

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

[www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com)

## **Planning Application Reference: 21/01883/FUL**

**Proposal:** (Retrospective) Planning Application for a Temporary Programme Management Office Facility and Contractors Compound with Related Staff Welfare Facilities for a period of five years

**Location:** Coach Park Pilgrims Lane North Stifford

## **Our statement**

Thames Crossing Action Group represents thousands of people who are strongly opposed to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.

We also strongly oppose this planning application for the LTC compound.

Government state that "A person who has undertaken unauthorised development has only one opportunity to obtain planning permission after the event"<sup>1</sup>. This LTC compound site has been subject to numerous retrospective planning applications, and has now been in use for over 2.5 years. We therefore feel this application should be refused on the grounds that only one opportunity should be given and the applicant, a Government company and their associated contractors, should know better. The fact they have not sought planning permission prior to development and use of the site, just goes to show their complete lack of respect for the planning procedures, our council, and our community.

They are asking for the 5 years, they have requested, to begin when permission is granted. What about the two and a half plus years they have already been using it without permission?

Not only has their behaviour in regard to this site been questionable to date, we also seriously question the info they have provided within the application documentation.

For example, the applicant stated there were no trees on site, yet they have destroyed trees to place the temporary offices that they do not have permission for.

The applicant states that 220 staff would utilise the site but that on average at any one time there would likely be 80. Yet there is no commitment to keeping to the figure of 80 staff and we don't have any reason to trust them that they wouldn't increase numbers on site.

When their estimated traffic movements for just 80 of their staff would see 501 vehicle movements, we have serious concerns that the traffic movements have been provided based on a smaller percentage of staff using the site than they are saying the site could accommodate. There are no guarantees that they would not increase traffic movements if it suited their needs and wants.

We do not agree with the comparisons to the coach park traffic numbers, as even when it was a coach park it never saw usage as high as being proposed.

We consider it would be inappropriate use of greenbelt due to the nature of the onsite buildings, which would also negatively impact the openness of the site.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ensuring-effective-enforcement#Retrospective-planning-application>

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

[www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com)

There is no evidence that the use of the site would bring any benefits to the local area. In fact the opposite can be said, especially since having an LTC compound in our community has negative impact on our community.

With regard to other possible sites or claims of this site being integral to the progress of the LTC Development Consent Order application, there is no reason at all why the DCO application work needs to be carried out within Thurrock, and couldn't be done at their offices in London or elsewhere.

We can in no way see how a site that supports progressing such a hugely destructive and harmful project as the proposed Lower Thames Crossing can be considered a sustainable development.

We therefore call upon the council to refuse this application, but should it be granted, and in light of the applicant's previous lack of respect, we stress the importance of conditions and close monitoring of the site, and that all necessary action is taken as needed.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide this statement and are of course happy to comment/discuss further if required.