

Thurrock Strategic Infrastructure Board (TSIB)

Meeting Minutes

Date: January 27, 2026

Time: 04:00 pm

Location: Microsoft Teams, 3rd Floor Room 4

Attendees

Board Members Present:

- Priscilla Omede – Planning
- Ashley Baldwin – Planning, Regeneration and Growth (Chair)
- Natalie Smith – Community Development and Equalities
- Peter Wright – Highways and Transport Delivery
- Clive Collins – Environment Performance and Support
- Keith Andrews – Housing Development
- Helen Horrocks – Public Health
- Rocchina Raymond – Recreation and Leisure
- Patryk Jaskiewicz – Planning
- Navtej Tung – Transport Development
- Christopher Smith – Health and Social Care Transformation
- Kate Kozlova-Boran – Employability and Skills
- Isratu Marah – Planning

Apologies:

- Victoria Baldwin – Finance
 - George McCullough – Regeneration
 - Sarah Williams – Education
 - Laura Last – Finance
 - Michele Lucas – Education, Children Services
 - Louise Neilan – Communications and Engagement
 - Helen Nicol – Legal and Governance
 - Nisshanth Narendran – Finance
 - Anthony Fletcher – Performance, Support and Intelligence
-

Agenda Points

(PO) presented on the below agenda points.

Overall S106 Position

(PO) provided a general overview of the S106 Programme's current position.

- Amount Available - £14,909,713.01
- Amount Received this Financial Year - £1,423,222.24
- Amount Spent this Financial Year - £736,089.06

(PO) reminded the Board of the target to achieve £1 million in S106 spending by the end of the financial year, March 2026. (PO) noted that there is £263,910.94 left to spend to achieve the target. (PW) confirmed that this may be achievable by early March, alluding to large Highways projects. (AB) asked whether there were any other large schemes like this to further achieve spending. (PO) highlighted projects under Education and noted there may be few others.

(AB) enquired whether any lessons had been uncovered throughout the S106 programme, and if they could inform what targets to aim for next year. (AB) added that it may be worth thinking about realistic targets for the next financial year, and what schemes can be put into place/mobilised. (PW) noted that he could potentially forecast spending for Highways projects that are still in the development stage, which would be just under £2 million. (AB) emphasised that it is important not to be overambitious when forecasting.

Infrastructure Requirements List (IRL)

(PO) explained that IRL requests will be brought to the Board to discuss, and members of the Board can raise any issues, queries etc.

(PO) explained the Thurrock Youth Zone has been suggested for inclusion on the IRL, which holds funding until 2027. (PO) asked the Board whether they held any issues, or questions regarding its inclusion to the IRL. (NS) noted that there needs to be greater consideration given to how other young people across Thurrock can access the Youth Zone, which is situated in Tilbury. (HH) noted that she does not disagree with the suggestion but agreed that further transport considerations are required. (HH) further raised questions surrounding revenue costs. (PO) summarised that the consensus is for the Thurrock Youth Zone to be included on the IRL. (AB) added that money can be secured for revenue costs, but greater thought would be required over meeting CIL tests, if it is to be S106-funded. (KKB) further raised concerns over cost of salaries and youth workers, as well as noting the restructuring of staff and footfall/travel challenges.

(PO) asked (NT) if there is anything the Council could add to the IRL to help improve travel facilities. (NT) responded that this would be facilitated by revenue costs, unless

the development was a large project, then a bridge could be implemented. (PO) reiterated that there are few limitations on what can be added to the IRL, so Services should be ambitious regarding items they wish to add. (AB) enquired on the criteria required for an item to be added to the IRL. (AB) noted a lack of other youth zones in Thurrock, and expressed uncertainty over alternatives and the lack of guarantee of contributions from other developers/schemes. (NS) noted an uneven distribution of youth zones in Thurrock, and highlighted other community-led youth providers whose own responsibility it will be to nominate items to the IRL. (NS) noted this requires the Council to aid and think about how this will be facilitated and happen. (PO) concluded that the Thurrock Youth Zone has been agreed by the Board for inclusion on the IRL for now. (AB) added that the proposal is legitimate to include on the IRL, but noted that planning cannot resolve all issues, questioning whether this is the right forum to resolve other issues.

Board Approval Process

(PO) presented the Board Approval Form for the following projects.

Community Development and Equalities – presented by (NS) – 1 item

- Board agreed to an allocation of £169,500 to extend East Tilbury Library opening hours to full time to cover additional staff hours until 2027/28, and investment into additional resources for increased use and activities.

[13/00165/ETL]

(NS) explained that East Tilbury library is only open two days a week and has very little public service activity and visibility. (NS) further emphasised the role the library can play as a community hub, highlighting: the Bata Heritage centre based here, lunchtime openings, evening openings for students, technology available, and rooms for hire. (NS) underpinned that the East Tilbury Library has the opportunity to become a meaningful community space.

(AB) questioned whether the East Tilbury Forum has been engaged. (PO) noted that the Head of the Forum has provided some information for the proposal. (NS) added that the Forum has not yet been engaged on this specific proposal but is happy and willing to engage with the Forum before proceeding. (PO) confirmed that the developer (Persimmon Homes) is happy for the allocation to be repurposed, and the Council has this in writing. (AB) noted that so long the Forum agrees, and supports the project, then he is content to approve this allocation.

(CC) highlighted that there also exists a £187,500 S106 contribution under 'Planning Obligation Strategy', which would mitigate the need to repurpose an allocation. (PO) noted that this contribution does not expire until 2031. (CC) stated that the Council may want to be mindful. (PO) agreed that utilising this contribution would be the more intuitive process, Persimmon Homes have already expressed their agreement to repurpose the original Highways contribution. (NS) highlighted

that this contribution could help facilitate, support and mobilise community groups within Thurrock.

Community Development and Equalities/Sports and Leisure – presented by (PO) – 1 item

- Board did not agree to an allocation of £30,000 for the Light Up Thurrock Event at Coalhouse Fort. This event will take place in March 2026 with a programme of free engagement in several wards (Grays, West Thurrock, Stanford-le-Hope and East Tilbury catchment). The event will be a large-scale light, lantern and mass-participation dance event at the Fort in March 2026.

[TBC]

(PO) explained that this suggested spend is for Creative Blast as part of CVS. (PO) added that this event happens annually, with this event scheduled for March. (PO) noted that there will be funding from multiple sectors, and the Board need to discuss whether this is a viable option.

(PW) and (RR) discussed the costings for this project, and what other funding they may have secured. (PW) enquired who scrutinised these costs. (PO) elaborated that Creative Blast are gauging the viability of their proposal, before submitting further evidence.

(HH) asked whether this proposal was from Arts Outburst, which (RR) confirmed. (HH) noted that Arts Outburst has placed a bid and questioned whether they trying to obtain match funding. (KKB) noted that last year's event did not go ahead due to costs, which were c. £25,000. (KKB) further noted that they had hoped to project images onto Coalhouse Fort itself, which would explain and incur greater costs. (RR) explained that projections onto the Fort would not be allowed due to nesting birds, and Arts Outburst have had to change their proposals. (RR) added that the situation is being handled with care in conjunction with Natural England.

(NS) stated that the proposal is expensive but noted it covers four events across the Borough. (NS) highlighted further concern over time constraints, and whether Arts Outburst have enough time between now and March to appropriately engage and mobilise groups. (KA) noted the lack of forward planning. (NS) confirmed that there exists a wider strategy, with funding obtained from the Arts Council and Thurrock's involvement in arts and sports. (KKB) added that the proposal is likely to be an enhancement for security and delivery, with the funding providing additional capacity. (HH) agreed, and added they hold links with dance workshops, and Find Your Active Thurrock. (KKB) noted that the long-term ambition is to eventually open Coalhouse Fort to public. (NT) questioned whether they are all one-off costs, suggesting that it may be better if the proposal is for equipment that could be reused to reduce costs for following years. (RR) stated that there is also the need to consider

setting a precedent. (PO) reiterated that the proposal covers engagement throughout the Borough, but the final light show would be at Coalhouse Fort.

(PO) proposed an alternative to the Board, where the Council provides some funding but not all. (PO) suggested whether match funding would be viable. (NS) stated she would be happy to consider this proposal, but a greater course of action around engagement is needed, discussing community impact, pride, happiness etc.

(PO) noted that a breakdown of the costs will be required to see if the proposal is feasible.

(AB) questioned the proposal's compliance with the CIL tests. (PO) responded that they could be met and gave the example that the dance element of the proposal could be aligned with healthcare and community development aspects/impacts, though it would depend on the wording of the agreement. (AB) expressed uncertainty over this allocation, but noted the Council wants to encourage working with the CVS. (AB) further noted that the Council may be in receipt of a large number and wide scope of requests and would struggle to defend some. (PW) highlighted that costs could be reduced through social value but noted a lack of a Council lead in this area. (HH) stated that there may be a better use of S106 money in other places and spaces.

END OF MEETING