

Thurrock - An ambitious and collaborative community which is proud of its heritage and excited by its diverse opportunities and future

## Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

The meeting will be held at **6.00 pm** on **15 October 2018**

**Council Chamber, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL**

### Membership:

Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), Qaisar Abbas, John Allen, Andrew Jefferies, Tom Kelly, Terry Piccolo, Jane Potheary, Gerard Rice and Sue Sammons

### Substitutes:

Councillors Russell Cherry, Mike Fletcher and Sue Shinnick

### Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1 Apologies for Absence</b>	
<b>2 Minutes</b>	<b>5 - 12</b>
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 17 September 2018.	
<b>3 Items of Urgent Business</b>	
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.	
<b>4 Declaration of Interests</b>	
<b>5 Election of Vice Chair</b>	
<b>6 Verbal Update: A13/A1089 Traffic Movement Update</b>	
<b>7 Verbal Update: East Facing Slip Roads</b>	

- 8 Verbal Update: Statutory Consultation**
- 9 Presentation by Highways England**
- 10 Task Force Priorities List 13 - 16**
- 11 Work Programme 17 - 20**
- 12 Any Other Business**

**Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:**

Please contact Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to [direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)

Agenda published on: **10 October 2018**

## **Information for members of the public and councillors**

### **Access to Information and Meetings**

Members of the public can attend all meetings of the council and its committees and have the right to see the agenda, which will be published no later than 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

### **Recording of meetings**

This meeting may be recorded for transmission and publication on the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

Members of the public not wishing any speech or address to be recorded for publication to the Internet should contact Democratic Services to discuss any concerns.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto: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](mailto: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-CIVIC
- 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](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) 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 Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 17 September 2018 at 6.00 pm

---

- Present:** Councillors Peter Smith, Qaisar Abbas, John Allen, Andrew Jefferies, Tom Kelly, Russell Cherry
- Matt Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative  
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative  
Linda Mulley, Resident Representative
- Apologies:** Councillors Terry Piccolo, Sue Sammons and Peter Ward
- In attendance:** Steve Cox, Corporate Director Place  
Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing  
Mat Kiely, Transportation Development Manager  
Luke Tyson, Business Manager  
Tisha Sutcliffe, Democratic Services Officer
- 

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

### **71. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Terry Piccolo, Sue Sammons and Mr Peter Ward, Business representative.

### **72. Minutes**

The minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 23rd April 2018 were approved as a correct record.

### **73. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **74. Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **75. Election of the Chair**

Nominations were invited for the election of the Chair. Councillor Allen made a nomination for Councillor Smith to remain as Chair for the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force. All members agreed with this nomination and the Chair remained as Councillor Smith.

### **76. Verbal Updates: Consultation**

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing shared a verbal update in regards to the Statutory Consultation. Officers were anticipating that the start date would be by the middle of October and would run for roughly 10 weeks although there had been no confirmation or advanced information received from Highways England. Officers were expecting to receive the information by the middle of October for, when the Task Force meet in October, November and December it will feature a heavy discussion regarding the Statutory Consultation and the materials that Highways England should have published.

The Chair expressed deep disappointment with the lack of engagement from Highways England and the disingenuous information being shared which was preventing issues from progressing.

#### **77. Verbal Updates: Statement of Community Consultation**

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing updated the Task Force on the Statement of Community Consultation. The Statement of Community Consultation is the start of the process and is an item that a promoter of a Development Consent Order is required to consult the Local Authority about the way in which a statutory consultation is to be conducted in its area. Thurrock Council received the information in August 2018 and Officers had worked across the Council to formulate a response. The document details the length of consultation period; where events will be held; where documents will be presented; and deposit locations and information points where people can collect feedback forms.

Thurrock Council produced a detailed schedule of comment in relation to the Statement of Community Consultation to ensure the consultation would be fair and accessible for all local residents and they were given the opportunity to share their feedback and to participate.

The Chair opened the Task Force to questions.

Mr Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative expressed concerns with the lack of performance from Highways England as they did not convey in their process what was going to be achieved. Highways England needed to be open and transparent on what they wanted to achieve and whether the community were going to understand the wording and structure of the documents. Mr Jackson also questioned how Highways England were going to inform residents about the upcoming Consultation.

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing commented that the Statement of Community Consultation did not contain any details or information about the consultation although they were fully aware of the dissatisfaction and engagement with the residents. Officers provided detailed information to Highways England in response to the Statement of Community Consultation. Highways England have regulations, guidance and its own policy they were required to follow and the consultation will need to be published a couple of weeks before in a National newspaper, the London



Gazette (for one week) and a local newspaper for at least two consecutive weeks. Thurrock had provided information to Highways England about the newspapers in the local area as well as the local consultation portal.

Mr Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative pointed out that in the past residents were not made aware of this and it was extremely important for residents to be alerted of what is occurring in their Borough.

Ms Mulley, Resident Representative shared concerns that Thurrock Gazette were publishing this information although those residents in the area most affected do not receive the Thurrock Gazette. The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing explained that the relevant information would be published on Thurrock Councils website and they would ensure that residents are made aware. Officers would do all they can to provide this information to residents.

Ms Mulley, Resident Representative pointed out that Highways England had already booked for a consultation before Thurrock Council advised that they had received this information in August 2018. The Corporate Director Place said Officers want to ensure all Highways England Consultation events reflect the scheme and provides an opportunity for local people to engage and contribute. The Local Authority will do all they can to ensure people are aware of the consultation.

Councillor Allen asked for an update on the Health Impact Assessment.

#### **78. Verbal Updates: Health Impact Assessment**

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing verbally updated the Task Force with regards to the Health Impact Assessment. Health Officers from Thurrock Council convened a meeting with representatives from Essex County Council, Kent County Council and Southend on Sea Borough Council, as they had all signed a formal letter to Highways England which set out a scope of work of what they expect to see within the Health Impact Assessment. All the relevant Authorities signed the documentation on 15 August 2018 and it was forwarded to Highways England on 17 August 2018, however there had been no response from them and a reminder email was again sent the following week.

#### **79. Verbal Updates: Planning Performance Agreement**

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing updated the Task Force on the Planning Performance Agreement. Thurrock Council were in discussion with Highways England about agreeing a Planning Performance Agreement and the idea was that Highways England were to help resource the Councils requirement to respond to their consultation and to their Development Consent Order.

The Planning Performance Agreement had been promised for considerable time but despite the promise and a number of reminders Highways England had not been forthcoming with it. On Friday 14 September a document was

received by Officers which was a Planning Performance Agreement template with very limited information included.

A request from Highways England was received for Officers to have a meeting with them to agree the work packages that would form part of the Planning Performance Agreement that the Council can be reimbursed for.

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing briefly outlined what a Planning Performance Agreement does to ensure that members of the public were aware.

The Chair shared concerns regarding the lack of engagement Highways England had shown with the scheme, even though they were still requesting a monthly update from the Council.

Mr Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative asked how Highways England can get a DCO. The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing advised that Thurrock Council's role was, once Highways England submit their DCO application, they were to provide a response on the adequacy of Consultation. In that regard, documents and correspondence are being recorded between Thurrock Council and Highways England. The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing had a list of items that were chased with Highways England on a weekly basis

Mr Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative asked how valid would it be for Highways England to gain the DCO, despite all of the things outstanding issues.

The Corporate Director Place expressed how difficult it was to predict and they were doing all they could as Officers to keep a record of all the correspondence and hold Highways England to account. However they will continue to do the right thing by being consistent and keeping track of all correspondence. Highways England were made aware of all concerns even though it was not being addressed.

The need for a Planning Performance Agreement was intended to help address the Council's concerns around the Lower Thames Crossing.

#### **80. Verbal Updates: Correspondence**

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing stated the item initially was included in the Agenda in anticipation that there would be more information to share with the Task Force in relation to outstanding points from Highways England.

#### **81. Update on Mitigation Schedule**

There are number of items on the Mitigation Schedule which Members will be aware of and was to be discussed with Highways England. In July a meeting with Highways England was held where they discussed a number of items on

the Mitigation Schedule, which was positively received and welcomed by Highways England as a starting point of discussion and negotiation. Work would need to continue and keep the pressure on them to feedback something more formal.

Councillor Kelly said in terms of progress the Task Force had made, at previous meetings there were 50 questions asked by Members and there had been no response for around 6 - 7 months. Every month there were questions added and it was concerning that the questions were removed off the agenda. During a normal Committee meeting questions would be asked by Members and they would be answered there and then with no delay.

The Corporate Director Place understood why Councillor Kelly was concerned, however it was difficult for Officers as the Scheme was run by Highways England and they have no ability to answer the questions without information from Highways England. Although the questions were asked to be put on the Work Programme for previous meetings there would have been very limited update unless Highways England were prepared to attend the meetings to feedback.

It was suggested and agreed by all Members and the Chair for the questions to be placed on the Work Programme for upcoming meetings and be included in the agenda. The Corporate Director Place explained the difficulties there had been as the questions had been transposed into the Mitigation Schedule.

Councillor Kelly agreed for this to be included on the work programme and the agenda for subsequent meetings, he requested that the questions also be added to any future agenda.

The Chair highlighted on page 66 of the previous minutes that no further information would be provided until the Statutory Consultation, since April 2017 the Task Force and Officers had extreme difficulties with answering questions for residents and move forward.

Councillor Kelly questioned the traffic modelling data available for the junction between the A13 and the A1089. He also asked that if Highways England were failing to respond would the Highways department at Thurrock Council be able to do their own research, as the Council should not have to rely on Highways England to answer the questions about our Borough.

The Corporate Director Place advised that Officers had met with the Department of Transport on a number of occasions. Officers were ready to respond to the questions and it was important that Officers were prepared to analyse the model when accepted. The Members shared their concerns and were right to ask what this would mean for the Borough as they had not received any response to clarify.

The Chair asked if the Department of Transport had a separate entity that were looking at this directly, or would the financing of any investigation need to come out of the transporting budget or would any more funding be provided

at a later date. Corporate Director Place advised a whole team across the Council were aware, along with a team of consultants who were briefed.

Ms Mulley, Resident Representative pointed out that over the summer the “red line” had drastically changed, which needs to be addressed as residents were being affected. The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing explained the Local Authority were only made aware of this recently and had increased by approximately 70% in the borough and again in recent weeks to include additional residents in the Heath Road area.

Ms Mulley, Resident Representative expressed how appalling it was that Highways England failed to inform residents and Officers, as there were a number of residents that were unhappy including the residents in the public gallery at the meeting. There would need to be an item on the agenda on how this is affecting the residents.

The Chair agreed that many residents in Thurrock do not want the Crossing to be built and it was also concerning that Highways England had made changes to the “red line” without consulting residents.

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing understood and said she shares the frustration, unfortunately they cannot reassure residents that the “red line” would not be changed again in the future, although they have asked for reassurance from Highways England but there had been no response.

Ms Mulley, Resident Representative asked if there was any legal advice that could be given to residents that were being affected as there were a number of residents who were struggling with this and one individual had admitted to thoughts of suicide. The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing responded that the Council as a Local Authority were unable to give any legal advice but they were able to provide information for affected resident to explore and organisations they can speak to about what help and advice they can get.

Councillor Cherry asked if the residents who were made offers under the discretionary purchase scheme had been told to keep it private. The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing advised she was unclear on the terms of any agreements Highways England make to acquire properties but it is likely that there would be some form of confidentiality agreement.

## **82. Work Programme**

The Work Programme was discussed and Members requested that the following to be added to the Work Programme:

1. Consultation to be explained
2. Deep dive A13 (A1089)
3. Mitigation Schedule
4. Presentation/detailed consultation

Councillor Allen asked if the east bound slip road could be included in the Work Programme for upcoming meetings.

Mr Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative explained that Tilbury Port were going to have an alternative route and Mr P Ward made a point at the last meeting that if the A1089 was to be declassified it would impact on residents.

The Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing advised that they were unable to discuss this matter as of yet as there were no clear details on this, however Highways England would be publishing this in October 2018.

### **Any other Business**

**The Chair asked if there was any other business to add.**

Mr Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative highlighted that previous meetings with Highways England fell apart in relation to effects on Heath Road, and plans illustrated a closed road. Highways England had said the road would remain open but with the recent affected properties in Heath Road, this may mean that Heath Road may be closed again and this would also impact on residents. He stated the Task Force should be mindful of this.

The Chair shared the recent minutes regarding Highways England and thanked Mr Jackson for raising this during the meeting, as Highways England were failing to deliver and it is unacceptable.

**The meeting finished at 7.00 pm**

Approved as a true and correct record

**CHAIR**

**DATE**

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact  
Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Thurrock Lower Thames Crossing Task Force - Summary of Key Priorities**

While Thurrock Council remains opposed to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) being developed by Highways England in the Borough, as part of the response to the Preferred Route Announcement, Thurrock Council established a cross party 'Lower Thames Crossing Task Force' which included representation of local residents, the business community and the local action group opposing the scheme.

The following list captures some of the most frequently raised concerns, issues and priorities associated with the project to date. Thurrock Council and the Task Force remain opposed to the Highway England development of a crossing in this location. However the list below is intended to illustrate the real cost of the LTC on Thurrock and its communities and if Highways England take these seriously and factor the cost of remedy it will fundamentally affect the Business Case for the scheme. This can be read in conjunction with the Thurrock response to PINS.

It is without prejudice and those attending the Task Force will keep this list under review as and when HE provides additional information.

### **1. Business Case**

- a. How much of this scheme is
  - i. Time savings for trips already on the road network?
  - ii. Real jobs and growth and how much of this will be in Thurrock?
  - iii. Simply creating more journeys by car and longer trips?
  - iv. If jobs was the highest priority (not a few minutes shaved off M25 journey times) how would this scheme compare to say a Crossing at Canvey?
- b. Who is to fund the entirety of the scheme?
- c. Tilbury Docks link road
  - i. Is this confirmed as part of the core 'funded' project?
  - ii. HE must design – for genuine consultation – a dual carriageway
  - iii. There are notable views as to the relative merits of downgrading the A1089. What are HE proposals and how will HE manage this sensitivity.
- d. When can local contractors access all current and future HE contracts?

### **2. Involvement of Thurrock Council**

- a. HE to commence full and detailed technical assessment with Thurrock Officers and how each and every scheme aspects is genuinely captured by HE and local harm fully mitigated and costed in their current understanding of their proposal.
- b. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project HE must
  - i. Accept that this scheme must be scrutinised in exactly the same manner as other NSIP's such as Purfleet, Tilbury 2 etc. albeit the sheer scale, impact and potential lack of benefit to Thurrock makes this all the more concerning.
  - ii. As developer, understand the full and significant impacts on Officer resources and democratic time and our ability to respond in advancing *any* Application of a DCO.

### **3. Alternatives to this proposal**

- a. The Planning Inspectorate has demanded these be set out – when will HE share with Thurrock how they intend this respond?
- b. All the historic crossing capacity (1963, 1980, 1991). This crossing will last 120 years at least. Will there ever be anything other than more and more roads when there is a need to safeguard and future proof for alternatives modes.

### **4. What is the scheme and how will the network operate?**

- a. When will we know the precise capacity of the crossing? This has already become 3 lanes through the tunnel, then up to the A13 but no detail thereafter.
- b. What is the capacity of the Tilbury Docks Link road and will the proposed design work?
- c. M25 / A2 Junction will be diversion point for the LTC; then back on to the M25. Can you prove that the entire network will be able to cope and that LTC does not simply create a new connection but with roads and junction either side at gridlock?

### **5. Design of the new Crossing**

- a. HE to provide detail of when and where Thurrock can genuinely influence HE proposals. HE must demonstrate where we can or cannot influence the scheme. The DCO process demands genuine consultation rather than keep telling us what you have decided.
- b. The tunnel portal as currently described is within the SSSI. HE must undertake full assessment (now) to adequately consider and respond to demands that it stay in tunnel until North of the railway line (*a key concern of the taskforce*).
- c. HE must provide alternative options for tunnelling and cut and cover at all junctions and sensitive areas. These worked up options to be discussed in detail with Thurrock Council prior to the Application for the DCO.
- d. All slips to have detailed designs developed for cut and cover as now being developed north of Thurrock on the M25. These designs to be open for genuine consultation and consideration by Thurrock Council.
- e. The legacy impact of road elevations – especially over the MarDyke valley needs to be fully recognised and addressed. A detailed understanding of the potential for cut and cover instead of highly elevated structures is needed including areas such as Chadwell St Mary, Orsett, Baker Street, Stifford Clays / Blackshots, Ockendon, Bulphan.
- f. More detail is needed beyond the current red line boundary and we need to have guarantees that HE is designing in robust mitigation including significant planting (5-10 metres) either side of the road (for masking the road, wild life protection, and creation of new community links for cycling, walking and equestrians).
- g. Where is HE's construction plan in terms of access routes / haul routes to enable construction to commence.

### **6. Incident Management**

- a. Action needed now on current gridlock – can HE lobby DfT for strategic action.
- b. The incident management, delay in response and absence of smart management (including alerts, roadside information, recovery) is not as good as elsewhere in the country (i.e. as now being developed in the West Midlands). Why is it worth spending



£6bn for a new crossing and not £60m for state of the art integrated traffic control 24/7 covering the current crossing and local road either side.

- c. Full Borough wide traffic micro-simulation is needed to understand the knock on effect of incidents on either network. Any new crossing is a decade away – so requires action now, especially with planned housing growth.
- d. Will the new crossing allow tankers to cross without escorts given currently delays?

#### **7. Environmental, ecological and health impacts**

- a. The severance of the new road – visual and communities will create separation and segregation especially in historic settings such as Coal House Fort.
- b. Construction impacts of noise, dust and road traffic need to be fully mitigated especially given the prevailing SW wind.
- c. The visual intrusion demands a maximum tunnelling and the remainder fully screened.
- d. More road trips will result in greater pollution than would otherwise be the case and an air quality assessment must be undertaken.
- e. A Full Health Impact Assessment must be produced by HE to consider the full health impact of the proposed route on local populations.
- f. Pollution models for noise, air, light and vibration must be set out for the community.
- g. How much of the Greenbelt will be lost to this scheme and how might HE mitigate the risk of making the Borough being less attractive to house builders.
- h. Each and every community, and heritage asset Including Coal House Fort, Tilbury Fort and East Tilbury Village will be irreplaceably damaged – where has HE experienced and mitigated this across its many years of experience.

#### **8. Consultation**

- a. HE has adopted approaches to consultation that removed over 10,000 voices against this scheme. Can HE confirm that they will work more transparently in the future to ensure genuine consultation and show how Thurrock can genuinely influence the scheme?
- b. HE has yet to produce a detailed consultation timeline and the approaches to the Council and local community have lacked any visible plan, and appear ad hoc. When can we have presented a clear communication strategy?
- c. When will HE provide a basic 'fly through' of the current proposals as used in other schemes? Even if this subsequently changes it has been six months since the PRA.
- d. When can detailed drawings be presented to allow local communities to be informed?

#### **9. Tolling**

- a. The Thurrock Community that will be impacted by nearly 2/3 of the scheme should receive a share of the proceeds to reflect the ongoing harm of the crossing and its traffic.
- b. The Dartford Crossing has already paid for itself and local residents and businesses should receive toll free crossings.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force  
Work Programme  
2018/2019**

Dates of Meetings: 18<sup>th</sup> June 2018, 16<sup>th</sup> July 2018, 20<sup>th</sup> August 2018, 17<sup>th</sup> September 2018, 15<sup>th</sup> October 2018, 12<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 10<sup>th</sup> December 2018, 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019, 11<sup>th</sup> February 2019, 11<sup>th</sup> March 2019, 29<sup>th</sup> April 2019

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Requested by Officer/Member</b>
<b>18 June 2018</b>		
Cabinet Update	Steve Cox	Members
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>16 July 2018</b>		
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>20 August 2018</b>		
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>17 September 2018</b>		
Cabinet Update	Steve Cox	Members

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**15 October 2018**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Task Force Priorities	Anna Eastgate	Members
Deep Dive A13 (A1089)/ East Bound Slip Roads	Anna Eastgate	Members
Statutory Consultation	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**12 November 2018**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**10 December 2018**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**14 January 2019**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**11 February 2019**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**11 March 2019**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**29 April 2019**

Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

This page is intentionally left blank