that this had come from a request from Councillor Muldowney at December's Task Force meeting, and set out the measures for CO2 emissions that had been included in the Hatch report, which had been published on the Council's website at: [Lower Thames Crossing proposals | Thames crossing | Thurrock Council](#). He stated that the Hatch report included 23 direct mitigation measures; 12 council-led support measures; and, 22 legacy measures; and, and 2 of these related particularly to CO2 emissions. He stated that these two mitigation measures included the establishment of ultra-low emissions vehicle (ULEV) targets on the LTC, and a carbon off-setting plan through the introduction of willow planting. He stated that the team were currently receiving HE's response to these two mitigation requests. The Senior Consultant outlined page two of the report, which highlighted the cost of willow planting, and how it would partly address CO2 emissions along the route. He stated that the DCO Version 1 had included the Environmental Statement, as well as the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), and when revisions to these documents were included in DCO Version 2 submission they would be legally binding. He explained that the team were currently working to ensure that willow planting was included in the REAC and CoCP, and although HE had agreed to some measures in the REAC, these still needed to be developed further.

The Senior Consultant then moved on and described how the Department for Transport's first draft of the Decarbonisation Plan had been published in March 2020, and had been through consultation so people could submit their ideas for decarbonisation. He stated that he understood that the Department for Transport planned to publish the final document in April 2021, which could contain measures that would affect the LTC, such as ULEV targets. The Senior Consultant briefly described the work that Transport Action Network (TAN) had been undertaking, and corrected the report by stating that TAN were only able to challenge the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) 2 on climate change, not air quality or SEA. He stated that currently HE did not have to comply with their current carbon and energy plan, but had to show that they had assessed carbon levels on the route. He added that HE also had to take into consideration the governments net zero goal, as approximately 5+ million

tonnes of carbon would be created during construction and for the first sixty years of the route opening. He stated that HE had already agreed to reduce the size of assets along the route, many other measures including changing the concrete mix to reduce emissions, but Thurrock would continue to push for further mitigation.

Councillor Muldowney questioned L20 of the Hatch report, and asked if this would have an impact on CO2 emissions. She also questioned how much willow planting would offset carbon emissions by, as she had worked it out to only offset carbon output from the LTC by 0.2%. She felt that although this was a good project, it would only be minimally effective. She felt that Thurrock and the UK needed to tackle climate change by reducing the number of large concrete projects, which produced a lot of pollution. She also questioned how the government could agree a decarbonisation plan as well as the LTC, which seemed to fundamentally have different goals. The Senior Consultant responded that HE had already committed to preparing an electric vehicle strategy, but it seemed to only include the transport of workers at present. He stated that the team were waiting to see what plant and construction equipment was proposed by HE, for example EU rules stated that class six HGVs were 'clean' vehicles, and HE could commit to using these, as well as electric plant equipment and willow planting. The Senior Consultant added that page seven of the draft Decarbonisation Plan emphasised six ways to reduce carbon, which included: an increased shift to public and active travel; decarbonising road emissions; decarbonising road vehicles and how we get our goods; place-based solutions; making the UK a hub for green transport technology and innovation; and reducing carbon emissions in a global economy. He stated that this did not include mention of reducing road building, but Stantec and Thurrock would continue to push for the LTC to include future travel patterns and technological changes. He stated that buses would be able to use the LTC but this needed to be promoted and made easier for people to access in their routes into and out of the tunnel.

The TCAG Representative highlighted the published Hatch report and asked if this could be reviewed, as some graphics overlapped text, which made it difficult to read. The Senior Consultant replied that he would liaise with the communications team to get this updated, as necessary. The TCAG Representative questioned where the willow planting would take place. She also queried how this would be useful for carbon offsetting as when the willows were chopped down and burned for biomass fuel, this would cause pollution. She also questioned point 1.3 of the report and asked how any spoil from the route could be used for planting, if planting was due to begin this year. The Senior Consultant replied that he would find the answers to these questions and reply in writing to the Task Force. The Ecology and Biodiversity Officer added that the willow planting would take place on Buckingham Hill, in the area behind the civic amenities site. He stated that this would be 26 hectares, which had previously been landfill and was a good site for restoration, as it had previously been poorly restored. The TCAG Representative asked if HE had to include non-motorised users in the LTC design, as if it was an A-road, it would be used by cyclists and walkers. The Senior Consultant replied that this would be likely to be set-out in the DMRB

guidance, but there were still questions as to whether the route would be a motorway, expressway or a trunk road and what implications that had for its design detail. He stated that it would be called the A122, but the team still did not know what restrictions or classifications this would carry. He added that an LTC report had assessed all existing walking, cycling and horse-rider (WCH) routes in the area, as well as their condition, potential for upgrade, and missing WCH links, and those top priorities would be encouraged to be included in the LTC scheme. He stated that the team would review this assessment and make suggestions for added links or missing provision if necessary. He explained that Thurrock had lots of capability for using WCH routes, but there was not currently the provision to encourage this, and this needed more detailed work. The Senior Consultant added that he was also looking into the Northwood Project at Councillor Rice's suggestion.

The Chair and Task Force agreed to extend standing orders.

55. Mitigation Update - verbal report

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that the team had received written comments from HE on all 57 mitigation items, and these comments were currently being reviewed by officers and senior Members. He stated that once this had been reviewed, it would be reported back to the Task Force. He felt hopeful that the Council and HE would be in a reasonable position by May/June 2021.

The Chair thanked officers, particularly Anna Eastgate – the Assistant Director LTC, and Stantec, for all their hard work throughout the year. The TCAG Representative echoed these comments and thanked Anna for her hard work, both with the Task Force and with TCAG. Councillor Muldowney also echoed these comments and thanked Anna and the team, particularly the Senior Consultant, the Ecology and Biodiversity Officer and the Strategic Lead Public Health for their hard work in digesting and summarising all the information for the Task Force. Councillor Spillman added his thanked to Anna, as he felt she had been very knowledgeable and had a brilliant sense of humour. He wished her well in the next step in her career. The Senior Consultant added that Anna had been brilliant to work with, as she had always spotted problems before they had arisen, for example the mitigation list had begun to be developed two years ago, which required lots of forethought. He also thanked Anna for her hard work in getting HE to agree to the PPA, as Thurrock had been the first local authority to do this, and this had allowed resources be spent by HE that had benefitted Thurrock. Councillor Allen thanked all officers for their contribution, particularly Anna and the Senior Democratic Services Officer.

56. Work Programme

There were no items to add to the Work Programme.

The meeting finished at 8.22 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**