

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 December 2019**

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

Membership:

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

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 12
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 14 October 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 Highways England Presentation - Cut and Cover	
6 Task Force Priorities List	13 - 32
7 Work Programme	33 - 36

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 December 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 14 October 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), Luke Spillman (Deputy Chair), Andrew Jefferies, Allen Mayes, Sara Muldowney, and Sue Shinnick

Apologies: Councillors Tom Kelly, Fraser Massey and Terry Piccolo
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative

In attendance: Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing
Mat Kiely, Transportation Services Strategic Lead
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer

Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Robert Quick, Resident Representative

Sarah Matthews, Peter Brett Associates Representative

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.

23. Apologies for Absence

Councillors Fraser Massey, Tom Kelly and Terry Piccolo sent their apologies. Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative, and Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative, also sent their apologies.

24. Minutes

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative commented that on page eight of the agenda, the minutes stated that she had mentioned a meeting with Highways England (HE) that had been arranged. She clarified that this had been said by the Assistant Director LTC.

The minutes from the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force on 16 September 2019 were approved as a correct record, subject to this change.

25. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

26. Declaration of Interests

There were no interests declared.

27. Modelling and Traffic Update

The Assistant Director LTC introduced the report and commented that the briefing note referenced supplementary consultation, and although this had been reported by a newspaper in Kent, the dates of consultation itself had not yet been confirmed by HE. She added that the views in the technical note were the views of Thurrock Council, and had not been checked with HE, so therefore were subject to change.

The Representative from Peter Brett Associates (PBA) added that the technical note was separated into three sections: an explanation of the cordoned model; a list of requests for HE and Thurrock Council; and next steps/actions to be taken. She began by explaining the cordoned model, which was a section taken from the larger traffic model and only showed the borough of Thurrock. She explained that because of this, it did not show traffic south of the river or the two crossings themselves, so incidents on the crossings could not be tested. She stated that the effect of the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) could be tested and from this, they could draw conclusions and possible outcomes from bringing the LTC into the highway network. The PBA Representative explained that there was a neutral impact on the local road network, and not much change could be seen after the introduction of the LTC, with only small variation on many local road junctions. She stated that there were adverse impacts on the strategic road network in peak periods after the introduction of the LTC due to induced traffic. She added that this was to be expected in traffic modelling as it showed changes in people's routes into and out of the borough on the strategic highway due to the LTC. She stated that the largest adverse impacts could be seen on the operation of junctions to the east of the LTC such as the Orsett Cock Roundabout and Manor Way. She added that because of these concerns PBA and Thurrock Council were taking a more detailed look at these junctions in the cordoned model. The PBA Representative stated that beneficial impacts could be seen due to the LTC on local roads such as speed improvements, and reduction of traffic on the current Dartford Crossing, on the A13 west of the LTC, and at junction 30 on the M25, as the LTC provided relief to the network. The PBA Representative summarised the audit of the cordoned model and stated that this was the view of PBA and Thurrock Council, and more investigation was still to be done on the Manor Way junction, and Orsett Cock Roundabout. She added that PBA also wanted to see the effect of the port expansion and Local Plan, as neither of these had been considered within the model.

The PBA Representative then moved on to describe section two of the technical note and the requests that had been made to HE. She described how Thurrock Council and PBA had asked for the model to be updated to include any design changes; the results of consultation; updated freight data and national road forecasts; the updated statutory consultation model; and for the model to include the A13 widening drawings.

The PBA Representative finally moved onto discussing section three of the

technical note and the upcoming actions for HE and Thurrock Council. She stated that Thurrock Council were going to provide HE with the A13 widening drawings, to allow the model to be updated. She also stated that HE were being asked to provide more data, as they had completed more surveys than were currently listed on their website. The PBA Representative added that HE were also being asked to include a sensitivity test for the Local Plan. She described how Thurrock would also provide a Tilbury Link Road junction option, as the LTC might include passive provision for this junction in the future. She added that Thurrock were asking HE to reuse the arisings from the tunnel for new housing developments or port expansion. She explained that the Port had also been asked to provide more detail on their planned expansion, and workshops had been requested regarding the Asda Roundabout on the A1089, as the LTC would bring about lots of change to this roundabout, and planned development. The PBA Representative summarised and stated that the Task Force would receive another update if the cordoned model was updated, and if any updates arose out of additional modelling for the Manor Way junction or the A13 east of LTC.

The TCAG Representative began questions and asked how accurate the cordoned model was at predicting real traffic flows in the borough. The PBA Representative replied that the model was based on a 'typical day' in March 2016, but there were always traffic variations. She stated that the model was only a tool to test relative change, but met industry standard web-tag guidance. The Assistant Director LTC added that although web-tag was the industry standard, it was known to be relatively outdated, but this could only be updated by the Department for Transport who were not planning an update in the near future. She added that traffic modelling was not an exact science, and most modelling for major schemes did not accurately predict traffic or people's behaviours. She stated that if the traffic modelling did not work, it could send the project back in the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.

The Resident Representative asked what pricing system had been used to run the traffic model, as the price of the tolls could have an impact on which crossing people used. The PBA Representative replied that the tolls had been run as like-for-like in the traffic model. Councillor Spillman asked if officers and PBA had been surprised at the outcome of the modelling, as it seemed like there were some benefits to the scheme. The Assistant Director LTC replied that traffic modelling was difficult to analyse as the data was from 2016 and therefore out of date. She stated that the Council's aim now was to update the model, but because roads and traffic changed so quickly, models were always in deficit. She clarified that the modelling could be used to identify mitigation, but that significant housing development and employment factors were not factored in. Councillor Spillman stated that he felt the recommendations in the note were fair and reflected the situation, and felt that adding the A13 widening scheme into the model would be useful. He asked how the Council would ensure that the model's data was as up to date as possible. The Assistant Director LTC answered that PBA and officers would continue to ask for an updated model from HE, but in the meantime would work on potential 'pinch points' such as the Manor Way junction and access to

DP World and London Gateway. She added that the Council would be seeking mitigation throughout the process, as well as future mitigation such as a Section 106 agreement stating that when traffic reached a certain level, additional mitigation could be added.

Councillor Mayes asked how often guidelines stated that models should be updated, or if they could be updated on an ad-hoc basis. The PBA Representative responded that guidelines suggested models be updated every five years, but pressure could be put on HE to update sooner as the model was now out of date. Councillor Mayes questioned the Tilbury Link Road as part of the scheme. The Assistant Director LTC replied that the Tilbury Link Road was not a part of the scheme, but provision for future access for the road was a desire of the Port of Tilbury and Thurrock Council, and stated that discussions were taking place with HE to ensure this design happened at a future point. She added that the scheme could only come from HE as the Tilbury Link Road would be funded through the Road Investment Strategy (RIS), and RIS1 was ending in April 2020. She commented that if the Tilbury Link Road was delivered, it would not be until RIS3 in 2025-2030.

Councillor Jefferies asked if the traffic modelling outcomes could change if PBA and Thurrock Council had access to the entire model. He also asked if the modelling data from 2016 had included the A13 widening scheme drawings, as this scheme had already been devised at that point. The PBA Representative replied that HE provided a base and a future model, which considered road capacity with or without the LTC, so the Kent model was not necessary unless Thurrock wished to undertake its own traffic modelling. She added that the future modelling included 2026, 2041 and 2051 and had included the A13 widening scheme, although not in its final design stage.

The Chair asked if the workshop with HE and the Port of Tilbury could include plans for a flyover at the Asda Roundabout to separate local traffic with freight. The Assistant Director LTC commented that this was known as a grade separated roundabout, which was the same design as the Rayleigh Weir. She stated that she had already suggested this to HE, as they were concerned by the impact of the LTC on the Asda Roundabout.

Councillor Muldowney questioned whether it was normal to receive a cordoned model from HE for schemes of this nature. The Assistant Director LTC answered that it was unusual to receive any model from HE as they usually only shared traffic modelling outputs. She clarified that this was the first time HE had shared a model, and the Council had worked hard to enter into a data sharing agreement with HE to be able to have access. She explained that as the Council had entered into the data sharing agreement, they could not share the model as it was classified confidential, but other local authorities had not signed an agreement yet, so did not have access at all. Councillor Spillman then asked if Thurrock could run their own model to have a primary data source, and asked what resources would be necessary to do this. The PBA Representative stated that discussions had taken place regarding building a similar model and if this would be worthwhile, so they could test the effect of new developments, port expansion, and incidents at

the crossings. She added that traffic models needed constant updating, and HE would not necessarily believe the results of Thurrock's modelling. She stated that discussions were still ongoing over this issue, as it could be a useful tool. The Assistant Director LTC added that this would be an expensive project as it could cost hundreds of thousands of pounds.

Councillor Shinnick expressed her concern that HE had not attended a Task Force meeting recently, and asked if they could be invited. The Assistant Director LTC commented that they could be invited to any Task Force meeting, although they would need to be invited for a specific purpose, so they could answer specific questions. The TCAG Representative questioned the fact that the current Dartford Crossing would remain over-capacity, even with the new LTC, and the over-capacity was one factor that caused incidents. The PBA Representative replied that the modelling showed improved journey times over the Dartford Crossing due to the opening of the LTC, which would potentially increase capacity at both crossings. The Assistant Director LTC added that the traffic model could not model people's behaviour, so even with an incident modelled at Dartford; it could not model for local people using rat-runs to get to the LTC. She stated that this had to be factored in through mitigation, although this could become complex. She commented that the Council would aim for future mitigation too, which would include future traffic management, as well as environmental mitigation for new technology such as self-driving cars and the increase of electric cars.

The Chair asked if a workshop could be held with HE regarding the proposed rest and service area in Tilbury, as he felt it would be better positioned on the M25 at Brentwood, or at the junction with the A127. The Assistant Director LTC responded that HE liked to put a service area near a tunnel entrance to prevent breakdowns within the tunnel. She added that currently there was an Esso garage at the A2/M20 junction but this would be removed due to the LTC, so the strategic road network would lose one petrol station. She clarified that guidelines suggested one service area every 26 miles. She stated that the Council were currently pressuring HE to close the services at junction 30/31 and build a newer, modern facility before the road split at Dartford Crossing. The Chair agreed with this idea as he felt that a proposed rest and service area at Tilbury would stop traffic and increase environmental concerns.

The TCAG Representative commented that she understood that the Local Plan could not be confirmed until the LTC was agreed, and asked for confirmation that this was the case. She also asked what environmental mitigation HE would have to take into account, as they had stated that as a delivery agency, they would not consider the proposed government 'climate emergency'. The Assistant Director LTC responded that this was the case regarding the Local Plan, but HE would have to consider the new Net Zero agreement to mitigate environmental factors. She stated she would email Members with more information regarding Net Zero. The TCAG Representative added that the London Mayor had recently pledged to reduce PM2.5, and Michael Gove had suggested a new bill to enshrine World Health Organisation guidelines regarding PM2.5. She asked that if these bills were

passed, would this make the LTC scheme untenable. The Strategic Lead – Transportation Development replied that the environmental protection team monitored particulates across the borough, and the Council were currently refreshing the Air Quality Strategy, and would potentially use a new air quality model. He added that although this strategy was only in its infancy, it could affect the LTC and the amount of particulate the scheme would be allowed to produce.

Councillor Spillman stated that a new budget was expected on 6 November 2019, and asked if this would have an impact on the LTC project. The Assistant Director LTC replied that a delay regarding the comprehensive spending review had been expected in the November budget, but nothing had been announced regarding this. She added that an announcement could be made regarding RIS2 spending, but nothing was confirmed. Councillor Spillman also questioned the relationship between the LTC and Local Plan. The Assistant Director LTC answered that the Local Plan could not be confirmed due to uncertainty regarding the LTC, but certainty would only be provided when the scheme was submitted for DCO, which would potentially happen in 2021. She stated that discussions were underway with the MHCLG, and Homes England as the Council were in a difficult position. She added that advice was also being sought from the Planning Inspectorate, but that progress could still be made regarding the Local Plan, including the plan passing through statutory phases.

28. Memorandum of Understanding - Highways England (Report to be tabled)

The Assistant Director LTC stated that this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) had been borne from advice given by the Planning Inspectorate, as concern had been expressed regarding data sharing by HE. She stated that the Planning Inspectorate had recommended producing an MOU to agree working arrangements in a more detailed format compared to the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA). She felt that the Council needed time to organise meetings and gather data, and this MOU would help to agree work planning time frames and expectations. The Assistant Director LTC summarised and asked for the agreement of the Task Force before it was sent to HE.

Councillor Spillman commented that he felt the proposed MOU was a good tool, and felt it was good to see a framework being put in place to ensure good working practices. The Task Force then agreed the MOU, and agreed for it to be sent to HE.

29. A14 Cambridgeshire - River Great Ouse Viaduct (Report to be tabled)

The Assistant Director LTC introduced the report and stated that this had been brought forward as an interest item. She mentioned that she and the TCAG Representative had been on a site visit to the A14 River Great Ouse Viaduct, which would be of similar height and scale to the proposed viaduct at Tilbury, and had taken pictures to show the Task Force. She stated that the

proposed Tilbury viaduct would be between nine and twelve metres high. She also explained that conversations were taking place with HE over the design of the viaduct, but these could not be shared in the public domain yet. She added that HE had also hired an architect, which was unusual practice, as the landscape of the borough changed dramatically from north to south.

Councillor Spillman thanked the Assistant Director LTC and the TCAG Representative for bringing this to the Task Force, and asked if the viaduct would be low enough to obscure. The Chair also asked where the viaduct would rise and fall. The Assistant Director LTC replied that it was rise up over the Tilbury Loop Line, as it had to give clearance for the trains and Network Rail infrastructure, and would lower back down after this. She added that the viaduct would go into false cutting after the Tilbury Loop Line, which would be provided by both natural and artificial cutting.

30. Task Force Priorities List

The Assistant Director LTC introduced the report and stated that the list had not been updated for a while, so would be updated and brought back to committee for November's meeting. The Chair asked when HE would be coming back to the Task Force. The Assistant Director LTC stated they would be invited to January's meeting, and could be invited in November if Members had specific issues that they wished to discuss, but that they had released no new information for discussion. She stated that a HE engineer could be invited in November to discuss cut and cover, and the reasons it would not be possible along the entire route.

The Chair stated that the scheme was already over budget, and asked how much over the project budget did the scheme have to go to become unviable, such as the HS2 project. The Assistant Director LTC answered that the scheme would only stop if there were a change in government or change in transport policy. She added that the problems currently being faced by the HS2 scheme reinforced HE's need to stay in budget, but could also provide additional funds for LTC if HS2 collapsed. She stated that a letter had been written to the Secretary of State regarding the problems with the LTC project, and once this was signed by the relevant officers, Members and Chair of the Task Force, a copy could be distributed to the Task Force. The Assistant Director LTC added that the LTC project currently had a Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) number of three, which was high. She compared this to the A303 Stonehenge scheme that had a lower BCR value of one, and was still going ahead.

31. Work Programme

It was confirmed that Highways England would be invited to the November and January meetings of the Task Force

The meeting finished at 7.14 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**

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. <p>We have carried out a further re-appraisal of all previous options to</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				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		
Nomination of Chair and Vice Chair	Anna Eastgate	Officers
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		
Memorandum of Understanding – Highways England	Anna Eastgate	Officers
A14 Cambridgeshire – River Great Ouse Viaduct	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Modelling and Traffic Update	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
11 November 2019 - CANCELLED		
16 December 2019		
Highways England – Cut and Cover	Anna Eastgate	Members
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

This page is intentionally left blank