

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## Thurrock Local Plan Consultations

### **Introduction**

Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) represent thousands of people who are opposed to the hugely destructive and harmful, not fit for purpose £10bn+++ proposed Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). More info on us and our concerns and issues with the proposed LTC can be found on our website [www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com).

Thurrock's Local Plan has been delayed over the years due to the threat of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing. As a community group we have a good understanding of certain aspects that are relevant to the Local Plan, as well as the proposed Lower Thames Crossing. Our comments will be relevant to aspects that relate to the proposed LTC and our standing against it. Any aspects in the consultations that we have not commented on should not be interpreted as anything other than it is something we do not feel relevant to our group, as we can only comment on aspects that we feel relevant to our position on the proposed LTC.

We have presented our comments on all Local Plan related consultations in the one document, as we feel our comments are relevant across all aspects. We have tried not to repeat ourselves more than we had to, so we would appreciate the whole document being taken into account for all the various Local Plan consultations. We hope our insights and comments based on our work as a community action group will be helpful.

This representation was prepared and submitted by Laura Blake, Chair of TCAG on behalf of the group in response to the Thurrock Local Plan Consultations. Our representation is in response to all aspects including the Initial Proposals<sup>1</sup>, Integrated Impacts Assessment, and Design Charter<sup>2</sup>. TCAG can be contacted via email – [admin@thamescrossingactiongroup.com](mailto:admin@thamescrossingactiongroup.com).

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://consult.thurrock.gov.uk/local-plan-initial-proposals>

<sup>2</sup> <https://consult.thurrock.gov.uk/design-charter>

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## Table of Contents

Thurrock Local Plan Consultations .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Table of Contents .....	2
Initial Proposals .....	3
About the Plan .....	3
Understanding Thurrock .....	4
Suggested Local Plan Layout .....	5
Vision and strategic priorities .....	5
Planning for the right level of growth in the right places .....	6
Initial Proposals .....	7
Integrated Impact Assessment .....	13
Inadequacies of Consultation .....	14
Design Charter .....	19
Understanding Thurrock .....	19
Key design principals for Thurrock .....	19
Pride in Thurrock .....	19
Healthy Places for All .....	20
Connecting to Opportunity .....	21
Resilient & Sustainable Futures .....	24
Design Ideas for Thurrock .....	25
The Thames .....	25
Neighbourhoods .....	26
Countryside .....	27
Good Neighbours .....	27
Employment Areas .....	27
Landscapes .....	28
Making it Happen .....	28
Next Steps .....	28
Other .....	29
Overall Conclusion on all aspects of the Local Plan related consultations .....	30

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## Initial Proposals

### About the Plan

We agree that there is a need for the Local Plan. We understand that there have been many delays to the Thurrock Local Plan, including the threat of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.

We acknowledge there have been changes in policy and legislation in regard to the Local Plan.

We highlight that even this consultation is out of date in regard to changes on Government policy and requirements.

We understand that things change and more recent changes may have occurred in similar timing to the current consultation being prepared. However it is essential that we are consulted on Thurrock's Local Plan based on up to date policy and requirements.

We have concerns that there is only one more consultation prior to Regulation 19, and that the stage we're at the level of detail is greatly lacking. For adequate consultation we would expect to have far more detailed information available.

As a community action group, with extensive knowledge of our area and the proposed Lower Thames Crossing we would be happy to take part in any additional consultations, and to discuss and join any focus groups or similar where possible.

To a certain extent we are familiar with many aspects of roads and transport, and would expect to see more assessments than are already mentioned and technical documents presented.

It is ludicrous to progress proposals at this stage without having carried out adequate assessments to know whether what you are proposing and asking for opinions on would even be viable.

It seems to us that the council are maybe leaning towards including sites that developers are pushing, rather than because they have been assessed and considered viable and good for the borough.

Whilst we would like to see such technical assessments and documents, it is also important that moving forward there are summaries of such information presented in a clear and informative way for members of the general public to review if they wish.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

We acknowledge mention of other relevant strategies, and again would expect there to be links to such strategies made easily available for review and consideration as part of the Local Plan consultation process.

In regard to mentioned Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) we of course stress our strong and complete opposition to the proposed £10bn+ Lower Thames Crossing.

We also have concerns about the National Grid Norwich to Tilbury proposal, and The London Resort too, as both are relevant to the proposed LTC, whether it be in relation to overlap or close proximity of order limits (development boundaries), or the associated traffic issues. We would be happy to provide further info on this if requested and helpful.

We are happy to read that Thurrock position is one of opposition on both the proposed LTC and National Grid Norwich to Tilbury, and would hope that The London Resort would also fall within that position, should an application be resubmitted as it would have severe traffic impacts to our area, along with the associated pollution.

## ***Understanding Thurrock***

We are pleased that Climate Change is mentioned in this section, and also pleased that Thurrock declared a Climate Emergency in 2019. We agree that this is a very important issue that needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

We are however, disappointed that whilst this section refers to things like being more environmentally friendly, the importance of sustainability, and local food growing, the proposed Local Plan contradicts such matters, including large sections of local grade 1 listed agricultural land being proposed as sites for development.

We agree there is a need to also ensure resilience, particularly for flooding, but for all aspects. Pushing for more unnecessary and excessive growth and development as seems to be the council's agenda and ambition with the Local Plan is not in keeping with this.

There are definitely health inequalities within Thurrock, and a definite need to improve healthcare as well as health and wellbeing of residents in the borough.

It is not enough to simply just provide more health care services, although they are very much needed, we also need to ensure people in Thurrock can have healthier lifestyles to avoid the need for health care services.

Public transport and active travel options in Thurrock are not good. We need and want reliable, safe, affordable options. It is stated that Thurrock wants to reduce car dependence, yet we are losing bus services, and there is no mention of provision for public transport within the proposed Local Plan, except for a potential transport interchange near Stanford close to where they still have serious issues with the current station provisions.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

The proposed growth has not been assessed in regard to impacts to rail services as we will detail further into this response.

We agree that modal shift is needed, but it cannot simply be an onus put on residents, the council need to play their part, and so do businesses. A large percentage of traffic in our area comes from industry and the major roads that pass through our borough, congesting and polluting our communities, and adversely impacting our health and wellbeing and natural environment.

We do not support growth for the sake of growth, and any growth must be beneficial to the people of Thurrock and our environment to provide a healthy and sustainable future.

We have serious concerns that growth leads to increased traffic, associated pollution, and harm and impacts to our environment and communities. See above again re the onus of modal shift and behavioural change on residents, we need the council and businesses to step up too. We have more than our fair share of destructive and harmful development and growth in Thurrock.

## ***Suggested Local Plan Layout***

We recognise all the different aspects that are laid out, but we do not feel that the proposed Local Plan is in keeping with the policies and what communities need and want.

## ***Vision and strategic priorities***

We don't believe that many of those that we represent in Thurrock would share this vision of Thurrock in 2040. We don't believe people want more growth and industry, they want the communities we have to be improved and for a council that listens to and acts on behalf of the residents with their best interest at heart.

We don't want our communities destroyed and impacted further. We want to be able to live happy healthy lifestyles. We want our natural environment saved, protected and enhanced.

We want local services and facilities improved, as a priority, but with low unemployment employment is not necessarily a high priority, especially if it further destroys and impacts our communities and natural environment, and increases traffic and congestion.

We want a reduction in congestion, and the associated pollution. But the onus cannot simply be on residents, it has to include businesses and others. The priority should be on modal shift to more sustainable integrated, well-connected, reliable, safe, affordable public transport and active travel options for everyone.

Economic growth for the sake of economic growth is not sustainable and should not be a priority. We also need to see better economic management within Thurrock Council, as

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

has clearly been proven. Our borough has thrived far better historically for the people of Thurrock than it does now, because growth for the sake of growth comes at a cost to us, our communities, health and wellbeing.

We agree that reduction of Thurrock's carbon footprint is very important, and that ties in with the fact that growth for the sake of growth is not sustainable, see above.

We would be interested to know exactly how many homes are truly and genuinely needed in Thurrock, as opposed to what Government guidelines are, and what the council want. It is what is actually **needed**. There is also a general feeling in the borough that housing in our borough is being taken advantage of by London Boroughs as it is cheaper to move people here than keep them in the city. We cannot keep developing to accommodate this at the expense of our communities and residents health and wellbeing and our natural environment.

Promoting, conserving and enhancing the special character and heritage is important, but the proposed Local Plan is not in keeping with that. Same with providing, improving and maintaining a well-designed network of green places and open spaces.

Any development in Thurrock must be done sustainably, and there is a distinct lack of the word sustainable in the priorities, the focus seems to be on growth and economy rather than sustainability and genuine benefits for us, our communities and our natural environment.

We agree that improving health and wellbeing is an important priority, but again the proposed Local Plan does not support this. Same with retaining green belt, and protecting and enhancing tranquillity in the borough; and conserving and enhancing our built and natural environment.

Whilst we recognise that retail in Thurrock has played a part in regard to the economy and employment, it has also had a negative impact in regard to crime and traffic congestion and pollution.

The vision and policies we want are for a council that communicates, listens to us, has meaningful engagement with us, and acts responsibly and with the best interest of us as residents. A council that backs up talk with actions to ensure a healthy sustainable future for our communities.

## *Planning for the right level of growth in the right places*

We are pleased to see it stated that "Growth must not occur 'at any cost'" yet what is being proposed doesn't support this statement, neither do the apparent council ambitions. Growth for the sake of growth and/or at any cost is not wanted or sustainable.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

Local Authorities can now set lower housing numbers, and don't have to build on greenbelt etc, as per new Government guidance. We need Thurrock to step up and save and protect our greenbelt and not propose a Local Plan and growth that is not wanted or needed, and that would be harmful to our communities and lives.

We do not believe the information in the 'Understanding our needs' to be a true and up to date reflection, as guidelines have changed since these 'updates' have been carried out by the council.

We not believe that adequate assessment has been carried out on the proposed development sites. Many of the proposed sites are on greenbelt, and also agricultural land including grades 1 and 2 listed land that is some of the best and most versatile land in the country. Nor the impacts to local food supplies and food security in general. Let alone the impacts to our local farmers, who have farmed the land for many generations, and help feed our nation.

We do not believe traffic and transport has been adequately considered for the proposed sites, and whether they would be viable for access, junctions, public transport, traffic levels etc.

We not believe that biodiversity has been adequately assessed, and consideration been given to how viable biodiversity net gain would be for such sites.

By this stage, when there is one consultation to go before Regulation 19 we need much more detail than is being provided.

It seems to us that the council is attempting to progress the option that would see the largest amount of development, and therefore likely the greatest level of impact to our communities.

## ***Initial Proposals***

We will not be focussing specifically on individual settlements, rather giving an overall boroughwide commentary, but may mention specific concerns that relate to certain areas if relevant.

Thurrock has more than its fair share of industry and major roads, with all the associated pollution and congestion that comes with it.

Cleaner air, access to and protection of green spaces, and biodiversity enhancement and net gain, cutting congestion and improving public transport and active travel, better health care, happy, health lifestyles, protecting our communities are all things that residents of Thurrock need and want.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

Growth for the sake of growth and economic growth are not things that feature on wish lists of the majority of residents.

In fact growth goes against what most people want, as growth would worsen pollution, increase traffic, put more pressure on health care, be destructive and harmful to our communities and natural environment, and there are no provisions in the proposed Local Plan that we can see to improve public transport and active travel.

As we comment on in our response to the Design Charter, it seems that what is being detailed as ideal and what residents want and need recognises many of the right things, but in reality what is being proposed in the Local Plan goes completely against that.

We also consider it to be unethical and irresponsible to propose building homes that would not only increase traffic, congestion, and associated pollutions; but also put homes near to existing and proposed roads that knowingly would put people's lives, health and wellbeing at risk.

As Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) we feel it important to stress that the proposed Lower Thames Crossing would not solve the problems suffered due to the Dartford Crossing.

The Dartford Crossing had a design capacity of 135,000 vehicles per day, and regularly sees 180,000 per day. That means we'd need to see a reduction of more than 25% of traffic to bring it back below design capacity. Yet National Highways state the proposed LTC would take around 19% dropping to 13% by 2045. Thurrock Council's analysis on the official traffic modelling concluded that the proposed LTC would take as little as 4% in the am peak hour and 11% in the pm peak hour. Whichever predictions you look at it is clear that the Dartford Crossing would still suffer problems, even if the proposed LTC were to go ahead<sup>3</sup>.

Not only that, but Thurrock Council's assessment of traffic modelling has also concluded that the Dartford Crossing would be back to today's level of traffic within 5 years of the proposed LTC opening, if it goes ahead.

It is clear that Dartford Borough Council are keen to push development and growth in their area to the south of Dartford Crossing, and that Thurrock Council seem keen to push development and growth to the north of the river.

As well as the existing traffic that already causes severe congestion and pollution, things would only get worse not only with the proposed development and growth both side of the river, and in other surrounding areas and through the regions both sides of the river; but also from induced demand. It is simply not sustainable.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/ltc-not-fit-for-purpose/>



# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

The Dartford Crossing experiences more than 3000 incidents every year. Since the Dartford Crossing would remain over capacity even if the proposed LTC goes ahead, we can still expect high numbers of incidents.

National Highways also forecast there would be 2147 additional accidents over 60 years, including 26 fatalities, 220 serious injuries and 3122 slight injuries, as a result of the proposed LTC, if it goes ahead<sup>4</sup>. So, it is clear that there would also be additional incidents from the LTC too, and those figures don't include all incidents, just forecast fatalities and injuries.

National Highways are not planning for how traffic would migrate when there are incidents at either crossing, if the proposed LTC goes ahead, and how traffic would migrate between the two crossings. Evidence shows that there simply would not be adequate connections, so we'd end up with more congestion, pollution and chaos<sup>5</sup>.

For example, when there is an incident at the Dartford Tunnels, traffic would come off the M25 onto the A2 coastbound only to find there would be just one single lane from the A2 onto the LTC.

Similarly, when there's an incident at the QE2 Bridge, traffic would come off the A13 eastbound, and have to go all the way down to the Stanford/A1014 junction on the A13, up around the already busy traffic lighted roundabout (alongside DP World, Thames Gateway, Thames Enterprise Park, and other traffic), back down westbound on the A13 until the new LTC slip road which would be just past (but not accessible from) the Orsett/A128 junction on the A13. This is known as the Stanford Detour.

If instead traffic came off the M25 onto the LTC, the M25 at this point would be 5 lanes of traffic, and the LTC southbound would be 2 lanes until just past the A13.

These are just a few examples of the lack of adequate connections, there are others.

In regard to the QE2 Bridge, National Highways also made it clear in the LTC Development Consent Order (DCO) Examination that they still propose to close one of the Dartford Tunnels any time the bridge is closed to continue to allow two way traffic at the Dartford Crossing.

There are also serious concerns in general about the lack of adequate connections, and additional traffic that the proposed LTC would bring to the region, and the impact it would have on our existing road network, including our local Thurrock roads.

One area in particular would be the Orsett Cock roundabout (A13/A128). To be clear, the A1089 would only be accessible to traffic traveling westbound on the A13 via the Orsett Cock junction, the current A1089 slip road would be lost if the proposed LTC goes ahead.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/serious-concerns-over-ltc-road-safety/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/incidents-ltc-dartford-crossing>

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

Instead of accessing the A1089 from the A13 westbound as traffic does now, it would instead have to come off the A13 at the Orsett Cock and go round the roundabout as if it is going back down on to the westbound A13, but off that slip road would be another slip road for the A1089.

With concerns about the Dartford Crossing still being over capacity, quickly rising back to today's levels of traffic, no adequate connections for traffic to migrate when there are incidents, a general increase in the amount of traffic on the roads, and various issues that would impact the existing road network (including our local roads), any further growth would add to the problems.

Not only that but existing and proposed new roads within the Local Plan would not only generate more traffic, but also be used as rat runs.

For instance any routes between the Dartford Crossing and LTC would be used as rat runs, particularly when there are incidents, with traffic often discovering that migratory routes are not adequate.

The Stanford Detour<sup>6</sup> would see increased traffic along the A13 as well as the Stanford junction, and could also lead to traffic coming off at the Basildon turning and rat running through Stanford to use the old A13/A1013.

Many of the proposed Local Plan new roads would just offer and encourage new rat running opportunities, not only for local traffic but traffic on major roads passing through our area.

We do not believe that the council has carried out any traffic modelling before drawing lines on maps of proposed new roads, we find this irresponsible and unacceptable.

Neither do we believe any consideration or assessment has been given to whether new roads and junctions where they are proposed to connect to the existing road network would be viable and compliant with highways standards and guidelines.

For instance, development to the north of South Ockendon connecting to either North Road or Dennis Road would be highly unlikely to be viable due to both being busy narrow windy roads.

Proposed new road connecting through South Ockendon via Medebridge Road would create a rat run potentially from the M25 through to the A13, particularly when there are incidents on the M25. The connection from Medebridge Road to the A13 is via a narrow road close to the North Stifford/Stifford Clays/A13 roundabout, which is already a busy rat run and junction.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/the-stanford-detour/>

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

The proposed connecting road through the Southfields, Orsett proposed development connects from the already busy Orsett Cock/Brentwood Road through to the already busy, narrow and dangerous Buckingham Hill Road. It even looks like it has been drawn to connect on a dangerous bend.

We wish to be clear that we do not support the proposed Tilbury Link Road, but we are surprised that it has not been included in the proposed Local Plan, when other proposed roads are being shown.

Further major development, particularly for industry in the Tilbury area would lead to much more traffic, and the A1089, particularly the Asda Roundabout is already suffering with congestion and issues.

The proposed port development in Tilbury would also remove more natural/industry free access to the river front, and adversely impact the marshes and flood plains.

Cumulatively with the proposed LTC impacts in regard to changes in land use and land levels, water courses, ground water, and flooding we have serious concerns about what is being proposed in this area.

The proposed Local Plan does not appear to be fully taking into account proposed aspects of the proposed LTC, such as emergency access roads that connect to and from our local roads to the proposed LTC.

It appears that generally the proposed Local Plan is only taking the actual route of the LTC carriageways, rather than other aspects. For instance they are not shown on Local Plan proposal maps and it would be relevant in places like Chadwell St Mary and South Ockendon.

The Wilderness in South Ockendon is not marked as Ancient Woodland, and a section of it is also amongst the first woodland in the country to be given Long Established Woodland status. It is through evidence TCAG submitted to Natural England that these status have been awarded<sup>7</sup>.

People have serious concerns about the lack of adequate healthcare in our borough as it is, without further development whether that be the proposed LTC or proposed Local Plan. It therefore concerns us that what is left of Orsett Hospital is included as a site for development in the proposed Local Plan.

We would highlight that residents were told that it would not be closed until the new health hubs were open, as they do not appear to be going ahead, we question the inclusion of Orsett Hospital as a proposed development site in the Local Plan. Simply moving the

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/the-wilderness/>

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

services currently offered at Orsett Hospital to existing centres in the borough or further afield would not be acceptable.

The proposed Alternative option for Orsett also appears to include a section of the Orsett Showground, including a proposed new road through the northern section of the showground. National Highways originally planned to put a road through the Orsett Showground, as part of the proposed LTC, which through consultation was removed. The showground has already been adversely impacted by the Orsett Cock and A13 widening, and is under threat from the proposed LTC still. We do not want or need the council proposing to further threaten it and the existence of the Orsett Show.

The proposed new 'area of opportunity' of Lower Langdon would lead to increased traffic if it were to be progressed, something we do not support. It would also see the loss of more greenbelt and agricultural land, which we do not support.

Similarly, with the proposed new 'area of opportunity' of 'West Horndon' because whilst there may already be a station in West Horndon (which is already very busy), the railway line separates the boroughs of Thurrock and Brentwood.

We feel such a development could lead to issues and confusion in regard to a place called West Horndon falling within two different council areas.

We also believe such development would lead to an increase in traffic on an already busy and dangerous A128 and the country lanes, in addition to the loss of yet more greenbelt and agricultural land.

Whilst we are obviously strongly and completely opposed to the proposed LTC, the proposed Local Plan does not appear to have considered and assessed any potential cross over in construction periods of everything that is being proposed, particularly if the worst were to happen and the proposed LTC goes ahead.

Another concern in regard to the proposed LTC is the adverse impact it would have on our emergency services, and we question what consideration has been given to support the need for extra emergency services to support any such proposed Local Plan.

On the whole we see many, many reasons to oppose the proposed Thurrock Local Plan for the same and very similar reasons to our opposition to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## **Integrated Impact Assessment**

This document is inadequate because the proposed Local Plan is nowhere near at a level whereby accurate assessments could be made on the impacts to residents and communities.

As far as we can see there have not been adequate assessments of things like traffic modelling, carbon emissions, biodiversity net gain, public transport and active travel etc.

How when sections of the proposed Local Plan are not even developed enough to know what is being proposed can this IIA be in any way considered adequate?

In paragraph 1.5 it is stated that Thurrock is a key regeneration area in the East of England.....due to the availability of large areas of former industrial land for redevelopment. So why is so much development within the proposed Local Plan falling on greenbelt?

In regard to climate change and reducing carbon emissions, the focus is again put on reducing journeys by private car. Not only does the proposed Local Plan encourage more car journeys, it also encourages more traffic in general particularly from industry/business development. Where is the requirement for non-private car/vehicle journeys to be reduced ie LGV and HGVs?

What assessments have been carried out to ensure infrastructure such as energy supply, water supply and waste water handling will support the additional need from the proposed development within the Local Plan? What assessment has been carried out on the associated pollution and carbon emissions etc in that regard? And/or any further loss of land to accommodate new infrastructure that may be needed for such amenities?

It is not helpful that the key to symbols and colour coding in the IIA featured in Table 2.2 on page 57/235, when the actual summary of effects in Table 4.1 for example did not appear in the document until page 116/235. It is not user friendly if you are trying to review the key points of such a large document.

This document and the Appendices is huge and technical so unlikely to be helpful to most members of the public. A summary that is clear and informative would have been helpful.

From what we have been able to review it seems to us that there is still a lot of uncertainty which gives no confidence and in our opinion shows that what is being proposed is not sound.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## Inadequacies of Consultation

If you go to the Thurrock Council website and look for the Local Plan consultations, the banner image on the home page takes you to <https://www.thurrock.gov.uk/new-local-plan-for-thurrock/thurrock-local-plan>.

If you click on the links in the council newsletter emails it takes you to the various Local Plan consultations on the council's planning portal <https://consult.thurrock.gov.uk/hub-page/ypyv>

Depending on which of these two options you click through on you will get to different pages, the first (from the home page of the council's website includes a far more comprehensive selection of Local Plan related documents, which do not appear to be shared on the consultation portal.

When you click through to actually take part in the consultations online, there are 3 tabs. Up until the 7<sup>th</sup> February when you selected the Integrated Impacts Assessment (IIA) tab it displayed the same questions as for the Local Plan: Initial Proposals. The questions did not relate to the IIA. This does seem to have changed since we gave feedback at the Orsett event on the afternoon of the 7<sup>th</sup> Feb.

Whilst we appreciate this apparently being dealt with following our raising it at the event, it does mean that anyone who has attempted to or indeed responded to the consultation prior to the 8<sup>th</sup> Feb has not been asked relevant questions in regard to the IIA.

We visited the Orsett event to report some of the inadequacies of the consultation, as we felt it better to do that rather than just put them in this response, to allow for the issues to be resolved and suggest that the consultation be extended to allow people time to respond once the problems have been resolved.

A member of the consultation team noted our concerns about the inadequacies and said they would report them to a manager. They took contact details and suggested that someone may get back to us on the matter. Whilst we have noticed changes to the website, there has been no follow up communication, and no extension to the deadline.

We also asked if they had paper copies of the response forms at the event, so we could look at them to see if they helped to see what questions were being asked. Initially it seemed there were only paper copies for the Local Plan: Initial Proposals and the Your Place, Your Voice, but not for the IIA and Design Charter consultations. The paper version of the Local Plan: Initial Proposals did not appear to be identical in the way the questions were presented compared to the online response form.

We then also noticed that the paper response form seemed to be seeking responses not just for the Initial Proposals, but also the IIA and Design Charter. Online these all had

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

separate response forms. Plus, there should be different questions for each consultation, so one very basic but confusing form to cover all of them hardly seems appropriate.

Whilst the staff at the events (we attended the Belhus and Orsett events) were friendly and tried to be helpful it was apparent that they weren't all geared up and prepped to discuss all areas. Fair enough they each had different areas of expertise, but it seemed very area specific. This means anyone who was unable to attend their most local event, but instead chose to go to a different area event would likely find it harder to get information relevant to their own area. Or if you went to the event in your area and then went to another with follow up questions, staff and info was not geared up to present info on all areas in Thurrock, it was area specific. It did not seem possible to get detail across the whole borough at each event, as it was so area specific, apart from the large map.

It was not clear that paper copies of documents and response forms were available at the events. Staff seemed to be focused on getting people to put stickers on boards. Due to the lack of overall and boroughwide knowledge there was often times where numerous people had to wait to talk to the person that might know an answer. We understand that each member of staff would have their own area of expertise, but for adequate consultation there needs to be better provision for anyone to go along to any of the events and for there to be more than one person who can answer the majority of questions regardless of where in the borough the questions related.

Also, to have all area maps/info available at all events. When we went to the Orsett event a member of the consultation team had to refer to a walking and cycling map they had in a box to view the South Ockendon area, so we could discuss a matter relating to that area, as there were no other detailed maps of South Ockendon and other areas available to view as part of the consultation.

Many have voiced concern and frustration about the timings of the events, particularly people not being able to attend as the event in their area was held during working hours.

Whilst we appreciate community events as part of the consultation, we do not feel that what has been provided has been adequate.

We noticed that towards the end of the consultation there have been webcast events. These appeared to be area specific and not offered for all areas as far as we can see.

A general webcast or even presentation recording that was available from when the consultation opened covering the main points, and even having one for each specific area would have been helpful for those that could not make the events.

If you created pre-recorded presentations for boroughwide and specific areas they could not only be used on the website for all to view from the start, but could be used within live webcasts to allow online question and answer sessions.



# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

We also question that it appears an event has been added for Fobbing (to be clear we have no problem with Fobbing having an event) that falls after the consultation deadline. The details of the event state that it falls after the deadline and that feedback will be captured at the event.

We would state that if the event does not fall within the official consultation period that the consultation has not been adequately planned, and also that not everyone is getting the same period of time to respond, as those able to attend the event get longer.

Considering the level of inadequacies of this consultation, and the fact you are holding an event after the consultation deadline, why not extend the deadline? This would also assist in all Local Plan related consultations ending at the same time as currently some aspects end on 19<sup>th</sup> Feb and others on 31<sup>st</sup> March.

Why when the Local Plan events are called Your Place, Your Voice and those consultations end on 19<sup>th</sup> Feb does the Your Place, Your Voice consultation end on 31<sup>st</sup> March? It is confusing and makes no sense.

We note that there appears to have been changes to the consultation pages on the council website/portal since the consultation began. Whilst we support and appreciate mistakes, issues and inadequacies being dealt with, it still doesn't make the consultation adequate, and it means that people have not had the same experience and opportunity to review and respond to the consultation.

As we work through the Initial Proposals document we note that Section 6: Our Initial Proposals does not have any associated questions in the online response form. This seems ridiculous considering that is what the consultation is supposed to be about.

It also adds to the confusion whereby there are different forms to respond to different things, but it is not clear of overlaps like this. The Initial Proposals can be responded to individually, but are not included within the general comments section, so anyone that wants to respond on all areas or boroughwide issues is limited, and/or has to time consumingly go to each individual area response form.

This issue is exasperated by the fact that the individual settlements in the document are listed randomly, starting with Grays, but the response form section on the website is listed in alphabetical order.

This means that anyone wishing to comment on different or possibly all areas as a boroughwide response has to keep cross reference and going back and forth within the document to find info on the relevant area, which just adds to the effort and confusion.

The Local Plan Initial Proposals – Boroughwide Map pdf take a long while to load compared to the other documents. Once eventually loaded there is lag and the map is



# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

not very reactive. The initial time it takes to load can at first appear that the file won't load. The fact the file is large and does not respond well to interaction is frustrating.

Whilst we appreciate that it is a slightly larger file, it doesn't appear to be so large that it should cause such issues. We appreciate that a larger scale map allows for people to zoom in and see the map for the area that they are interested in, but this is not good if there are issues loading and using the map. An advisory note could have been issued alongside the document link to advise it may take some time to load and may be slow reacting for some. This is particularly relevant for those attempting to access the map in areas that have poor/slow internet.

The Boroughwide initial proposals map on page 24/168 (pdf numbering) does not appear to show the potential transport interchange in the Stanford area that was shown on the large boroughwide map at the events, and also appears on the separate boroughwide map that takes a long while to load, as mentioned above.

Maps used in the consultations in general fail to show detail that is needed, and completely miss some properties, such as Townsfield Cottages on North Road in South Ockendon, which instead are shaded within an area for New Neighbourhoods.

In regard to detailing the proposed Lower Thames Crossing on consultation maps, whilst we appreciate showing the proposed junctions, particularly the LTC/A13/A1089 junction is not easy as it is huge and complex, the position of the junction on the maps is misleading.

The maps also lack the detail of things such as the proposed walking, cycling, horse riding (WCH) route on the east side of North Road in South Ockendon, which again should be shown as the Alternative proposals for the area overlap and are in conflict with this. Whilst both are currently proposed, people need to be aware when giving feedback as it is relevant, since the alternative plans include development including new roads that would sever the proposed WCH route, if it were to go ahead.

Neither do the maps show the proposed access roads in the vicinity of the proposed North Road Green Bridge within the proposed LTC plans. Again, this is relevant as they overlap with what is being proposed in the both the initial and alternative plans for South Ockendon.

In the main Local Plan Initial Proposals document some of the maps have been inserted on a different orientation to the rest, which means it is harder to and less user friendly to read.

The Alternative Option maps do not have map legends, only the initial proposal maps have legends. This means you have to scroll up and down the document to check the map legend, which is not ideal and doesn't offer clear and informative material.

We are very concerned that there is only one more consultation before Regulation 19, and that what is being presented currently is so high level.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

We are told that the final consultation will take place before the end of the year, which we do not feel is likely to be possible if so much detail is still outstanding.

It is not adequate to be proposing a Local Plan at this stage in the process that is so high level. No assessment has been made as to whether any of the proposed sites are even viable. No traffic modelling assessments, no biodiversity net gain assessments etc have been carried out.

How can you propose sites without assessing the level of BNG that would be required and how realistic it is to achieve that? Or traffic modelling to know what would be needed, and whether it would be viable and safe to provide access/junctions for the proposed sites? Or assessing the capacity of the railways, or bus service options to allow for more sustainable modal shift and use for the proposed sites?

It seems to us that way too much is being left until too late, and that we are not being adequately consulted for the Local Plan.

We are also aware that many experience confusion and issues with the council's consultation portals, and logging in. We have reported concerns on this previously. It would be helpful if there was an advice note that there is more than one council portal when it comes to consultations and planning applications for example. We believe many log in using their log in details thinking it is sitewide, whereas we have learnt that is not the case, but it is not obvious on your site.

Also, better provision and detail should be detailed in regard to be able to submit responses to consultations (and planning applications) without having to publicly disclose personal details, as some have good reason to protect their identity and location.

We know if you email and provide information allowances can be made to avoid identifiable information being shared publicly, but this is not detailed on your consultation portal and planning application portal, this needs to be addressed so that everyone knows they can take part.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## Design Charter

### *Understanding Thurrock*

In regard to 'Nature' we would just like to draw attention to the fact that whilst the Design Charter mentions the "link into a wider regional landscape along the Thames estuary of international significance as well as local value", the level of importance doesn't seem to have been fully acknowledged. In particular, the East Atlantic Flyway, an international migratory route for birds that passes through our area of the Thames Estuary has been nominated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

We also note that there is no mention that we have Ancient Woodland, Long Established Woodland, ancient and veteran trees within Thurrock.

It would also be good to recognise that some of the agricultural land in our borough is Grade 1 listed agricultural land, making it some of the best and most versatile agricultural land in the country, of which there are limited amounts.

'Health and wellbeing' should acknowledge that health services are greatly lacking, and that many have issues getting GP appointments and access to healthcare.

### Key design principals for Thurrock

#### *Pride in Thurrock*

Part of the reason we continue to fight the proposed Lower Thames Crossing is because we have pride in our borough and communities, and want to save, protect and enhance our area.

Over the years we have experienced the level of pride in doing this, with the huge amount of support from people in Thurrock, and all of us learning more and more about our local area, leading to an even greater desire to save, protect and enhance it.

We would say that it is very important that there is meaningful engagement with our communities, and that everyone is considered. However, we also have to comment that we do not rate the council's ability to communicate well with residents, so this needs to be addressed.

We would say that it is very important for any proposals to fit in and sit well within our existing communities and landscape, and that what we have should largely guide design of any proposals, so that our communities are not ruined by out of place development.

We would say that it is very important that any proposals are designed for the long term, they should benefit and enhance our existing communities and landscape. We do not need or want developers/developments that come in to make a quick buck at our expense, leave shoddy work, or fail to complete work and all associated benefits.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

We would question paragraph 1.4, as further clarification would be needed as to what the 'wider ambition and strategies of the borough' are. It seems to us that the council are keen for economic growth whereas many of us would prefer to see more focus on protecting and enhancing our communities and natural environment, rather than economic growth for the sake of it and at an unacceptable cost to our communities and natural environment.

We would say that it is very important to deliver wider benefits for Thurrock's communities, but have doubts on whether the council acknowledge what our communities need and want.

We would say that it is very important to celebrate our heritage and culture. It would be good to see the council recognise and share information on such aspects, as not everyone is aware of what we have in our borough.

In regard to paragraph 1.6 we would draw attention to the fact that what is visually attractive to one may not be to others, it is subjective, so such a statement is open to interpretation.

However, we do feel it is very important that visual impacts need to be assessed and considered, and that quality is important.

Additionally, we would like our natural environment to be part of what our borough is proud of, and the actions we take to save, protect and enhance it. Sustainability should be part of any proposals to ensure we can continue to take pride in this aspect of our community.

We would hope that the council will stand by all the aspects they presented as to what is wrong with the proposed LTC, when it comes to considering any future proposals in our borough, including design and the Local Plan.

## ***Healthy Places for All***

We would say that it is very important that physical activity, including active travel, is beneficial to our health and wellbeing, and acknowledge that it must be accessible for everyone, as well as safe and enjoyable.

We would say that it is very important for our communities to have access to high quality green areas nearby. However, these cannot just be newly created spaces, we need to save, protect and enhance our existing natural environment. Any new green space planting should be suitable for the location and be native rather than invasive to the local area, and take not only humans into consideration but also wildlife. This is important not only for the wildlife and habitat, but also because our interactions with wildlife help towards

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

our health and wellbeing, whether that be experiencing them living in our communities, or the role they have to play in our ecosystem for our food, and existence.

We would say that it is very important for our communities to have access to local, sustainable, healthy food, to support health lifestyles. We agree this should include things like allotments, orchards, community gardens, roof gardens etc.

However, we also feel it is very important that our agricultural land is saved, protected and sustainable farmed to help ensure food security. Too much agricultural land is under threat and being lost to development, housing, solar farms, and roads like the proposed LTC. This is not healthy or sustainable, especially when food security is such an issue.

We would say that it is very important to ensure that adequate infrastructure and facilities are delivered. However, we feel that we are greatly lacking on this front before a Local Plan that encourages growth is even considered, and that ensuring existing residents are taken care of first with adequate infrastructure and facilities first is essential.

We should not have to wait for further development, or be held to ransom of having to have further development to get infrastructure and facilities that are needed regardless of any future development.

We also note, since commenting on Healthy Place For All, that it is disappointing that while health is recognised in this design charter, the current Local Plan consultation shows no detail of things like healthcare facilities.

We stress the importance of any infrastructure and facilities needing to be delivered in a sustainable manner, and being accessible for all.

In regard to health, we'd also like to comment on health and safety risk associated with the Local Plan, and that currently there doesn't appear to be any consideration of risk from things like Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) which is a risk throughout the borough.

In regard to developments this is not just a potential risk physically to contractors and the public, but also is stressful and impacts people's mental health and wellbeing if they know there is a risk of UXO near their home and development is being proposed close by. This is something we have raised with National Highways in regards to the proposed LTC, and is also very relevant in regard to the Local Plan.

## ***Connecting to Opportunity***

We would like to begin by stating that the word 'opportunity' is open to interpretation, as different people will have different ideas of what is opportunity and what is not.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

As far as we can see the council's idea of opportunity as a whole is for as much economic growth and development as possible. In our experience this is not what many in our borough want or need.

Many are of the opinion that one of the main reasons currently for the council to want so much economic growth and development is because of the absolute mess that the council has gotten into financially through terrible management and behaviours.

The theory of growth bringing more money into the council/borough to 'improve' things is not realistic. Historically there were fewer people living in Thurrock and services and facilities were much better. The more the borough has been developed the worse our service and facilities have gotten. We are therefore of the opinion that growth does not equate to benefits or improvement, rather the opposite that the more development the worse things get.

We are more than aware that communities within our borough are suffering through lack of connectivity, such as in the East Tilbury area where they are severed from the rest of the borough when the railway crossings are down. This can literally be a matter of life or death for those in the East Tilbury area, and the council should take their duty of care responsibly to ensure people are not put at risk like this. It shouldn't come down to such communities having to have new development inflicted upon them for a solution to be proposed and developed.

It is very important for communities to have accessible services and facilities, and active travel where possible should be encouraged to help reduce traffic and pollution. Public transport also has a role to play. We are concerned about bus services already being stopped and reduced in the borough. How would the council propose to ensure there would be reliable, safe, affordable public transport options for everyone? It's one thing to have ambitions it's another to deliver the services needed.

The same question can be asked of healthcare facilities, and shops. We note that it is proposed to develop on the Lidl site in South Ockendon for example. Where would people shop if you took away a supermarket like this? In an ideal world people would shop at local stores, but in reality the big supermarkets have the buying power to be cheaper, so that is where people shop, and if there's not a supermarket in walking distance they will use a car, as a weekly family shop on the bus/train is not generally an easy and viable option.

It is very important that our communities are connected to nature. Evidence shows this is beneficial to our health and wellbeing. Plus of course ensuring the protection and enhancement of our natural environment, when done properly, is essential for a sustainable future for us all.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

There are too many proposed developments both within the proposed Local Plan and outside of it that adversely impact our natural environment. This is not sustainable or acceptable.

Whilst we agree that it is very important that there are options to travel to jobs and opportunities sustainably, it is also essential that the council acknowledge that we have much lower rates of unemployment in our area. So, to keep pushing for more growth that creates large numbers of employment only forces a need for more people to come to the area to fill such jobs. This then leads to the need for more houses, and/or generates more traffic coming into the area, adding to congestion and pollution. Economic growth for the sake of economic growth is simply not sustainable or desirable. Try counting your money when there is no clear air to breathe, clean water to drink, and healthy soil to grow our food.

It is very important that our communities have access to culture and leisure. However, it is hard to trust in a council on such matters, when Thurrock are looking at selling off places like the Thameside Theatre and Grangewaters etc.

It is very important that our communities have good accessible options for active travel and public transport. However, the proposed Local Plan does not cover this adequately. For example, what consideration and assessment has been carried out in regard to impacts to the existing rail network?

On the C2C line between Grays and Upminster, via Chafford Hundred and South Ockendon there is just one railway track, with two tracks at stations. The platforms would not accommodate longer trains. It is questionable as to whether timings would allow for additional/longer trains to allow safe and adequate time for train to cross at stations, since they cannot pass on the tracks outside of stations.

So, whilst it is good to plan for development that encourages the active travel and the use of public transport, it has to be viable, and the proposed Local Plan does not provide adequate information to know what assessment has been carried out and whether it would be viable, but local knowledge and common sense suggests it wouldn't be viable as things stand now.

If rail improvements were needed, what provisions are in place to ensure such improvements are viable and would be carried out? The section of railway mentioned also goes through the London Borough of Havering, who we understand are also close to declaring 114 (Local Authority equivalent of bankruptcy) so as well as the planning and logistics of such rail improvements there would also be the question of how the cost would be covered.

To be completely clear, we support and encourage active travel and public transport, we agree it is very important. We are simply stating that we do not trust that enough



# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

consideration and assessment has been given to it in respect to the proposed Local Plan. We know all too well that ambitions do not necessarily lead to the desired outcome, and it would be irresponsible to support development without such matters being viable and secured, if any such development has to go ahead.

## ***Resilient & Sustainable Futures***

We agree that a carbon net zero future is very important, it is one of the many reasons we oppose the proposed LTC, with its whopping estimated 6.6million tonnes of carbon, if it goes ahead. However, again we have to say whilst we support the ambition we question what the council would actually do to ensure so much development for the Local Plan would not be generating large amounts of carbon emissions?

The best way to reduce carbon emissions is to reduce development and make changes to our borough for a more sustainable future.

We agree that it is very important to ensure resilience and future-proofing, but development is part of the problem. What is being proposed in the current Local Plan would be destructive and harmful and add to the climate emergency, not improve things or lead to a more sustainable future.

The very fact so much greenbelt and agricultural land is proposed to be developed on, including grade 1 listed agricultural land highlights this. Not only would the loss of such land lead to a general loss of agricultural land and have an adverse impact on food security, but it would also lead to increased food miles and all the associated carbon and other emissions.

Building on flood plains has proven to be a failure within our borough. Any greenbelt land or flood plain that we build on adversely impacts the natural environment, which only adds to climate change and worsens the situation.

We agree that nature and biodiversity is very important, and support the need to save, protect and enhance our natural environment. What is being proposed in the current Local Plan does not save, protect and enhance our natural environment, in fact it is quite the opposite.

We question what baseline the council would use to assess Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)? Do the council have qualified and experienced staff and resources to monitor and assess BNG in regard to any proposed Local Plan/developments in the borough? Who would monitor that any BNG is fulfilled, and take action for any failings?

We agree that nature-based solutions are very important, but what is being proposed in the current Local Plan does not support this. We again stress that proposing building on



# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

flood plains, greenbelt, and agricultural land etc is not sustainable and does not support nature-based solutions to anything, as it destroys and adversely impacts the natural environment.

We feel that embedding circular economies is very important, yet again the proposed Local Plan does not support this. The economic growth that the council supports such as the ports etc are largely about importing from overseas, not supporting a local circular economy. Plus in regard to the ambition as stated of embedding circular economies into construction and consumption what assessments have the council carried out on this, and who would monitor it? There would be nothing to stop developers just doing what is quickest, cheapest and easiest for them.

## Design Ideas for Thurrock

### **The Thames**

When we read the proposed 'Design opportunities along the Thames' in the Design Charter there are some we agree with, but we also find them to be contradictory to what the council are proposing and supporting as current and future ambitions they have. We again stress these are ambitions they have, and do not necessarily well reflect what our communities want and need.

The points raised in the Design Charter talk about enhancing accessibility to the Thames, restoring habitats, improving connectivity, BNG, climate change resilience, celebrating heritage. Yet at the same time the council want economic growth through development and the ports, which already consume large sections of the river front.

We can see no detail of what is meant by 'Creating opportunities for clean energy generation wherever possible' but assume it is maybe linked to the ports.

Thames Freeport is something that we really haven't been consulted on, and there are still so many unknowns about Thames Freeport. However, we believe it will increase traffic to the area, which adds to congestion and pollution. It would destroy and adversely impact yet more of our river frontage and greenbelt land. It is likely that crime would rise, and that generally disbenefits would outweigh benefits to our communities.

Thurrock has more than our fair share of industry and development, to keep pushing for more is not sustainable and also encourages proposals like the proposed LTC to serve such growth.

There is not capacity on the rail network to support the move of more freight onto more sustainable rail in our area, so all development remains road focused, and our area is already congested and polluted we don't need more.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

We need to be limiting development in our area to help assist in reducing traffic, not pushing for more and more growth for the sake of growth, it is simply not sustainable.

We have the London Cruise Terminal in our borough, and we have access via river, and public transport to a certain extent (train stations in river towns) to the city of London. Why are we not looking at options to enhance what we already have to encourage such visitors to enjoy and spend in our local area? This could help support the future of the forts, our nature reserves, our water front towns, whilst also keeping it accessible and desirable for our local communities. East Tilbury would of course benefit from the reintroduction of a bus service in this regard.

Improving desirability of our borough benefits everyone if done in a sustainable way, and if done correctly would bring economic benefits and general improvements to our area in a sustainable manner, rather than more destructive and harmful development that is currently being proposed. Save, protect and enhance what we already have in a sustainable way.

## **Neighbourhoods**

In order to try and avoid repeating ourselves, this section includes many aspects that cover green and sustainable options that we feel are very important. However, we feel the what is being proposed contradicts this. For example, the proposed Local Plan destroys allotments. We've already covered the questionable aspect of whether building near train stations is viable due to limitations with tracks and platforms. It's not just the proposed development in the stretch of railway that only has one track either, as other trains further along the track pass through this section and stations. This kind of failure would just drive people in those areas to use a car, which then leads to more congestion, pollution, and also issues in regard to parking, since planning will expect people to use rail despite the development worsening the experience of rail travel in this way.

To stress again, we support sustainability, we just don't believe that what is being proposed in the Local Plan is viable, or that adequate assessment has been carried out and presented to back up any of the proposed ambitions are compatible and viable with the Design Charter.

We would finish by saying that in regard to car parking being integrated, we know from experience that there are places in Thurrock, such as the houses built on the site of Orsett Hospital, where they have narrow roads, and garage for cars, but whilst it may be possible to drive a car into the garage for most it is not then possible to get out of your car. This leads to people parking on the narrow streets, which makes it less safe, less accessible, and less desirable.

We have also not seen reference to facilities for charging electric vehicles (EVs). We would also like to stress that EVs are not the panacea many like to believe, as they still emit deadly

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

particulate matter (PM2.5). Particles so tiny they get into our organs via the bloodstream, and can be deadly. EVs also do nothing to address the issue of congestion. In fact if people believe EVs to be greener they are more likely to use them which leads to more congestion.

The Neighbourhood diagram shows new health centres, yet whilst definitely needed have not featured in the proposed Local Plan in any detail.

## **Countryside**

Yet again, and to try and avoid repeating ourselves, we agree with many of the points raised in this section, but we believe that what the council is proposing and has ambitions for contradicts what is being proposed in the Design Charter.

How can you talk about opportunities for green space, biodiversity, and food production at the same time as proposing large developments on our greenspaces that would adversely impact biodiversity and food production?

There is also an increasing amount of solar farms being given permission in Thurrock, which are resulting in a large loss of agricultural land, adversely impacting nature and wildlife, and become scars on our landscape. Whilst we support sustainability, there are many other places that should be prioritised for solar panels before we even begin to consider putting them on our fields and open spaces.

Views out to the open countryside, from home and public spaces, would be lost and adversely impacted by the scale of proposed development.

## **Good Neighbours**

To avoid repetition for this section we will simply comment that specifically in regard to major roads, "effective noise barrier, screened with vegetation green habitat bridges, addressing severance" are standard requirements for such projects, and not a sign of being a good neighbour. Being a good neighbour would be not inflicting major roads on our area in the first place. More roads lead to more traffic, induced demand, and more traffic leads to calls for more roads, and so the vicious cycle continues. This has to stop, we need more sustainable alternatives that allow, support, and encourage modal shift. We have more than our fair share of major roads in our borough. We need to see changes that reduce road traffic, including stopping developments that just bring more traffic to our area.

## **Employment Areas**

We support some of the proposals in this section, but have doubts in regard to the proposed Local Plan actually supporting them.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

Plus we know that Thurrock is an area that has low unemployment, so any pushes for growth in developments that create employment opportunities need to carefully consider whether they are genuinely beneficial for our borough, or if they will just generate more traffic from people travelling for the jobs, and/or calls for more homes to accommodate more people that would be needed for the new jobs.

These Local Plan consultations focus way too much on the council asking about proposals of what they want, rather than actually taking in to account what the people of the borough want and need.

## **Landscapes**

We revert to the comment that whilst we support many of the proposed opportunities in this section, we do not believe that the proposed Local Plan and councils ambitions support such opportunities.

We consider it to be very important that our landscapes, ecosystems, biodiversity, nature, and our accessibility and connection with it are saved, protected and enhanced in a sustainable manner.

## **Making it Happen**

As we have said time and time again in our responses, whilst we agree with many of the points that are being proposed, we simply do not see that the proposed Local Plan reflects what is being proposed in the Design Charter. We do not believe that the council has carried out adequate assessments, or has the staff and resources to be able to assess, monitor and police requirements that are being proposed ongoing.

If the council are not even going to present a proposed Local Plan that complies with the proposed Design Charter what hope is there?

## **Next Steps**

Unless people are familiar or curious enough to hunt down this consultation promotion has been greatly lacking. There has been no real clear indication that this consultation is even running at the Local Plan events.

The way all the Local Plan consultations has been presented leaves a lot to be desired and could be greatly improved.

It is not just the Local Plan related consultations that the council lack good communications on, it is all aspects of council business. We need increase and improved communications

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

between the council and our communities. We need interaction, not just comms that fire what you want to fire at us. The council needs to genuinely listen and engage in a meaningful manner.

There is serious concerns that the council do not listen, and that you will just go ahead and do what you want anyway.

Following all the disastrous mess that has been created by the council we hear about the council wanting to offer transparency and improve, but now we need to see actions to back this up.

## *Other*

We would like to highlight that we feel it questionable that the council have used photos of people's homes for the Local Plan consultation without advising them, which can be stressful for residents when you are not expecting to see your home featured in such materials.

We also question why the Design Charter consultation could not be better incorporated into the Local Plan consultation, as it appears to have a different email address for responses.

Whilst all these different Local Plan related consultations may be being treated separately by the council, to us as residents it is all part of one big picture of the Local Plan. We cover the inadequacies of the Local Plan consultations in a separate section above.

We again stress as we have done for other sections of the consultations there are definite inadequacies of consultation, and that things should and could have been presented in a much clearer and more informative way. That said out of all of them the Thurrock Design Charter response form does appear to be the better out of them all, largely due to the way links were inserted into the response form to take people to the relevant information.

# THAMES CROSSING ACTION GROUP

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

## **Overall Conclusion on all aspects of the Local Plan related consultations**

Whilst certain section of all the associated documentation for the proposed Thurrock Local Plan appear to detail things we would support such as reduction in congestion, pollution, saving, protecting and enhancing biodiversity and our natural environment, protecting the greenbelt, improved health care, happy health lifestyles for residents etc; we fail to see any real evidence in the proposed Local Plan that truly supports these ambitions.

Ambitions are no good unless the work is done to ensure the results are attainable and attained.

From what we can see the Thurrock Local Plan would be destructive and harmful, and encourage more traffic within the borough, along with the associated pollution, would be harmful not only to residents and our health and wellbeing, but also to greenbelt, biodiversity and our natural environment, not to mention things like food security.

We have concerns about the lack of adequate assessment and information in this consultation and in the Local Plan, and have concerns that there will not be enough time to adequately assess and prepare and present a final consultation to Thurrock before the end of the year, and in time for when Regulation 19 is being proposed.

So again, we stress that we oppose the proposed Thurrock Local Plan for the same and similar reasons as we are and remain strongly opposed to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.