

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 1 February 2022 at 7.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Tom Kelly, Martin Kerin, Graham Snell (nominated Chair), Lee Watson and Adam Carter (Substitute) (substitute for David Van Day)

**Apologies:** Councillors Alex Anderson (Chair) and David Van Day (Vice-Chair)

**In attendance:** Jahur Ali, Recreation and Leisure Services Manager  
Phil Carver, Strategic Lead Enforcement and Community Protection  
Anthony Fletcher, Development Services Manager  
Matthew Ford, Chief Engineer  
Mat Kiely, Transportation Services Strategic Lead  
Kevin Munnely, Interim Strategic Lead Regeneration  
Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection  
Lisa Preston, Enforcement Operations Manager  
Julie Rogers, Director of Public Realm  
Keith Rumsey, Interim Assistant Director, Regeneration and Place Delivery  
Henry Skipton, Interim Strategic Lead Regeneration  
Stephen Taylor, Strategic Lead of Economic Development  
Navtej Tung, Strategic Transport Manager  
Peter Wright, Strategic Lead of Highways and Infrastructure  
Grace Le, Senior Democratic Services Officer

---

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

As the Chair and Vice-Chair were not present to preside over the meeting, Democratic Services opened the meeting and asked for nominations of a Chair. Councillor Snell was nominated and voted by the Committee to act as Chair for this meeting.

The Chair stated that as this meeting was being held in South Essex College instead of the Council Chamber, there was a time limit for the use of this venue which was until 9.30pm. If the items on the agenda were not concluded by 9.30pm, the items would be deferred to the next meeting.

### **30. Minutes**

The minutes of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration O&S Committee meeting held on 7 December 2021 were approved as a true and correct record.

### **31. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chair stated that the Thurrock Transport Strategy and Vision, Tram, Active Travel and River Connectivity briefing note had been circulated on 21 January 2021 to the Committee. Members confirmed that they had received and read this.

### **32. Declaration of Interests**

The Chair declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he owned a car in Thurrock and that he lived in a PPA parking area.

### **33. Fees and Charges Pricing Strategy 2022-23 (deferred from 7 December 2021 meeting)**

The report was introduced by Leigh Nicholson.

Councillor Kerin raised concerns over the number of charges that had risen above inflation particularly in Darnley Road and Argent Street car parks and in car parks where there were sports recreation facilities. He said that the charges would impact on businesses and users of the sports facilities and questioned why the charges were above inflation. Referring to page 15, he pointed out that the charges on Argent Street would increase by 42% which he felt was not justifiable even if the charges had not increased over the past 3 years. He was also concerned over the increases in the car parks for Coalhouse Fort and Belhus Cricket Club.

Phil Carver explained that the service aimed to maintain a consistent approach in charges and had benchmarked their charges against other local authorities. He said that the methodology used for charges were outlined in the report. In regards to the increase in car park charges for Coalhouse Fort and Belhus Cricket Club, he explained that the car parks were well used and that although it was currently free, it cost the service to maintain the car parks. The increase in the car park charges was to offset this cost. Maintenance of the car parks included resurfacing and filling potholes which caused accidents to users. The charges would be ring fenced back to these car parks. Adding on to this, Julie Rogers referred Members to paragraph 3.3 and said that the service looked at their neighbouring authorities' charging schemes to try to keep a consistent approach in charges.

Councillor Kerin said that he could not agree with the principles for increasing the car park charges as the borough's recreational spaces were much needed

and well used. He pointed out that people had to drive to these places to access these and felt it was not right to have charges there.

Referring to 5.3, Councillor Kelly questioned whether this had influenced the decision to increase car park charges. Julie Rogers replied that Covid had played some part but the pandemic had an overall impact across the Council. She explained that the car parks cost the service to maintain and pointed out that the charges had not increased over the years but this needed to be balanced to ensure they were maintained.

Councillor Carter pointed out that the 42% increase was in line with inflation and that if the charges did not increase, the service would not be able to maintain the car parks well. Councillor Watson questioned whether the charges would be over a 7 day period or during Monday – Friday. Lisa Preston answered that the car park charges would be during Monday – Friday except for the car park in Grays Beach. For Canterbury Parade, the charges would be in place during Monday – Saturday, but would remain free for the first hour.

The Chair commented that an increase in charges was not well liked by people but pointed out that car parks required maintenance which came at a cost. He mentioned that he was aware of claims for injuries in car parks and questioned the cost of these. Phil Carver answered that the last figure had been in the region of £24,000 and some of these injuries had been due to the potholes in the car parks.

Councillor Watson asked what the forecasted costs of maintaining the car parks was and what the revenue would be from the car park charges for the year. Phil Carver advised the detail was in the report.

**RESOLVED:**

**1.1 That Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the revised fees, including those no longer applicable, and comment on the proposals currently being considered within the remit of this committee.**

**1.2 That Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted that director delegated authority will be sought via Cabinet to allow Fees & Charges to be varied within a financial year in response to commercial requirements.**

**34. Introduction of additional Pay and Display sites within Thurrock (deferred from 7 December 2021 meeting)**

The Chair stated that a statement from a member of the public had been accepted and he invited Mr Cansdale to speak. Mr Cansdale read out his statement:

“Unfair Tax on Outdoor Sport and Lifestyles

I believe that our local parks and recreation grounds contribute to healthy living and residents should be encouraged to visit them and should not be deterred by car parking charges. It is my understanding that Council policy is to encourage outdoor activity as part of a healthy lifestyle.

My concern is that the car park charging will drive away organised sport from the venue as club members may choose to participate elsewhere at one of several venues where sport is played in Thurrock and where it is free to park. Or they may choose not to play at all. Teams do not pay for car parking at 'away' fixtures and it is likely Thurrock teams will be ostracised by leagues and competitions, potentially leading to expulsion and social division.

Essentially, Thurrock Council is proposing that a very small sub-set of the population of Thurrock, which uses Ockendon Recreation Ground very frequently, will be paying a very heavy price for repeated visits as Council looks to gain additional revenue to recover the reported £34.3m funding gap and we would suggest that contributions to close this gap are made across the whole Thurrock community, not via these proposed car parking charges, so that an unfair and disproportionate financial burden on our membership can be avoided.

I wish to point out that the statutory guidance for local authorities on enforcing parking restrictions from HM Government, section 2.1, states that 'Enforcement authorities should not view it in isolation or as a way of raising revenue'.

#### HM Government's Sports Strategy

The report appears to be contrary to HM Government's Sports Strategy, published in December 2015, with the mantra of 'a new strategy for an active nation'. The first key heading for a series of 23 performance indicators is 'More People taking part in Sport and Physical Activity'. I suggest that, in Thurrock, this objective will not be met if Council erect pay and display equipment in the car parks of local recreation grounds, such as that planned at Ockendon.

#### Objectives of DCMS Renewal Taskforce

On 20th May 2020, the DCMS announced the creation of this taskforce, chaired by The Right Hon. Oliver Dowden CBE MP, with the view of ensuring that sport and culture can re-open successfully in the post-covid era. I believe this is part of HM Government's pledge to 'Build Back Better'. I therefore suggest that charging to park vehicles at Ockendon Recreation Ground is contrary to the objectives of HM Government, the DCMS and its renewal taskforce.

#### Thurrock Council's Active Place Strategy

This strategy was adopted by Cabinet at its meeting held on 13th January 2021. A Council member in recommending the report for adoption, said:

“Sports will be at the centre of the new local plan and this report will help to increase sport uptake across the Borough”. I ask the current Cabinet members to consider that introducing car parking charges at Ockendon Recreation Ground will not meet the expectations of the Active Place Strategy and participation of outdoor sport at Ockendon will diminish as a result.

#### Similar Recreation Grounds in Thurrock

I am of the opinion that to introduce car parking charges at Ockendon Recreation Ground would be unfair. It is the only playing field of its type which is earmarked for charges; all other venues remain free of charge. How can this be fair? For the avoidance of doubt, I am not suggesting that charges should be inflicted across the area.

#### Self-Maintenance of Sports Pitches at Ockendon Recreation Ground

Thurrock Council had previously advised that, due to budgetary constraints, sports clubs would have to maintain their own sports pitches with effect from April 2021. This has been fully complied with at Ockendon Recreation Ground. It should be recognised that those actions will save hundreds of thousands of pounds over the next two decades or so, yet playing field users at Ockendon are paying a heavy price for the costs of grounds maintenance equipment to replace the equipment previously used by Council operatives. I consider it an insult for sports club members who stay at the ground to carry out this work on a daily basis to then be charged to park their vehicles.

#### Incorrect Nomenclature of Venue

The report initially refers to “South Ockendon Recreational Centre” and this incorrect naming was recently reported as such on a BBC News website item. I consider this to be highly misleading and indicates potential concealment of the proposal. I wish to point out that clarity of proposals to the public is referenced within section five of the statutory guidance for local authorities on enforcing car parking restrictions issued by HM Government.

Further, part 2.7 of the report encourages ‘a large turnover of vehicles’. I consider this to be wholly inappropriate for Ockendon Recreation Ground which is a small, basic public park and not in any way a ‘Recreational Centre’, which implies multiple single visits from across the region.

#### Reducing Anti-Social Behaviours

I reject the notion of part 2.4 from the report which states that ‘the lack of parking enforcement also means these car parks do not receive regular patrols leaving these areas more prone to abandoned vehicles, fly tip, traveller incursions, ASB and nuisance behaviour’. Insofar as Ockendon Recreation Ground is concerned, I believe that the reverse is true. I say that a car parking charge would deter proper usage of the park leading to more problems, not less. The vigilance of our members has, in the past, resulted in successful outcomes from their reporting of a wide range of occasional anti-

social behaviour at our venues, such as racist chanting and graffiti, drug use, fly-tipping, vandalism and motor bike incursion, most of which would otherwise have been unreported.

When, for example, a local sports club had to move away from another Thurrock public park due to Council spending cuts in the mid-1990's, drug dealing replaced cricket and the local crime rate went up. Hardly a co-incidence, I would suggest. Please do not make this mistake at South Ockendon.

#### Perceived Contradiction of Funding Requirements

I note that there appears to be a contradiction with the proposal document. On page one, it is clear from the Executive Summary that Council needs to remedy the funding gap over the next two financial years as a basis for introducing additional car park charging. However, on page seven, a senior management accountant has recorded that car parking income can only be used for car parking purposes and has to be ring-fenced for that sole purpose. But I question whether the estimated annual income of £159,964 is far in excess of what the actual maintenance costs are for each of the four venues highlighted in the report.

#### Lack of Clarity over Issuing of Permits to Sports Clubs

I recognise that there is a reference to members being able to obtain permits, but it is unclear at this stage how this would be organised and my enquiries have not found any evidence that such a scheme is being planned. There is also visiting 'away' teams to consider, as well as match officials, caterers, coaches/managers and maintenance staff. In cricket, the match day captain certainly has enough to do, without trying to organise car parking permits. If the home team captain is also the 'adult in charge', this could lead to a safeguarding issue if he or she has to leave the field to issue a temporary permit to a visiting latecomer. In cricket, I should clarify that it is acceptable for adults and children to play in the same team, subject to minimum age and appropriate consent.

I believe that charging for car parking at Ockendon Recreation Ground will only lead to congestion and inconvenience for local residents where road parking is allowed and uncontrolled.

In scrutinising this report today, I trust you will be able to recommend that it is rejected. Thank you."

The Chair invited officers to respond.

In regards to crime and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), Phil Carver said that Civil Enforcement Officers were trained to identify and report ASB which they did. An option to reduce ASB was through the use of Automatic Number Plate Readers (ANPR) which was widely known to reduce crime as it was able to trace vehicles to owners.

In regards to sports recreation, Jahur Ali said that the service had consulted with the sports clubs. There would be a permit scheme for clubs with fixtures so they would not be charged. At the South Ockendon recreational ground, the service had identified a designated parking area that would be used for the sports clubs to park in without charge. There were multiple options that could be considered to ensure that clubs continued to use the facilities.

The report was presented by Phil Carver.

Referring to the designated parking space at South Ockendon recreational ground, Councillor Kelly queried the number of car parking spaces available there and how the ANPR system would work within this area. He also asked whether the service would consider not charging on one of the days in the car park. Jahur Ali replied that the area would fit around 30 cars but would need some work to be undertaken to bring it up to standard, if the proposal in the report were to be approved. He said that the area would be gated to prevent other non-club users from parking there. In regards to using an ANPR system in the area, he explained that the clubs would manage this by adding vehicle number plates into the system that were allowed to park in the area. On the car park charging, Phil Carver explained that the car park charges were proposed for 7 days a week.

Councillor Watson asked whether the works in the designated parking space in the South Ockendon recreational ground would be undertaken before the car park charges started. She pointed out that the area could be resurfaced with tarmac to allow the club users to use this before the charges began. She asked whether parents of the children who used the clubs would be charged and whether the charges could be at a lower rate on the weekends. She was concerned that people would not use the clubs if they had to pay for car parking.

Officers replied that the service had a quote for the works to be undertaken in the designated parking space of the South Ockendon recreational ground. They explained that the area already had tarmac and was being used by the clubs. The parents could also use the designated space. In regards to lower charges at weekends, officers said that this could be considered.

Councillor Kerin noted that the charges were to reduce ASB but stated that he agreed with Mr Cansdale in that the more people that used car parks was a deterrence in ASB itself. He commented that the proposed charges was to bridge the Council's £34k financial gap and the charges was a burden on people who wanted to use the sports clubs for their kids to play sports. Phil Carver explained that the proposed charges were for the maintenance of the car parks and to deter ASB.

Thanking Mr Cansdale for his statement, Julie Rogers said that this would help to inform the service of how to proceed forward. She explained that this would go through a full TRO process which lasted around 12 weeks and the service would work with the sports clubs. She stated that the charges would

not start until the designated parking space was ready. In regards to the income from the car park charges, these would be ring fenced back to maintaining the car parks only.

In regards to the charges for Coalhouse Fort and One Tree Hill, Councillor Kelly commented that it was not unusual to see charges for these areas as this was common in Essex Country Parks. Referring to the charges proposed for Tamarisk Road, he questioned which area of this road the charges would be for. Phil Carver answered that the service had undertaken an exercise on this road which had suggested that the number of vehicles parking on this long stretch of road were from commuters. He said that it would be commuters that would be paying the charges and residents would have permits.

The Chair queried whether the service had the authority to charge in Langdon Hills Country Park. Officers advised that the land crossed council borders and there was a management agreement in place, which was to be reviewed at the request of Essex County Council (ECC). Officers explained that the car park was maintained by Thurrock Council and that two of the service's rangers managed and patrolled the entire site. Car parking charges would form part of the renegotiation of the Management Agreement and ECC would be included in the consultation process.

Referring to the South Ockendon recreational ground, the Chair stated that he was also concerned over the charges as people also used the car park for visiting the cemetery as well. He thought that ANPR would be beneficial and agreed with MR Cansdale that paper permits would not be ideal as it was harder to manage. He said that he could understand the reasons for the charges but the sports club needed to be helped first and would prefer to see those changes in place prior to any charges being implemented.

Councillor Kelly stated that he wanted to see a reduced charge on one of the days of the week or on weekends. He said that the ANPR system should be tested first if it was to be used for the designated space at South Ockendon recreational ground. He stated that he did not want to see double yellow lines to be introduced anywhere around the roads leading to the car parks as this would cause parking issues around that area.

Referring to the recommendations, Councillor Kerin stated that he had considered the proposals but he did not support the recommendation to Cabinet. Councillor Watson agreed with him and also did not support the recommendations.

The Chair, Councillor Kelly and Carter supported recommendation 1.1.

#### **UNRESOLVED:**

**To consider the proposal, in view of the Medium Term Financial Plan and efficiencies required to meet a balanced budget, and support the**



**recommendation to Cabinet to create additional pay and display facilities and car parks in Thurrock.**

**35. Parking Policy and Strategy and Parking Design and Development Standards**

The report was presented by Navtej Tung.

Councillor Kelly asked whether there were any substantial changes since the report was last discussed at the PTR meeting on 5 October 2021. He commented that the parking strategy needed to acknowledge the issues that the borough currently faced and highlighted issues of the lack of visitor spaces in developments. He felt that there needed to be spaces for delivery vehicles to unload as well. Referring to the multi-storey car parks in Lakeside, he said that these worked well and commuters were able to park there for free but other areas such as Grays did not have this. Navtej Tung replied that there were no substantial changes since the last report but gave Members the opportunity to look at the policies again as requested by the Chair (Councillor Alex Anderson).

Referring to parking standards in new developments, Councillor Kerin asked if this took into consideration the changing nature of families as children became adults but was still living at home. This usually resulted in the purchase of another car which meant another parking space was needed. He also asked what support was in place to help schools with car parking issues. Referring to page 142, Matthew Ford said that a range of different land use and parking standards were outlined and this was applied to ensure that there were good provisions within schools such as drop off and pick up points. He referred to a recently approved planning application for the Orsett Heath Academy and explained how extra parking had been provided due to the recreational uses within the site and also to provide for the multi-functional provision to maximise these. He explained that land use focused on the area of a development where there were opportunities to relax parking standards such as town centre locations with other modes of transport or to provide appropriate parking provisions for facilities that were further away.

Councillor Kerin questioned what was in place to support existing schools who did not have those extra car parking spaces. Matthew Ford replied that the parking standards were not designed to mitigate existing schools and that there were different procedures for these. The service encouraged schools to use travel plans but needed schools to work with the service on these.

In regards to residential developments near train stations, Councillor Kerin commented that these did not have an adequate number of parking spaces. He queried the views of the service when developments proposed less parking spaces because of the proximity to the train station. Matthew Ford explained that over the past 10 – 15 years it had been difficult to evidence the need for adequate parking spaces in residential developments without a parking policy in place. He said that government policies had shifted to require certain parking standards which was reflected in the NPPF to require an

appropriate mix of parking spaces. He went on to say that there were some developers who tried to reduce the number of spaces proposed but the policies and standards in the report would set the requirements for parking spaces in developments in Thurrock.

The Chair commented that the policy and standards set out attempted a modal shift in encouraging people to use other modes of transport. Referring to the table on page 72, he pointed out that wards with a higher percentage of no cars had a train station in their ward but the percentage of car usage was still high. He stated that the parking policy document was rejected at the last discussion because it forced people to use other modes of transport and people still wanted to use cars. Referring to page 84, he pointed out that parking permits penalised people for having a car. He went on to refer to page 93 and said that people would also be charged for using emission based vehicles.

Agreeing with the Chair, Councillor Watson said that her ward covered a large area and that most people owned a car. She said that reducing the number of parking spaces in new developments would cause cars to park on streets. She mentioned that she was a member of the Planning Committee and that there were not enough parking spaces in proposals and also no disability parking spaces. She stated that the borough could not cope with less parking spaces. Matthew Ford explained that the elements of the parking standards were evidence based on case studies that included Chafford Hundred and looked at the impact of car usage on the road network and how people moved around the borough. This gave a range of parking options which allowed for some flexibility for developers and for the Council and developers who proposed less parking spaces had to demonstrate how this would work. There was a requirement for developers to provide safe parking spaces and on plot parking as well as spaces for disabled users closer to the dwellings. On plot parking also enabled these to be used for electric charging points in future. He said that the service would not be encouraging garages as a parking space as these were not viable and could be converted into rooms. He explained that the parking standards document was not a fixed document and could change over time but the service needed a policy in place to support in appeals and applications.

In regards to the parking strategy, Navtej Tung explained that the document did not force people to use other modes of transport but only encouraged this modal shift. He said that car ownership was decreasing across the country and the document reflected this to encourage less car usage. He explained that the strategy did not aim to charge people for car use but only provided this opportunity. If there were to be charges, this would need to go through consultation. In regards to emission based vehicles, he explained that this part of the strategy looked at the opportunity to improve air quality.

The Chair pointed out that the document did not reflect the officers' comments. He said that he had lived in Thurrock a long time and had only ever seen a modal shift in an increase in the use of cars. He stated that car ownership had declined elsewhere in the country but felt that this was not the

case for Thurrock. Councillor Kerin added that there were no major changes in the documents from the last discussion and that the Committee still did not support the documents.

Referring to Orsett Heath Academy, Councillor Kelly said that the service should look to that development as a blueprint for future school developments. He stated that there needed to be an increase in the number of parking spaces in new developments and to ensure that there was a good balance. This included more visitor spaces and increasing the number of spaces per dwelling. He referred to the parking spaces proposed for Springhouse Club as an example. Councillor Carter stated that there should not be less parking spaces because a development was near a train station. He pointed out that the numbers reflected that car usage was still high in those areas. The Chair mentioned that there were no issues with the parking enforcement or design documents but he was not happy with the parking policy and standards documents. He was not happy to support the report's recommendation and said that these documents needed to be reconsidered. He said that he wanted to see clarity on the emissions based vehicle charges and parking permits along with the other issues that the Committee had raised.

**RESOLVED:**

**To review and propose recommendations for amendment to the Parking Policy and Strategy, Parking Design & Development Standards, and Parking Enforcement Strategy.**

**36. Integrated Transport Block Capital Programme 2022-23. Highways Maintenance allocation and programme 2022-23**

The report was presented by Mat Kiely and Peter Wright.

There were no questions or comments from Members.

**RESOLVED:**

**1.1 Planning Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny provide comment on the report and the following Cabinet recommendations:**

**1.2 Endorse the ITB Capital Programme allocations, policy and prioritisation direction for the DfT ITB Block funding under the key Policy areas of Road Safety Engineering, Safer Routes to School, Area Intervention Programme and EV charging programme.**

**1.3 Endorse the Highways Maintenance Block Allocation Programme (as detailed in Appendix 4) for 2022/23.**

**1.4 Support the process which delegates authority to the Director of Public realm, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and**

**Transport, to review and make local changes to the ITB programme and the DfT Maintenance Block Allocation programme, as well as other funding allocations that may arise within-year.**

**37. A13 East Facing Access Update and Outline Business Case Proposal**

The report was presented by Mat Kiely.

Referring to option 1A, the Chair questioned if this was a preliminary plan. Mat Kiely explained that this option would require a more extensive design idea.

Councillor Kerin commented that there was not much to say until it was confirmed who would be the scheme promoter. He said that the report needed to be brought back to committee once this was confirmed. He questioned why National Highways had been approached to be the scheme promoter and why Thurrock Council could not be the scheme promoter themselves. Mat Kiely replied that this was due to the ability to find more funding and National Highways had funding for road investments. National Highways were also more familiar with large scale road infrastructure delivery and the road was also a part of their strategic road network. Thurrock Council had taken the initiative to bring the scheme forward in a much needed area.

Councillor Kelly commented that the scheme should have been implemented years ago due to the Lakeside basin. He mentioned that there was a football pitch in the area and said that the service needed to ensure that the pitch was supported in their move. Navtej Tung explained that the service had been in discussions with the sports pitch providers and there were a number of options in moving the pitch. The service would work with them to ensure that there would be minimal disruption to them.

The Chair commented that the scheme was needed and would help to improve journey times and reduce the amount of traffic on the roads. He asked that the report be brought back and that it needed to highlight potential pitfalls within the project.

**RESOLVED:**

**1.1 Planning Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny provide comment on the report and the following Cabinet recommendations:**

**1.2 Members are asked to note the work undertaken to produce the EFA Outline Business Case to date, to endorse the approach that has been taken and to provide comment on the OBC.**

**1.3 Members are asked to note and comment on the proposed approach to work with National Highways to identify how the OBC submission and responsibility for the scheme can be progressed.**

**1.4 Members are asked to note and comment on the proposed cost and risk implications identified within the report.**

**38. Stanford-le-Hope Interchange Report**

Members discussed whether the item should be discussed in an exempt session. Councillor Kerin and Watson wished to discuss the exempt appendix in an open session as they felt that this needed to be discussed in an open public meeting. The Chair, Councillors Kelly and Carter voted to discuss the item in an exempt session and Councillor Kerin and Watson voted against. Councillor Kerin and Watson chose not to participate in the item in an exempt session.

This item was discussed in an exempt session.

**39. A13 Widening Project**

Due to the time limit of the venue, this item was deferred to the next meeting.

**40. Tilbury and Grays Town Fund Updates**

Due to the time limit of the venue, this item was deferred to the next meeting.

**41. Regeneration Programme Update**

Due to the time limit of the venue, this item was deferred to the next meeting.

**42. Work Programme**

Members requested that Stanford Le Hope Interchange Update and A13 Widening Update remain as standing items on the work programme in the next municipal year.

**The meeting finished at 9.27 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](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)