

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 **16 September 2019**

Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL

Membership:

Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), Luke Spillman (Deputy Chair), Andrew Jefferies, Tom Kelly, Fraser Massey, Allen Mayes, Sara Muldowney, Terry Piccolo and Sue Shinnick

Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Robert Quick, Resident Representative
Peter Ward, Business Representative
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 10
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 15 July 2019.	
3 Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
4 Declaration of Interests	
5 Health Impact Assessment Briefing Note	11 - 12
6 Task Force Priorities List	13 - 32

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

Agenda published on: **6 September 2019**

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

Guidelines on filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings

The council welcomes the filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings as a means of reporting on its proceedings because it helps to make the council more transparent and accountable to its local communities.

If you wish to film or photograph the proceedings of a meeting and have any special requirements or are intending to bring in large equipment please contact the Communications Team at CommunicationsTeam@thurrock.gov.uk before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will then be consulted and their agreement sought to any specific request made.

Where members of the public use a laptop, tablet device, smart phone or similar devices to use social media, make recordings or take photographs these devices must be set to 'silent' mode to avoid interrupting proceedings of the council or committee.

The use of flash photography or additional lighting may be allowed provided it has been discussed prior to the meeting and agreement reached to ensure that it will not disrupt proceedings.

The Chair of the meeting may terminate or suspend filming, photography, recording and use of social media if any of these activities, in their opinion, are disrupting proceedings at the meeting.

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

Wi-Fi is available throughout the Civic Offices. You can access Wi-Fi on your device by simply turning on the Wi-Fi on your laptop, Smartphone or tablet.

- You should connect to TBC-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 15 July 2019 at 6.00 pm

- Present:** Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), Luke Spillman (Deputy Chair), Tom Kelly, Fraser Massey, Allen Mayes, Sara Muldowney and Sue Shinnick
- Apologies:** Councillors Andrew Jefferies, Terry Piccolo
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative
- In attendance:** Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing
Helen Forster, Strategic Lead Public Health
Luke Tyson, Business Manager
Natalie Warren, Community Development and Equalities Manager
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer
- Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative
Robert Quick, Resident Representative
John Speakman, Thurrock Business Representative, as substitute for Peter Ward
- Alison Powell, People and Communities Advisor, Highways England
Chris Stratford, Lower Thames Crossing Stakeholder and SoCG Advisor, Highways England
Ben Fusaconti, External Affairs Advisor, Highways England
-

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.

9. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrew Jefferies and Councillor Terry Piccolo. Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Board Representative also sent his apologies, and John Speakman acted as his substitute.

10. Minutes

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative highlighted page seven of the agenda and clarified that ground investigations would be taking place both north and south of the river. She also clarified that on page eight of the agenda, she anticipated that additional consultation would be occurring, rather than believed.

The minutes from Lower Thames Crossing held on 10 June 2019, subject to those changes, were approved.

11. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

12. Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

13. Highways England Health Impact Assessment Update

The Highways England (HE) People and Communities Advisor gave a presentation regarding the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and began by stating that it would have a community focus, highlighting economy, places, equality, health and people. She stated that the HIA would be combined with an Equalities Assessment to ensure a collaborative approach, which would identify potential benefits and adverse effects of the scheme, whilst taking into account mitigation, existing and future communities and local area understanding. She commented that a Community Impacts and Public Health Advisory Group (CIPHAG) had been set up which was comprised of affected Local Authorities, and had an independent Chair. The HE People and Communities Advisor then went on to discuss the timeline of the CIPHAG and discussed how it had been set up in November 2018, had agreed the Terms of Reference in January 2019 and had then been involved in topic specific sessions. She clarified that each meeting related to a specific topic and outlined which topics had been discussed so far, with accessibility and road safety being discussed in April 2019, and air quality and noise discussed in June 2019. She stated that the next CIPHAG meeting would be held in September. She added that so far the CIPHAG had agreed the definition of health the HIA would use, which would be the definition used by the World Health Organisation (WHO), the social model of health to be used, the topics scoped for assessment, and the collation of localised baseline data. The HE People and Communities Advisor added that they had a comprehensive baseline dataset of Thurrock collected, which had been provided by Thurrock Council officers, and ensured the data covered local areas as well as borough-wide. She moved onto outlining the process of the HIA and highlighted that the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) scheme was currently undertaking topic-based assessments to feed into the HIA, and this included areas such as accessibility, travel time, and public transport. She summarised and stated that the HIA would consider potential impacts and benefits during construction and operation of the scheme, and outlined the next steps for the HIA over summer.

The Chair began the debate and asked how the departure of the LTC Project Lead would affect the scheme, as he felt Thurrock Council had had a good relationship with him. He also highlighted Appendix A of the report and drew the Committee's attention to the fact that areas such as Tilbury, Chadwell St

Mary and South Ockendon already had higher levels of COPD than other areas of Thurrock and England. He asked what environmental measures would be in place to protect those residents living in urban areas close to the scheme, such as cut and cover along the route. The HE External Affairs Advisor replied that the LTC Project Lead had left to develop his career, but his legacy was the relationship built with Thurrock Council, which would continue. The HE Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor added that big projects such as the LTC went through a design process that could take between one and two years, and this process was currently ongoing. He stated that HE would undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment, which would influence the final design and would identify mitigation measures. He clarified that cut and cover would not be an engineering possibility along the entire route, for example in the Mardyke Valley.

Councillor Spillman asked if HE had been aware of the high levels of COPD before the original design had been announced, and the HE External Affairs Advisor responded that although the final scheme had not yet been agreed, an appraisal had been done when choosing the proposed route. The Assistant Director LTC also responded that now the proposed route had been announced, only tweaks could be made to the alignment, as this was a nationally significant infrastructure project that favoured development. She stated that the general route was now fixed unless a new scheme was developed elsewhere.

The TCAG Representative asked why only certain sections of the borough had been included in the report, as the scheme would affect all residents in Thurrock. The HE People and Communities Advisor replied that the whole of Thurrock would be included in the HIA, but this paper only focused on communities that were in close proximity to the route, as certain issues such as noise would be more localised. The TCAG Representative then asked why HE were using the WHO definition of health, but not WHO guidance on areas such as PM2.5 along the entire route. The HE People and Communities Advisor replied that the HIA would draw on the Air Quality Assessment that used UK and EU legal standards, and modelled PM10. She clarified that PM2.5 made up a fraction of PM10, so although PM2.5 was not explicitly stated in the report, it was included as a fraction of the PM10 modelling. The Assistant Director LTC added that the HIA was a voluntary document, compared to the Environmental Impact Assessment that was a statutory document.

Councillor Mayes highlighted issues of COPD in Tilbury, and mentioned the testing of dust that was currently being undertaken. He felt it would be difficult to mitigate against health impacts, and asked for his concern to be noted by HE. The HE People and Communities Advisor responded that HE were currently focusing on environmental mitigation, but many factors caused increased levels of COPD, such as lifestyle and income. She stated that the legacy of the scheme, such as benefits in STEM education for children, could help to offset factors such as deprivation. The HE Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor added that the HIA and Environmental Impact Assessment would quantify how much the scheme would affect residents, and if the affects

could not be mitigated against then a judgement would be made at examination phase. He mentioned that decisions would be scrutinised both at the Task Force and by government during examination phase.

Councillor Muldowney highlighted the fact that the HIA was voluntary, compared to the Environmental Impact Assessment and asked if they would carry equal weight at examination phase. The HE Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor stated that only mitigation secured through requirements, protective provisions, or legal agreements were a legal requirement. He added that HE currently wanted to submit the Development Consent Order by the end of the year, but the design process and analysis of 29,000 consultation responses would take time. The HE External Affairs Advisor added that they had a commitment to getting the scheme right, and as they wanted to use lots of data to do this, the scheme would take time.

Councillor Massey highlighted that Stanford-le-Hope had not been considered in the paper, even though it was close to the route and would have increased pollution levels, and asked if it was being considered for the HIA. The HE People and Communities Advisor stated that entire borough was being included in the HIA, but Appendix A was only an extract. The Assistant Director LTC clarified that the data had been given to HE by Thurrock Council officers so could confirm it was accurate. The Resident Representative asked if further tunnelling along the route was being considered as an option. The HE Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor replied that a tunnel could not be considered along the whole route due to drainage issues in the Mardyke Valley. He added that the Environment Agency did not favour a tunnel under the Mardyke, but were considering a viaduct to avoid flooding.

Councillor Kelly highlighted the traffic flow at the Orsett Cock Roundabout, as to access Grays or Tilbury from the A128 it appeared that motorists would have to travel along the A13 to Stanford-le-Hope and then back on themselves. He asked if HE could reconsider the design of the Orsett Cock Roundabout, to avoid motorists using the old A13, which ran closer to resident's homes. He also asked if HE were still considering a Tilbury Link Road to avoid HGVs driving through the middle of the borough. The HE Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor replied that they had received many consultation responses regarding the Orsett Cock Roundabout, and this was an issue HE were considering in detail. He added that separate meetings on the Tilbury Link Road were taking place between HE, Thurrock Council and the Port of Tilbury.

The Assistant Director LTC felt that the scheme was affecting the mental health of residents, as many were unable to sell their homes and were unsure of the changes that would be taking place in their towns. She asked on behalf of the Task Force for HE to help those residents suffering with mental health issues due to the scheme, for example setting up a dedicated mental health helpline. The TCAG Representative asked if a more detailed map of ground investigation sites could be given to the Task Force. The HE External Affairs Advisor stated that a high-level map had already been made public, but a balance had to be struck to protect landowners where ground investigations

were taking place, as many were occurring on private property. The TCAG Representative then asked how many weeks' notice would be given to landowners where ground investigations would be taking place. The HE External Affairs Advisor replied that HE aimed to give two weeks' notice although this could change, as ground investigations were dependent on factors such as the weather.

The Thurrock Business Board Representative asked if legislation like that in London regarding pollution could be implemented on the LTC to reduce incidents of COPD across the borough. He added that a push towards electric vehicles from HE would also help the issue. The HE Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor replied that as the LTC would be a motorway it would be governed by motorway legislation and could not have specific pollution laws. He added that during construction phase HE would commit to a low pollution level of HGV.

14. Task Force Priorities List

The Assistant Director LTC stated that no updates had been received regarding the Task Force Priorities List, but this was a standing item on the agenda. Councillor Kelly stated that many questions on the Task Force Priorities List related to consultation, and asked if a question regarding the business case and how the LTC would be charged could be added. He felt that residents should be able to access the LTC for free, or heavily discounted, and the charging system should be linked to DartCharge to make it easier for all users. Councillor Massey asked if a question regarding the Proposed Rest and Service Area in East Tilbury be added to the Priorities List, and the Assistant Director LTC replied that this had been discussed during consultation, but when HE clarified the scheme then further discussions could be had on this topic.

15. Work Programme

The Assistant Director LTC stated that although the Work Programme looked bare, this was because HE were reviewing their consultation responses, so were not in a position to provide updated to the Task Force. She stated that consultants were currently analysing the traffic modelling data, and once this was complete a traffic modelling workshop with the Task Force could take place.

The meeting finished at 7.39 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**

Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) Task Force

Monday 16th September 2019

Health Impact Assessment Briefing Paper

1. Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is the technical name for a process that considers the wider effects of projects and developments and how they, in turn, may affect people's health and wellbeing. Some of these may be positive while others could be detrimental and require mitigation.
2. The idea is to ensure that a proposed project or development of significant size (ranging from a housing development to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) such as the LTC, can be adjusted to maximise benefits to local health and minimise any harm by addressing existing health inequalities as well as avoiding the creation of new ones. An HIA is an ideal tool for integrating the promotion of health and wellbeing into a wide range of policies, projects and services.

The European Centre for Health Policy defines Health Impact Assessment as:

'A combination of procedures, methods and tools by which a policy, programme or project may be judged as to its potential effects on the health of a population, and the distribution of those effects within the population'

3. An HIA is a systematic, objective and practical tool to support decision making; it can inform decision makers and communities of the potential health and wellbeing impacts and consequences of a development. An HIA is not in itself the means of making a decision on whether a development should proceed; instead it is a way of organizing a range of evidence and assessing its relevance and application to the health of a particular local or regional context. As an HIA is **not a statutory requirement** of the planning process, its power to influence is limited to recommendations and material guidance.
4. Development decisions may have a profound effect on people's health and quality of life; therefore, there is a need to ensure that the processes for assessing evidence are robust, inclusive and transparent. Wherever possible, HIAs should be conducted in partnership with stakeholder groups, as well as consulting national standards documents such as *Active By Design*, *Secured By Design* and the *National Planning Policy Framework* for robust guidance on positive design principles. Making use of relevant evidence and expertise ensures HIAs are mechanisms to support evidence-based decision making.
5. An HIA looks at health in its broadest sense, using the wider determinants of health as a framework. The environment, income, employment, transport, the design and condition of housing, crime and the social and physical condition of neighbourhoods all contribute to the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities. An HIA identifies how a particular decision will alter these 'social determinants' of health and assesses the likely impact on the health of different groups in a population.

6. The benefits of an HIA can include:

- promotion of greater equity in health
- action to maximise health and wellbeing benefits and minimise health and wellbeing risks
- increased awareness amongst policy and decision makers across sectors of how decisions may affect health
- identifying the connections between health and wellbeing and other policy areas
- promotion of evidence-based planning and decision making potential to reduce demand on NHS and social care services by investing in healthy policies, projects and developments that may prevent ill health

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.

Qu Number	Mitigation Schedule Reference	Topic	Question	Response	Actions
1a(i)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Business Case	How much of this scheme is time savings for trips already on the road network	To be answered as part of the transport modelling work	
1a(ii)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Business Case	Real jobs and growth: how much will be in Thurrock	<p>During construction: There will be hundreds of construction jobs created by the Lower Thames Crossing. The LTC's contractors will have a requirement to recruit locally.</p> <p>Following completion: The Lower Thames Crossing will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant traffic relief to local roads – particularly west of the A1089. • Better access to the 	

				<p>motorway network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved journey times to cross the river • Better reliability to cross the river • Improved access to labour markets and to jobs <p>This will provide opportunities for businesses to grow/for new developments to come forward.</p>	
1a(iii)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Business Case	How much of this scheme is simply creating more journeys by car and longer trips	To be considered by the Council as part of the transport modelling work to inform the Council's consultation response	
1a(iv)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Business Case	If jobs are the highest priority (not a few minutes shaved off m25 journey times) how would this scheme compare to say a crossing at Canvey	<p>There are seven scheme objectives against which options were assessed. The Secretary of State for Transport ruled out pursuing Option D (a crossing at Canvey) in 2009. It was assessed against the scheme objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support sustainable local development and regional economic growth in the medium and long term: Option D would draw less traffic compared to Option C, demonstrating that the economic benefits generated would be considerably smaller. • To be affordable to Government and users: Option D was estimated to cost 40% more 	

				<p>than Option C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To achieve value for money: The low traffic demand, limited relief to Dartford and greater cost of Option C indicated that Option D would provide low value for money• Minimise adverse impacts on health and the environment: Option D would have had a significant effect on a number of SSSIs along the route.• To relieve the congested Dartford Crossing and approach roads and improve their performance by providing free flowing north-south capacity: Option D would take around 3% off the traffic at Dartford and would take 50% less traffic than at Option C.• To improve resilience: Resilience would be provided, however, being distant from the M25 and existing Dartford Crossing would mean that were there a problem at Dartford, it would be a very long diversion to use a route at Option D's location.• To improve safety: Only limited safety improvements would be gained from Option D. We have carried out a further re-appraisal of all previous options to	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				re-check and validate the preferred route announcement.	
1b	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Business Case	Who is to fund the entirety of the scheme	The Chancellor announced in his budget on 29.10.18 that no further PF2 contracts will be signed by the Government. LTC was expected to comprise of a mix of Design and Build (DB) and Design, Build, Finance, Maintain (DBFM) contracts. Since the announcement has been made there is no clarity around the funding for LTC other than there will be a requirement for funds to come from the Roads Investment Strategy (RIS) 2 and RIS3 programmes which run from (2021 and beyond)	
1c(i)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Tilbury Docks Link Road	Is this confirmed as part of the core scheme	This does not form part of the consultation scheme and is not part of the DfT Client Scheme Requirements.	
1c(ii)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Tilbury Docks Link Road	HE must design for genuine consultation a dual carriageway	This is no longer part of the scheme	
1c(iii)	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Tilbury Docks Link Road	There are notable views as to the relative merits of downgrading the A1089. What are HE proposals and how will HE manage this sensitivity	This is no longer part of the scheme	

1d	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Contracts	When can local contractors access all current and future HE contracts	<p>Should also request an indicative programme for the procurement process for the scheme. Market engagement day was held in April this year with A303 Stonehenge scheme which has just been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for consent.</p> <p>HE Response: local labour, suppliers and contractors are essential to delivering this project, should the scheme be approved and subsequently constructed. The Procurement Strategy, currently being drafted, will include the relevant commitments and our approach to early market engagement. The procurement process timetable is currently under review.</p> <p>A Prior Information Notice (PIN) was issued to inform the market that the LTC may, at a future date, wish to buy goods and services. This is standard practice for a project of this scale and does not commit Highways England to carrying out work or issuing contracts.</p> <p>On 6 March the LTC will attend the Thurrock Business Conference, where local businesses will be able to find out more about the project</p>	
----	---------------------------------------	-----------	---	--	--

				and potential opportunities	
2a	2, 4, 10,	Involvement of Thurrock Council	HE to commence full and detailed technical assessment with Thurrock Officers and how each and every scheme aspect is genuinely captured by HE and local harm fully mitigated and costed in their current understanding of their proposal.	Technical meetings take place each week to discuss scheme development with officers and share information. The work to identify and mitigate harm will be ongoing throughout the process including consultation, examination, decision and delivery	
2b(i)	2, 4, 10,	Involvement of Thurrock Council	HE must 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.	The Planning Inspectorate will appoint an independent panel of inspectors to assess the application. The examination process will thoroughly and objectively test the application and evidence before a report is given to the SoS for Transport on which to make a determination	
2b(ii)	2, 4, 10,	Involvement of Thurrock Council	As developer, understand the full and significant impacts on Officer resources and democratic time and our ability to respond in advancing <i>any</i> Application of a DCO.	A PPA has now been agreed and signed, which will enable the LTC to provide funding for officer time.	
3a	20, 21	Alternatives to this proposal	The Planning Inspectorate has demanded that these be set out – when will HE share with Thurrock	Alternatives that have been considered are included within	

			how they intend to respond	the preliminary environmental information. Further assessment of the alternatives will be provided with the DCO application and should conform with the National Policy Statement for National Networks	
3b	20, 21	Alternatives to this proposal	All the historic crossing capacity (1963, 1980, 1991). This crossing will last 120 years at least. Will there ever be anything other than more roads when there is a need to safeguard and future proof for alternative modes	To be considered as part of the transport assessment work	
4a	9,	What is the scheme and how will the network operate?	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.	The scheme is now three lanes throughout. This will be answered as part of the Council's analysis of the consultation material	
4b	9	What is the scheme and how will the network operate?	What is the capacity of the Tilbury Docks Link road and will the proposed design work?	This no longer forms part of the scheme	
4c	9	What is the scheme and how will the network operate?	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	To be considered by the Council as part of the transport modelling work to inform the Council's consultation response	

			connection but with roads and junction either side at gridlock?		
5a	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	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.	HE response: we are open and listening to comments on the entirety of the proposals within our Statutory Consultation, as nothing is committed at this stage.	
5b	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	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 (<i>a key concern of the taskforce</i>).	Current proposal to be considered by the Council as part of the consultation response. Need to review the Preliminary Environmental Report (PEIR)	
5c	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	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.	To be considered as part of the Council consultation response.	

5d	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	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.	Not currently part of the proposal. Need to assess the junction with A13/A1089 but unlikely there is room in this location for the design suggested	
5e	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	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.	Thurrock to be involved in discussions/detail around design. To be discussed with HE at technical meeting	
5f	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	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 (510 metres) either side of the road (for masking the road, wild life protection, and creation of new	To be considered as part of the PEIR and the development of the ES	

			community links for cycling, walking and equestrians).		
5g	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	Where is HE's construction plan in terms of access routes / haul routes to enable construction to commence.	There is some information in the consultation material but this is to be subject of HE technical meeting and fed back as part of ongoing scheme design. Ultimately the routes agreed will be secured in a requirement which can be enforced by the Council	
6a	19	Incident Management	Action is needed now on current gridlock – can HE lobby DfT for strategic action reflecting the local observations that the actual need is for better management of the current crossing rather than any suggestion of a new crossing.	The NPS identifies the need for another crossing of the Thames. The [insert name of group] of which Thurrock is a member meets to discuss this. There is also the Congestion Task Force which meets to discuss existing use of the crossing and its impacts	
6b	19	Incident Management	A new state of the art traffic control centre is need now. Why is it worth spending £6bn for a new crossing but not £60m for state of the art integrated traffic control 24/7 covering the current crossing and local roads either	Response from HE: there are references to a regional control centre to oversee traffic within our Guide To Consultation (Pp 130-132). There is a need to consider this further within HE's wider business and no further	

			side. Robust network management is now needed as any crossing is a decade away and once in place would secure additional capacity that supposedly is only possible with a £6Bn LTC. 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).	information is possible at this stage. We would welcome any feedback on this matter within your consultation response.	
6c	19	Incident Management	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.	To be considered by the Council as part of the consultation response and the outcome from the assessment of the traffic modelling.	
6d	19	Incident Management	As HE have now confirmed that tankers will have unescorted use	Response from HE: if this is a requirement of	

			of any new crossing, can they confirm they will ban / restrict tankers using the current tunnels and thereby remove the delays currently seen?	Thurrock Council, then please include it within your response to Statutory Consultation, so it can be properly considered.	
7a	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	The severance of the new road – visual and communities will create separation and segregation especially in historic settings such as Coal House Fort.	To be assessed by the Council and included in the consultation response	
7b	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	Construction impacts of noise, dust and road traffic need to be fully mitigated especially given the prevailing SW wind.	To be assessed by the Council and included in the consultation response. Work will be ongoing on this and will be developed fully in the Environmental Statement. The application will include a Construction and Environmental Masterplan (CEMP) which will be secured by requirements meaning the Council can enforce it	
7c	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	The visual intrusion demands a maximum tunnelling and the remainder fully screened.	To be considered by the Council as part of the consultation response	

	37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,				
7d	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	More road trips will result in greater pollution than would otherwise be the case and an air quality assessment must be undertaken.	This will form part of the ES. There is some information in the PEIR which will be considered as part of the Council's consultation response	
7e	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	A Full Health Impact Assessment must be produced by HE to consider the full health impact of the proposed route on local populations.	This has been agreed and work is ongoing. The Council is co-ordinating the other LA DPH's and representatives to identify commonality of approach and consistency. The Community Impacts and Public Health Advisory Group was set up to coordinate this work in 2018. It has met twice so far (26 Nov 2018 and 29 Jan 2019) and has a programme of rolling quarterly meetings.	
7f	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	Pollution models for noise, air, light and vibration must be set out for the community.	There is some information in the PEIR and further details will be developed as part of the ES production.	

7g	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	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.	Approximately 7%. To be discussed at HE technical meetings	
7h	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	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.	Response from HE: the effects on such assets will be considered fully within the Environmental Statement and is partially considered within the PEIR, submitted as part of the Statutory Consultation documents. Furthermore, there are various considerations relating to impacts that HE will be subject to within the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), particularly in Sections 5.120 – 5.142 on the historic environment.	

New Questions:

Qu Number	Mitigation Schedule Reference	Topic	Question	Response	Actions
8	N/A	Benefits	What's in the scheme for 'us'? ie residents and businesses	<p>Response from HE: As you are aware, the broader benefits are set out within the statutory consultation material. However, in order to summarise, we believe these broader benefits will flow from the seven Highways England objectives for the project (three of which are less relevant for this discussion) and our subsequent technical discussions can be guided accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>To support sustainable local development and regional economic growth in the medium to long term</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTC will support this by strengthening and connecting local communities and improving access to jobs, housing, leisure and retail facilities on both sides of the river. ○ Poor connectivity across the Thames east of London severs local labour and product markets, impacting economies in the surrounding area. Better connections 	

				<p>across the river mean more job opportunities for those living in the region, and a greater pool of potential employees. They also boost the market for local businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ New training and job opportunities created during construction will boost both the local and regional economies● <u>To be affordable to government and users</u>● <u>To achieve value for money</u>● <u>To minimise adverse impacts on health and the environment</u>○ Throughout the design process we will look to improve and enhance these routes (footpaths, bridleways and cycle paths) as we consider how they will be affected○ We will work in partnership with local authorities and community interest groups to explore how we can improve accessibility and local connections○ Structures along the route will be designed to blend in	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>with local surroundings as sympathetically as possible. A number of green bridges are being considered with features such as timber barriers and bollards, gravel, coppice woodland, ground cover planting and shrubs. We will also keep the road as low as possible within the landscape and use natural screening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ By creating habitats for wildlife, protected species such as otters, water voles and bats, establishing new woodlands and ensuring landscapes are sensitively designed we aim to protect and enhance this rich landscape● <u>To relieve the congested Dartford Crossing and approach roads, and improve their performance by providing free-flowing, north-south capacity</u>○ LTC will reduce the number of vehicles using the crossing by 22 per cent with 13 million fewer vehicles using the crossing at opening, vastly improving	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>journey times and reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>To improve resilience of the Thames crossings and the major road network</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ improve journey times along parts of the A127 and M20 ○ cut congestion on approach roads to the Dartford Crossing (including parts of the M25, A13 and A2) ○ increase capacity across the Thames from four lanes in each direction currently (at Dartford) to seven lanes each way (Dartford plus the Lower Thames Crossing) ○ allow nearly double the amount of traffic to cross the Thames • <u>To improve safety</u> <p>Clearly, without the project and adherence to these objectives, then congestion on the Dartford Crossing will increase, the A13 and its M25 junction will come under further pressure, the ports and logistics businesses will be constrained and possibly marginalised, due to increased congestion on major roads HGVs will increasingly use local roads and local traffic will increase.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Besides these clear significant broader benefits that residents and businesses can benefit from, we have agreed to continuing our regular technical discussions, particularly we have agreed that we will host a workshop with Thurrock at Beaufort House in order to identify how the Lower Thames Crossing can help to support your Local Plan and explore what synergies there are in terms of benefits. If you could let me know what day you would prefer that meeting to take place (I suggest we do this outside of our normal Wednesday meetings, so that we do not disrupt that schedule) and your proposed agenda, objectives and outcomes, we will go ahead with setting the meeting up.</p> <p>In addition to the Local Plan workshop, we will continue to work with you over the coming months regarding detailed consideration of NMU connectivity, environmental mitigation areas (for flood compensation and environmental mitigation), tree planting and other environmental enhancements and major utility diversion routes. Such</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				discussions can then feed into the ongoing design development work and your Local Plan development, as well as providing long term legacy and benefits.	
9	N/A	Future-Proofing	Why are lessons not being learned from the A13 East Facing Slips which could result in a similar issue with the lack of access to LTC travelling from the M25 eastbound along the A13	Response from HE: the current scheme has been designed to balance connectivity and local road traffic increases. Please provide your feedback in your consultation response, providing your preferred arrangement and reasons why, where possible.	

**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force
Work Programme 2019/20**

Dates of Meetings: 10 June 2019, 15 July 2019, 12 August 2019, 16 September 2019, 14 October 2019, 11 November 2019, 16 December 2019, 13 January 2020, 10 February 2020, 16 March 2020, 20 April 2020

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
10 June 2019		
Terms of Reference	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
15 July 2019		
Health Impact Assessment	Helen Forster	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
12 August 2019		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
16 September 2019		
Health Impact Assessment: Briefing Note	Helen Forster	Officers
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

14 October 2019

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

11 November 2019

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

16 December 2019

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

13 January 2020

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

10 February 2020

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

16 March 2020

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

20 April 2020

Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers