

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 **18 October 2022**

Committee Room 2, Civic Offices 3, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL.

Membership:

Councillors Alex Anderson (Chair), John Allen (Vice-Chair), Tom Kelly, Kairen Raper, Graham Snell and Lee Watson

Substitutes:

Councillors Adam Carter, Colin Churchman, John Kent, Martin Kerin and James Thandi

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Minutes	5 - 14
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 5 July 2022.	
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. To agree any relevant briefing notes submitted to the Committee.	
4. Declaration of Interests	
5. A13 Widening Project	15 - 20

- | | | |
|-----------|---|----------------|
| 6. | Stanford-le-Hope Interchange Report | 21 - 28 |
| 7. | Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2022/2023 | 29 - 32 |

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Kenna-Victoria Healey, Senior Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **7 October 2022**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Advice Regarding Public Attendance at Meetings

If you are feeling ill or have tested positive for Covid and are isolating you should remain at home, the meeting will be webcast and you can attend in that way.

Hand sanitiser will also be available at the entrance for your use.

Recording of meetings

This meeting will be live streamed with the recording available on the Council's webcast channel.

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-GUEST
- 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](#) or [Android Device](#) 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 5 July 2022 at 7.00 pm

- Present:** Councillors Alex Anderson (Chair), John Allen (Vice-Chair), Adam Carter (*substitute*), Kairen Raper, Graham Snell and Lee Watson (*arrived 7.02pm*)
- Apologies:** Councillor Tom Kelly
- In attendance:** Mat Kiely, Strategic Lead Transportation Services
Kevin Munnelly, Strategic Lead Regeneration
Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Keith Rumsey, Interim Assistant Director, Regeneration and Place Delivery
Navtej Tung, Strategic Transport Manager
Lucy Tricker, Senior Democratic Services
-

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

1. Minutes

The minutes of the Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 1 February 2022 were 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 interests declared.

4. Thurrock Supported Bus Services

The Strategic Transport Manager introduced the report and outlined the three subsidised bus services currently operating within Thurrock, which were the 11, 265 and 374. He stated that the 11 service ran Monday through Friday between 7am and 7pm every two hours and covered areas such as Purfleet, Aveley, Grays, Chadwell St Mary, Horndon-on-the-Hill and Basildon Hospital. He added that the 265 operated Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and the 374 operated Monday through Friday at 90-minute intervals and every three hours on a Saturday. He commented that some rural areas did not have any other public transport links such as Fobbing, Bulphan and Horndon-on-the-

Hill, and the contract had been operated by Nibs since 2019. He stated that Nibs currently had a three-year contract for the services with a two-year extension option. The Strategic Transport Manager added that the current contract had come to an end in March 2022, but had been extended for a year. He stated that bus services had been affected by the pandemic as in 2019 there had been approximately 89,000 journeys compared to only 30,758 journeys in 2020 and 65,008 journeys in 2021. He explained that the service cost approximately £454,318 per year to run, but this could change due to the number of bank holidays in a year.

The Strategic Transport Manager explained that approximately 60% of service users had concessionary passes and therefore did not pay for the bus service, although this percentage was higher in some areas such as Bulphan. He stated that 40% of bus users were paying for the service and this had increased since the start of the pandemic. He mentioned that Nibs had maintained the bus services in Thurrock, but costs were expected to rise by approximately £100,000 per year due to fuel costs, driver shortages, maintenance, and tyre costs. He stated that the purpose of the report was to seek approval and endorsement to review the services to ensure they continued to provide value for money and were needed by residents, either in their current guise or at all. He added that Thurrock Council did not have a statutory duty to provide bus routes and had managed to partly subsidise these services through a £50,000 Covid grant from the Department of Transport. He explained that Nibs also received some grants from Essex County Council as the bus services partly operated in Essex County Council's area. The Strategic Transport Manager summarised and stated that the report set out the process for consultation, which would be approximately 12 weeks and would run alongside a Community Equality Impact Assessment and user profiling. He stated that a report outlining consultation responses and other work undertaken would be brought back to the Committee in December 2022.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and questioned how removing public transport links would help the Council move towards its aims for sustainable and greener travel. The Strategic Transport Manager replied that the consultation would review how the service was provided, for example if big buses were needed for lower occupancy routes, or if smaller buses could be used. He added that if some routes were being under-utilised this added to Thurrock's carbon footprint, so it might prove more sustainable to remove some routes. He explained that the team would consider all consultation responses and how services were being used to ensure journeys were sustainable. The Chair sought reassurance that the team would be undertaking thorough research and investigation into how much services cost to run and how much they were being utilised to ensure accurate figures. The Strategic Transport Manager replied that although the transport team was small, it contained one officer who was an expert in the bus industry and had a good working relationship with Nibs. He explained that the officer had worked his entire life on buses, as a driver and operator, and provided the Council with invaluable guidance and expertise.

Councillor Allen queried if the proposal considered the Local Plan, which

would increase the number of homes in the borough, as this may increase the number of bus users. He also questioned how the consultation would be undertaken. The Strategic Transport Manager stated that the consultation would be undertaken through both digital and in-person channels. He explained that he would work with the community engagement team to ensure that surveys were distributed to those people in harder to reach communities or those who did not have access to the internet, for example those in rural areas. He added that the consultation would also piggyback off the 'Your Place, Your Voice' Local Plan consultation events to ensure the team could have conversations with residents and understand how the service was being used.

Councillor Watson thanked officers for their report and felt that the 2020 and 2021 journey figures were not a true representation of usage due to the pandemic, and asked if figures could be provided for 2022. She stated that the three bus services stopped regularly at Orsett Hospital and Basildon Hospital and users of these services could be elderly or disabled. She asked if the team would ensure that these people still had access to the hospitals if the bus services were ended. She stated that some people in rural villages only had access to these public transport services and asked officers to wait until the Local Plan was finalised before considering stopping services. The Strategic Transport Manager responded that the team were using the 2019 journey figures as a baseline, as this was the last year that data was not affected by the pandemic. He stated that it was important for the team to consider how buses were used and why to ensure they could understand the reasons for use. The Assistant Director Planning, Transport and Public Protection added that the Local Plan would include the Transport Strategy, which would outline how to improve sustainable travel within Thurrock. He explained that the both the Local Plan consultation and bus service consultation would happen at the same time, so would piggyback off each other and ensure bus services were considered as part of the wider Local Plan picture. He stated that the team would work to ensure that the consultation captured any unintended consequences if the bus route was stopped.

Councillor Carter queried if Thurrock Council had any control over the number of concessionary pass holders. He felt that £5.10 per journey was expensive per passenger and felt it was good to consult users and begin the conversation to ensure taxpayer value for money. The Strategic Transport Manager explained that the concessionary pass scheme was central government led, and Thurrock had little control over who received a pass. He added that Thurrock did allow concessionary pass holders free travel at 9am, compared to government guidelines which suggested free travel should start at 9.30am, and Thurrock also allowed carers free travel which was not outlined by central government. He stated that central government provided Councils with a grant for the concessionary pass, which was then recompensed to bus operators using a complex formula. Councillor Allen felt concerned for elderly and disabled residents if the bus services were stopped and sought clarification on how much the service cost could increase. He asked if the Council could investigate alternative provision for elderly and

vulnerable residents. The Strategic Transport Manager stated that the service cost could increase by approximately £100,000 per year, which would mean the service would cost approximately £500,000 per year. He added that although the Council did not have a statutory duty to provide these bus services, under the Transport Act 1985, Council's did have to show consideration for services. He added that the team would be looking into alternative transport methods, other service providers, and new ways of operating services.

Councillor Snell highlighted that the 89,000 journeys were spread across the three routes and did not indicate the number of passengers using each service. He added that the £5.10 cost per journey was not spread evenly across all passengers, as 60% of passengers were concessionary pass holders, so only 40% of users paid for the service. He asked if the team could investigate how many people used the bus services, rather than how many trips they were making. He also asked if the bus operator had tried to provide cost savings already, and if alternatives had been considered. The Strategic Transport Manager stated that the team would be looking into more detailed figures after the consultation, and this could be shared with the Committee at that point. He explained that the bus operator had small profit margins and it was therefore difficult to find cost savings, particularly with increased future costs and lack of bus price increases for the past three years. Councillor Raper highlighted section 3.3 of the report and asked if the team had the manpower to conduct a thorough in-person consultation across Thurrock, as some residents struggled to access online consultations. The Strategic Transport Manager replied that they would work with the communities' team to look at how the consultation could be promoted, for example posters, drop-off centres and through bus drivers themselves. He stated that the team would work with bus operators to promote the consultation and would organise postal consultations too.

The Chair thanked officers for their report and asked if the report scheduled for December could contain figures regarding the cost per passenger, rather than cost per journey, and the number of passengers on each service.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Committee agreed to endorse the commencement of consultation within the community for a period of no less than 12 weeks on the need and impact of the three bus services supported by Thurrock Council.**
- 2. That the Committee noted that during the consultation period any necessary profiling of user groups is to be undertaken together with a Community Equalities Impact Assessment.**
- 3. That a further report scheduled for December 2022 will be presented to the Committee to be made aware of the outcome of the consultation, the Community Equalities Impact Assessment and recommended options for future service provision into 2023 and beyond.**

5. Stanford-le-Hope Interchange Report

The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery introduced the report and stated that the project was being brought forward in two phases: Phase 1 being the new station, which was in detailed design phase and construction stage; and the Phase 2 being the Transport Hub, which was in concept design stage. He stated that a contractor for Phase 1 had been appointed in March 2022 and the team were currently negotiating the final sign-off of the contract, which would hopefully be completed next week. He added that there was currently a one- or two-month delay to works starting on the site due to the contract execution issues, but was hopeful that the contractors could offset this delay as the detailed design phase continued. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery added that the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP), who are one of the funders, had asked for an updated business case demonstrating value for money, which had been issued in draft with the aim that it be endorsed by SELEP in September. He stated that Part 2 of the business case concerning Phase 2 would describe how the concept design would be reviewed in partnership with stakeholders to ensure local businesses, such as the port, had their transport needs met and property development opportunities explored. He stated that construction of Phase 2 of the project could not begin until Phase 1 was completed, so felt that now was the optimal time to undertake a re-evaluation.

The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery explained that the contractors price met the Phase 1 budget envelope, and the team were working on a fixed cost contract, although this was currently being discussed with contractors due to the delayed execution and ongoing inflation issues. He highlighted Table 3.10 of the report which outlined the key milestones in the scheme, and explained that once the contract had been signed, activity such as enabling works could begin onsite. He added that 3.11 of the report outlined the key risks, mitigation, and opportunities for the scheme, and highlighted that Network Rail were involved in the scheme in an Asset Protection capacity and were an integral part of the design team, which meant that ideas such as reduced piling for platforms through value engineering could be progressed.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and asked if the late contract signing would influence the construction start date. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery stated that the effect of the late contract signing would be understood when the contract had been signed and the contractors programme was submitted. Councillor Allen felt that the project had taken a long time, but felt pleased that it seemed to be moving forward. He asked if the project could still be delivered within the original budget envelope, as the detailed design had been changed. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery felt confident that Phase 1 of the project could be delivered within the current budget envelope as there was risk tolerance allowed for. He stated that the team would be looking at additional funding for Phase 2 of the project to reflect opportunity to deliver

greater benefits.

Councillor Watson asked how much the contract would be signed for. She queried if the updated business case would increase the budget envelope and asked for the level of risk tolerance. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery stated that as contract negotiations were ongoing, he should not release the contract value information into the public realm. He added that as the cost for the project had increased, SELEP had asked additional questions regarding value for money, which the team were providing. He commented that the current budget was approximately £29million, and an adequate risk tolerance was included in this for Phase 1 construction. Councillor Watson asked if a report on the Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project be brought to every Committee meeting. Councillor Raper highlighted section 3.4 of the report and asked how feedback on the project had been collected. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery replied that a steering group had been set up for the project which included resident representatives and stakeholders such as, SELEP, the Port of London and Network Rail, who regularly provided project feedback.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee noted and commented on the information provided relating to the Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project.

6. Tilbury Town Fund Programme

The Strategic Lead Regeneration introduced the report and stated that it was being presented to the Committee ahead of submission to Cabinet next week, and it outlined the Tilbury Town Fund programme. He stated that the programme provided approximately £22.8million to Tilbury as part of central government's levelling up programme, and officers were currently in the process of preparing a Business Case Summary to be submitted to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities before 5 August deadline. He explained that Table 1 of the report outlined the revised programme list, which had been amended following a cost plan review and stakeholder feedback.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and felt that it was positive as it would provide approximately £22.8million in funding to Tilbury. He asked if the team had considered cost inflation for areas such as materials within the budget, as parts of the project was not due to be completed until March 2026, during which inflation may have risen further. The Strategic Lead Regeneration stated that during the programme review stage, the budget would be looked at more rigorously. He explained that there had been inconsistencies in the previous budget due to inflation, which were now being addressed as outlined in section 3.4 of the report. The Chair queried the cost increase for the Tilbury jetty. The Strategic Lead Regeneration explained that this cost increase was due to sense checking the preliminary design. He stated that the first design had been for a double-decker jetty structure, which was not required and had been over-engineered. He stated that the cost

increase reflected predicted cost increases for quarter 3 in 2023 and other contingencies. He added that other areas of the fund had reduced their budget envelopes, for example the community hub and adult skills centre which had reduced costs by proposing the reuse of existing buildings rather than building a new building.

Councillor Allen felt that the proposed jetty would be more beneficial to the cruise terminal and ports rather than residents, although he felt it could be a good way to travel into London. He asked who had examined the preferred site of the youth centre at Anchor Fields and why they had determined that site to be the best location. He felt that other areas such as Brennan Road and London Road would be better sites for the youth centre, as Anchor Fields was currently designated as a Field in Trust and used as open, green space by residents. He asked if other sites could be explored and investigated for the youth centre. The Strategic Lead Regeneration explained that the Committee and Cabinet had previously considered the Town Investment Plan, which had included the proposal for the Thurrock Youth Zone. He explained that the location was subject to review, but the preferred site was Anchor Fields due to constraints with other sites. He explained that the old youth centre building was too small; the police station was also too small and not council owned; the children's centre was still being used as a children's centre with no plans to move; Dock Road was situated on industrial land, on the edge of the heart are, and had significant remediation costs; and Daisy Fields was used for a more active recreational area with sports pitches. He stated that the team had considered all sites against the agreed upon criteria, for example the site had to be within the heart of the community and council owned, and the proposed site would undergo due diligence tests before coming back to the Committee and Cabinet. The Strategic Lead Regeneration added that the site would have to undergo consultation and go through the planning process, which would include reasons why other sites were not as viable. He summarised and stated that the team would engage with residents through a public consultation with Onside to balance the benefits of the site against resident concerns. The Chair asked how much land would be left at Anchor Fields if the proposed youth centre was built there. The Strategic Lead Regeneration stated that minimal land take would be a requirement of the build and the team would ensure the building had a small footprint through consultation and engagement.

Councillor Watson questioned how the proposals would benefit the people of Tilbury. She felt that residents would benefit more from the regeneration of areas such as Dock Road, rather than a new jetty or heritage regeneration. She asked if Uber would be willing to contribute to the cost of the jetty, as she felt they would be the primary beneficiaries. She questioned why the cost of the Fort works had increased, but the cost of the adult skills hub had decreased, and who made the decisions regarding the proposals. The Strategic Lead Regeneration explained that the proposals were agreed upon by the Tilbury Town Fund Board (TTFB), which was constituted in line with central government guidance and included residents, commercial stakeholders, and political members. He stated that the TTFB had felt that the proposed programme balanced resources to ensure the money was spent in

the right places. He added that the team had talked to the relevant services about how buildings could be adapted and made fit for purpose, and would meet the need of residents, for example the proposed youth centre and adult skills hub. He commented that youth centres had a proven impact on the outcomes for young people, and programmes such as the jetty would improve commuters' journeys and encourage visitors to Tilbury to visit Tilbury Fort and the proposed Heritage Centre. He summarised and stated that points raised by the Committee would be reported back to Cabinet.

Councillor Raper asked how the fund would improve the area of Tilbury. The Strategic Lead Regeneration described how the TTFB had looked at the collection of buildings in Tilbury, such as the parade and church, and felt that improvements through the public realm team could uplift the area. He gave the example of the 1920s buildings in the town which were historical and prominent and stated that the team would be working to ensure its significance was retained and enhanced. Councillor Carter felt pleased to see that heritage had been added to the proposal list, as there was lots of history within Thurrock that could be improved and celebrated. Councillor Snell felt that it was good to see youth facilities and heritage on the proposal list. He added that the jetty would improve sustainable travel options in the borough and could increase footfall and business opportunities within Tilbury. The Strategic Lead Regeneration added that Tilbury town had already undergone some improvement works, such as new cycle facilities and planting, and some proposals would not be brought forward in this funding round, but would be considered in the longer term.

Councillor Allen agreed that a youth centre would improve the outcomes for the children of Tilbury, but felt opposed to the proposed site. Councillor Raper asked if other alternatives had been considered for the youth centre site. The Strategic Lead Regeneration stated that he would share the analysis of the alternative sites with the Committee, but explained that if the proposal did go ahead the land could contain a covenant to ensure the land was safeguarded.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee noted and commented on the report, including the Cabinet recommendations as set out below:

“That Cabinet:

Approve the Tilbury Town Fund Programme and Budget allocations as set out in Table 1 of this report.

Delegates authority to the Corporate Director of Resources and Place Delivery, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Strategic Planning and External Relationship and the Assistant Director of Legal Services, to approve the Business Care Summaries, and agree lease, development and contractual terms (including approval to go to tender and award) to support the delivery of the programme.

Confirms agreement to underwrite the proposed financial settlement to enable the delivery of the Thurrock Youth Zone, as set out in Section 8.1 of this report, and that officers actively seek alternative revenue streams to support the long-term delivery of the Youth Zone.”

7. Work Programme

Members agreed to add the following items to the Work Programme:

1. Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project at every Committee meeting
2. Grays underpass
3. Grays regeneration masterplan
4. Purfleet regeneration
5. Tilbury Town Fund to come back to Committee
6. Parking Strategy Update
7. Local Plan Update to be presented in October, and reports from the Local Development Plan Task Force to be shared with PTR Members.

The meeting finished at 8.42 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

18 October 2022		ITEM: 5
Planning, Transportation and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee		
A13 Widening Project		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: N/A	
Report of: Keith Rumsey, Interim Programme Director		
Accountable Assistant Director: Kevin Munnely, Assistant Director of Regeneration & Place Delivery		
Accountable Director: Sean Clark, Corporate Director of Resources and Place Delivery		
This report is Public		

Executive Summary

This report is provided at the Committee's request for an update on the A13 project. This report and future reports will focus on the latest progress in delivery of the project, any changes to the agreed programme or significant events.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 That the Planning, Transportation and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes and comments on the report content.

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 The project scope involves widening the A13 Stanford le Hope by-pass from 2 to 3 lanes in both directions, from the junction with the A128 (Orsett Cock roundabout) in the west to the A1014 (The Manorway) in the east and replacing four bridges. On completion of the project there will be a continuous three-lane carriageway from the M25 to Stanford le Hope, reducing congestion and resultant pollution, improving journey times and supporting further economic growth not only in Thurrock but across the whole south Essex corridor.

2.2 There have been several issues on the project which has resulted in delays in the delivery and an increase in costs, the detail of which has been discussed and considered in previous reports to both this Committee and Standards and Audit Committee.

2.3 This report and future reports to this committee will focus on progress in delivery.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

Progress

3.1 Progress on site in 2022 has been good with the road open with all Lanes running on the main carriageway at 50mph on 2nd May. Orsett Cock Roundabout was opened at 30mph until the traffic lights were commissioned on 26th May and currently operates at 50mph. The road is running very well, and the main benefits of the project are being realised by creating additional capacity to reduce congestion, improve journey times, facilitate growth and improve access to key strategic economic hubs.

SIGNIFICANT MILESTONES IN 2022	
ITEM	DATE
Environmental Barrier Complete	May 13-22
All Lanes Running A13 Mainline	May 2-22
Orsett Cock roundabout traffic signals operational	May 26-22
Pond Liner installation complete	Aug 5-22
REMAINING MILESTONES	
Balancing Pond completion	Nov-22
Seasonal planting complete	Nov-22
Defects rectification	Nov-22
Full street lighting Commissioned	Jan-23

- All 3 lanes in both directions running very well. Some complaints/enquiries re when national speed limit will apply.
- Handover to TC Operations and Maintenance continues.
- All lanes running at 70mph requires all lighting commissioned. This requires replacement of power feeder pillars and connections for the street lighting at the eastern extent of the works. This is now forecast for Jan 23 due to national supply chain delays for manufactured equipment. Mitigations being explored including rolling speed restriction. Derogation to standards to run at 70mph examined – but tight geometry has ruled this out for safety reasons in past but is being re-evaluated & could be accepted by TBC on a risk basis?



- Environment Agency Abstraction license granted for Balancing Pond in July after over 12 months delay. Balancing Pond works progressing very well with excavation complete, liner installed, topsoil being placed and planting progressing. Headwalls under construction also.





- 3.2 More than £13 million has been invested locally, by using regional suppliers and businesses based within 10 miles of the project – supporting the local economy at a time when this is needed more than ever.

Safety

- 3.3 There has now been more than a Million hours worked since the last RIDDOR and nearly 1.5 Million hours worked on the project in total. The Project Accident Incident Rate is currently 0 which is a significant achievement – despite a recent incident. The Safety incident involved a cut finger from disc saw while cutting fencing & resulted in a 5-day Lost Time Injury. Root cause being determined – no impact to AFR

Programme

- 3.4 The anticipated planned contract completion date is 25 January 2023.
- 3.5 Work to Street Lighting may impact this date

Remaining Construction Works

- Complete traffic sign installation outside of normal site extents
- Complete street lighting feeder pillars and connections
- Balancing Pond and headwalls
- Landscaping and planting
- Pond access track

Budget - Cost

- 3.6 The forecast final cost position of the project remains under review. Commercial negotiation regarding the Keir contract cost is informed by Aecoms (Clients NEC Project managers) assessment on CEs and disallowed costs.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

4.1 To respond to the Committee's request for updates on the A13 project.

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

5.1 The agreed communication plan is followed.

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

6.1 The A13 Widening scheme supports the corporate priorities by encouraging and promoting economic prosperity.

6.2 The A13 Widening scheme also supports the Thurrock Transport Strategy (2013 – 2026) and in particular policy TTS18: Strategic road network improvements by creating additional capacity to reduce congestion, improve journey times, facilitate growth and improve access to key strategic economic hubs.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Jonathan Wilson**
Assistant Director for Finance

The forecast position on the project remains under review as set out in section 3.6

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Gina Clarke**
Corporate Governance Lawyer and Deputy Monitoring Officer

This is an update report and there are no specific direct legal implications arising.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Becky Lee**
Team Manager Community Development and Equalities

There are no direct implications arising from this update report.

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

The contractor is required to risk assess all aspects of this project and put in place appropriate procedures and measures to safeguard lives as well as the environment.

The contractor is also required to prepare a sustainability plan that reduces carbon emissions and reduces the project's carbon footprint.

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**

- None

Report Author:

Keith Rumsey, Interim Programme Director

18 October 2022	ITEM: 6
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Stanford-le-Hope Interchange Report	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: N/A
Report of: Keith Rumsey, Interim Programme Director	
Accountable Assistant Director: Kevin Munnely, Assistant Director, Regeneration and Place Delivery	
Accountable Director: Sean Clark, Corporate Director of Resources and Place Delivery	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

This report is provided at the Chair's request to inform Members of progress on the Stanford-Le-Hope Railway Station and Transport Hub project.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 That the Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes and comments on the information provided relating to the Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project.

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 This project consists of the construction of new station buildings with footbridge and lifts, passenger information system, bus turnaround facility, passenger drop-off points and cycle parking.

2.2 There are several stakeholders involved in the project including UK Power Networks, SELEP, Train Operating Company -c2c, Network Rail and the Port of London Authority. A Development Agreement with c2c, who are the principal landowner will be in place.

2.3 Since the last update to the PTR Overview & Scrutiny Committee in July 2022, there has been progress in resolving Station design issues but continued delay in executing the Station D&C contract.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

Progress:

3.1 The Project scope comprises:

- **Phase 1** - the construction of new station buildings with footbridge and lifts, widened platform, passenger information system and enhanced facilities,
- **Phase 2** - bus turnaround facility, passenger drop-off points and cycle parking.

Phase 1 is now in the Detail Design & Construction/Implementation Stage

Phase 2 is in the Concept Design Stage

3.2 SLH Phase 1 (New Station) contract award for the station to the successful contractor - Volker Fitzpatrick Limited was made in early March. To ensure mobilisation as quickly as possible, a Letter of Intent (LoI) was issued pending formal contract execution.

3.3 The planned Contract with VFL is NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract June 2017 main Option A. This is a fixed priced contract with an activity schedule where the risk of carrying out the work at the agreed prices is largely borne by the contractor. Execution of the contract has been delayed due to continued concerns regarding cost inflation, national supply chain for manufactured goods issues, scope change risk with NR and c2c as design approvers and rail possession availability impacting the contractors risk liability.

3.4 VFL have offered alternative means of moving into contract which TC has rejected as they are outside the procurement rules. TC and VFL have now developed a proposal that allows the parties to execute the contract and manage the risks step by step and incrementally within the existing contract terms and conditions. It is now planned to execute the contract by 31 October 2022 subject to further clarifications of detail and agreement on matters such as the treatment of inflation and possession availability.

Alternative procurement strategies are being considered and developed concurrently.

3.5 An updated Business Case (BC) was issued to SELEP to take account of increased estimated costs. The revised BC demonstrated High Value for Money. However, SELEP have asked for additional information outside of the original scope of the Business case and details that cannot yet be answered as Phase 2 is in Concept stage. Because of this the Independent Technical Evaluator - ITE (Steer) did not assure the BC. It was confirmed at the September Accountability Board that Thurrock were to have an assured BC in place with a full funding package in place by the first Board meeting of 2023 (likely June 23). If this condition is not fulfilled the £7.5M funding allocation will be reviewed further.

- 3.6 In the development of Phase 2 – Transport Hub - opportunity exists to refine and or enhance scope and funding to account for new developments and demand in the area eg Freeports, new bus lines, property development. The design of the current scope of Phase 2 is on hold until revised client requirements and a design remit are developed and issued. The current assumption is that the Daybreak windows site will not be released for development until the Phase 1 works are completed.

An occupation license is currently being sought from TBC for the contractor's access.

Budget

- 3.7 The budget for the overall project remains at £29.09M
The successful contractor for Phase 1 confirmed a contract price which met the budget requirements. Key Risks have been costed and allowances made in the contract budget to create a suitable risk pot/contingency. Examples of Key Risks are illustrated in 3.11.

The project team are currently reevaluating the risk exposure due to procurement and inflation issues. It is highly likely that additional funds will be required to take account of these risks and to capture the opportunities that the development of Phase 2 presents.

Programme

- 3.8 Soon after signing/implementing the contract the Contractor will submit their formal contract programme which upon acceptance by TBC will become the baseline programme for the project. Phase 1 of the works will be delivered first with the Phase 2 works following with the opportunity to award this work as a Variation Order to the current Contractor/designer. The mitigation and recovery of any delay to date will be dependent on detail design acceptance, procurement and manufacture times and rail possession availability
- 3.9 Covid is a receding issue in project delivery and any residual impacts will be monitored and mitigated but as there is not a significant presence on site now, any impacts have been kept to a minimum. This will be monitored and kept under review. However, the economic and logistics issues that Covid has caused plus the war in Europe are impacting on time and cost parameters of the project.

3.10 TABLE - Key Phase 1 project milestones

Milestone	Planned Date	Actual/Forecast Date	Delays/Notes
Concept design complete	31 October 2020	31 October 2020	
GRIP 4 and planning application	15 December 2020	15 December 2020	
Planning decision Phase 1	15 June 2021	15 June 2021	
Planning Pre-application Phase 2	23 February 2021	23 February 2021	
Phase 1 Tender let	16 September 2021	16 September 2021	
Contractor site visits	14 October 2021	14 October 2021	
Tender submission deadline	7 January 2022	7 January 2022	
Contract award	18 March 2022	3 March 2022	
Contract signed/implementation*	30 March 2022	<i>End Oct/Nov 2022</i>	Delay mitigated by LOI
Site setup / surveys*	Summer 2022	<i>tba</i>	Delays to be recovered where possible
Construction start*	Summer 2022	<i>tba</i>	
Construction completion*	Autumn 2023	<i>tba</i>	
Entry into service*	end 2023	<i>tba</i>	

* The Contractor will submit their formal contract programme which upon acceptance by TBC will become the baseline programme for the project. The mitigation and recovery of any delay will be dependent on detail design acceptance, procurement and manufacture times and rail possession availability

TABLE - Key Phase 2 project milestones (Indicative dates) – Concept Stage

Milestone	Planned Date	Actual/Forecast Date	Delays/Notes
Appoint Designer	October 2022		
Existing Options appraisal	December 2022		
Design Brief	November 22		
Requirements Specification	December 22		
Scheme Development complete	January 2023		
Single Option selection	February 2023		
Submit Planning Permission	March 2023		
Submit Business case for review	April 2023		To Selep/Steer for Assurance

Key Risks and Opportunities

3.11 Key Risks & Mitigations

Risk	Detail	Mitigation
Construction Access	Changes to access assumptions made by the contractor	Work with stakeholders/residents to facilitate planned access
Changes to Scope	2 approving bodies Network Rail (NR)/c2c increases risk of scope change	Robust change control process and clear interfaces
Construction Inflation	Impact on materials and manufacturing costs, goods and services	Early purchase of materials or services. Create risk and contingency pots £ where possible
Resources within NR	Changes in team/ different perspectives - increases risk of scope change	Work with NR to achieve continuity
Procurement lead times of Manufactured items	Longer lead in times for Procurement of manufactured goods such as modular components for station buildings	Allow for in construction programme and plan installation and rail possessions accordingly
Structure of NR	Restructuring of NR – Responsibilities, resource or approvals process changes may impact scope and timeline of projects	Develop relationship with senior NR leaders to get early awareness of potential changes and impacts/mitigations
Contract Terms	NEC fixed price contract demands collaborative behaviours and rigour in responding to contract management with extensive record keeping (CEMAR)	Client contractor and partner teams to establish partnering principles and behaviours and create collaborative working
Changes to Code of Practice/Standards	Changes to codes of practice, standards can result in 'scope creep'	Establish a design 'freeze' at Key milestone -eg design Approved for Construction AfC
Ground Conditions	Unforeseen ground conditions, ecology and archaeology	Robust site investigations – revisit scope and undertake trial trenches
Unforeseen Utilities/Equipment	Unforeseen utilities or railway equipment requirements may impact on cost and programme	Review records, robust site investigations – revisit scope and undertake trial trenches and scanning at key points
Change to Fire Safety Standards	Fire Safety standards changes impact scope of the project	Establish early design freeze and undertaking with NR/c2c Ensure route assessment submission excludes consideration of secondary means of escape

Key Opportunities:

- Securing early possessions from NR could benefit schedule and cost.
- Approvals of design earlier than planned
- Reduction of design overall duration and cost
- Review of SI data and construction methodology could mitigate risk and gain time – reduce cost
- Reduction in piling in platform widening potential for significant time/cost saving.
- Explore other value engineering opportunities with VFL
- Phase 2 Business Case to explore transport interchange opportunities in support of SELEP funding and more benefits to stakeholders could attract additional funding.
- c2c/NR create increased number and or duration rail possessions – eg cancel last train and start overnights earlier, take advantage of other rail engineering projects possessions and blockades.
- Inflation recedes

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 To respond to the Chair's request for information on the Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project.

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

- 5.1 Consultation was undertaken as part of planning process and further stakeholder engagement is continuing. This includes meetings with the residents of Chantry Crescent and local Councillors.

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

- 6.1 The Stanford-le-Hope scheme supports the Place corporate priority, in particular:
- roads, houses and public spaces that connect people and places

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Jonathan Wilson**
Assistant Director for Finance

The budget implications are set out in section 3.7
The Key Risks to the project have been identified and mitigations developed.
The risks have been costed and allowances made in the contract budget to create a suitable risk pot/contingency

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Kevin Molloy**
Principal Lawyer / Manager Contracts & Procurement Team

There are no new legal implications arising in this report

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Roxanne Scanlon**
Community Engagement and Project Monitoring Officer

There are no direct implications arising specifically from this update report

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

Not applicable.

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 – Current Concept Design Images

Report Author:

Keith Rumsey, Interim Programme Director

Appendix 1 – Current Concept Design Images



Work Programme

Committee: Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Year: 2022/2023

Dates of Meetings: 05 July 2022, 18 October 2022, 06 December 2022 and 28 February 2023

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
05 July 2022		
Stanford-le-Hope Interchange Report	Keith Rumsey	Members
Thurrock Supported Bus Services	Mat Kiely & Julie Rogers	Officers
Tilbury Town Fund Programme	Kevin Munnelly & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standing item
18 October 2022		
A13 Widening Project	Keith Rumsey	Members
Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project	Keith Rumsey	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standing item
06 December 2022		
Fees and Charges	Julie Rogers and Sean Clark/Kelly McMillan	Officers
Grays underpass	Kevin Munnelly & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Members

Work Programme

Grays regeneration masterplan	Kevin Munnely & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Members
Purfleet regeneration	Kevin Munnely & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Members
Tilbury Town Fund	Kevin Munnely & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Members
Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project	Kevin Munnely & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Members
Parking Strategy Update	Mat Kiely	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standing item
28 February 2023		
Local Plan – Consultation Feedback and Next Steps	Leigh Nicholson	Officers
Stanford-le-Hope Interchange project	Kevin Munnely & Henry Kennedy-Skipton	Members
ITB capital programme	Mat Kiely	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Standing item
Briefing Notes		
Transport Strategy update	Mat Kiely	
Local Plan Update	Leigh Nicholson	

Items to be represented at a later date - A13 East Facing Access update/ Mat Kiely

Work Programme

Clerk: Kenna-Victoria Healey

Last updated: September 2022

This page is intentionally left blank