

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 **5.00 pm** on **16 March 2020**

Council Chambers, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL

Membership:

Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), Luke Spillman (Deputy Chair), John Allen, Andrew Jefferies, 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 - 18
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 10 February 2020.	
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 LTC Supplementary Consultation Response	19 - 30
6 Task Force Priorities List	31 - 50
7 Work Programme	51 - 54

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: **11 March 2020**

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 10 February 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), Luke Spillman (Deputy Chair) (*arrived 18.44*), Andrew Jefferies, Fraser Massey, (*arrived 18.44*), Allen Mayes and Sara Muldowney

Apologies: Councillors Terry Piccolo, Sue Shinnick
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative

In attendance: Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing & Transport Infrastructure Projects
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer

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

David Manning, Highways England – LTC Development Director
Sam Stopp, Highways England – Local Government Lead

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.

39. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Terry Piccolo and Sue Shinnick. Apologies were also received from Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative and Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative.

40. Minutes

The minutes were approved as a true and correct record.

41. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

42. Declaration of Interests

There were no interests declared.

43. Highways England - Scheme Presentation

The HE Development Director introduced the presentation and stated that it presented the high-level changes that had been made following statutory consultation in 2018. He asked members of the public to come to the consultation events that were being held across the borough and respond to the consultation material. He stated that the government had rated the LTC as a Tier 1 project which meant it was a much needed piece of infrastructure, as it would reduce congestion and delays on the Dartford Crossing, but doubling river crossing capacity East of London. He commented that the LTC would remove 13 million vehicles from the Dartford Crossing in the first year of opening, and would improve the reliability of the M25 and surrounding roads.

The HE Development Director moved onto discussing the proposed tunnel which would hold the LTC, and stated that it would be the third largest bored tunnel in the world, and would still not be at capacity 25 years after opening. The HE Development Director compared this figure to the Dartford Crossing which was opened in 1993 and had almost reached capacity by 1997. He added that the LTC would provide better access for tankers and abnormal loads, as they would not have to be escorted through in convoy. The HE Development Director highlighted that 29,000 people had responded to the statutory consultation in 2018, and as there were 16 questions per response form, it had taken HE a long time to analyse them all. He added that since the close of consultation the mobile information unit had continued to visit areas across the borough and had received 7000 visitors. The HE Development Director then highlighted that since the close of consultation the team had been on site conducting ground investigations, which would last for one year, and were necessary to gather data such as soil quality, to be able to submit the planning approval. He added that the design had also been further developed to improve safety and reduce potential accidents along the route.

The HE Development Director clarified that the current round of consultation had started on 29 January and would last for eight weeks, and members of the public could fill the response form out online, or pick up a copy from the deposit locations. He added that numerous public information events were also being held across the borough, and questions could also be asked on the HE website. He mentioned that the main guide to consultation could be viewed online, or could be picked up from the foyer in the Civic Offices, and the response form also had a section for members of the public to add in any comments or concerns they might have.

The HE Development Director stated that there had not been much change regarding traffic updates, but HE had received new HGV data and port traffic data from government that had been included in the traffic model. He also added that an update to the Environmental Impact Assessment had been made, and it now focussed around air quality, as well as landscape, biodiversity and noise. The HE Development Director added that a utilities update was also included in the consultation as HE were working with the gas network and National Grid to better manage the scheme and limit service disruption and disruption to local roads. He stated that a special guide to utilities and LTC could be found online, as well as an easy read version. He commented that map books were also available, including route maps, a high-

level overview map, land-use maps, and engineering plan maps which described areas such as the proposed height of the route.

The HE Development Director then outlined the consultation events in Thurrock and stated that there would be five events across the borough, the first being held on 21 February in the Civic Offices. He added that a variety of technical experts would be attending to answer questions, and the events would go on all-day and into the evening. He added that a variety of events would also be held in Kent, and residents from Thurrock could also attend these if they wished. The HE Development Director described the mobile information centre that would also be travelling around the borough during consultation, and would hold four events. He mentioned that due to comments made at statutory consultation, a new location had been added in Stanford-le-Hope on 10 March, and this would be publicised on social media, and advertised through Thurrock Council. He commented that there were also five information points across Thurrock which contained information regarding the scheme, consultation documents, and response forms. He stated that consultation closed on 25 March 2020 and all consultation responses received by post, online or at public information events had to be received by this date. He stated that once this consultation had concluded, depending on the outcome, the project would then go to planning stage, or go out for additional consultation.

The HE Development Director then outlined the high-level changes that had been made following statutory consultation, and stated that if members of the public had any detailed questions they could talk to specific experts at the information events. He highlighted the key concerns that had been raised by Thurrock residents during the 2018 consultation and clarified the changes that had been made to the scheme because of this. He stated that Thurrock residents had showed concern for local connectivity to the LTC and clarified that the A13 and Orsett Cock roundabout had now changed and were connected to the LTC. He added that residents had also shown concern over the visibility of the scheme, and because of this, the proposed project would be better landscaped to hide the road from wider view. He stated that HE were also looking at longer-term investment to minimise local traffic impacts, and would try to minimise disruption during the construction phase, as this would last between five and six years. He added that HE were also looking at ways to get the local supply chain involved from a variety of fields, such as builders, caterers and recruiters.

The HE Development Director explained the changes that had been made since statutory consultation to the north portal, and clarified that the proposed Rest and Service Area (RASA) had been removed from the plans, partly due to the local viewpoint that it was not needed or wanted, and partly due to the strategic view that the route was only 14 miles long. He stated that because of the removal of the RASA, the junction at this point of the route could also be removed, and the viaduct could be reduced by 1.1 metres. He added that lorry movements would also be limited during construction as spoil would be used to hide the scheme from view, for local flood defence, and for landscaping on the north coast and portal.

Councillor Spillman and Councillor Massey arrived 18.44

The HE Development Director moved onto discuss the green bridges which had been added along the route, and highlighted that these would protect the environment, maintain bio-diversity, reduce visibility of the route, increase public access, and future-proof the route for non-motorized users. He stated that since statutory consultation some of the green bridges had doubled in size, such as the Muckingford Road bridge. He added that four bridges would also be used as green corridors, and footpaths along Brentwood Road bridge would be separated from live traffic by hard borders. He added that at the Chadwell link the route had been re-aligned 60m north to remove the need to move pylons, and therefore reduce cost, reduce the amount of work needed, and remove the likelihood of power outages and disruptions. He added that at Muckingford Road, the height had been reduced by 1.5metres, was largely in cutting and false cutting, and would be below ground level He added that by building green walls on this section of route, it would reduce noise pollution and visibility of the route for local residents.

The HE Development Director outlined the new proposals for the A13 junction and stated that slip roads had been moved and lowered due to concerns from local residents. He added that Rectory Road would now be the only road which would be above the A13, and every other road would be tunnelled underneath using pre-formed concrete tunnels. He commented that local access at the Orsett Cock roundabout would also be improved as there would now be access onto both the north and south-bound LTC. He commented that the realignment of Rectory Road also had an impact on the showground, as because of this change it no longer needed a road through the middle and could be reinstated to its current usage after construction. He added that HE would need continued access to the showground due to high-pressure gas mains that were situated there. He added that slip roads had also been realigned to give greater priority to access to the north-bound LTC and port traffic, which would increase safety due to the volume of traffic expected. He commented that HE had been working closely with cyclists and horse riders to improve shared facilities, and had therefore widened footpaths along the route.

The HE Development Director moved further along the route and described changes to the Ockendon Link. He commented that the Mardyke Viaduct had been lowered 100m, but had gotten larger due to the need to balance the flood plain with the size of the structure. He stated that this section of the route needed residents comment, as HE wanted to know what residents thought to the look of the viaduct and visibility. He added that HE had currently used a minimalist look to try and hide the viaduct, based on statutory consultation responses, but this could change due to new consultation responses. He explained that the next phase would be detailed design and architects would be looking to pick out key characteristics of Thurrock to use for design of the viaduct. He added that further green bridges had been added at Green Lane and North Road to ensure more meaningful access for non-motorized users. He stated that the route had also been moved 200m to

better manage high-pressure gas mains and the nearby Ockendon landfill site, which would reduce the programme for the scheme.

The HE Development Director described how traffic and connectivity had largely remained the same, and commented that members of the public could look at the traffic modelling data if they wanted more information. He stated that the scheme would provide relief for the majority of local roads in Grays, Tilbury and the westbound A13 when opened in 2027, as well as relief for the Dartford Crossing and junction 30 at the M25. He commented that the eastbound A13 might see increased traffic flow, but a separate study was being commissioned to look at traffic on the eastbound A13 to Pitsea, and would work with the Department for Transport (DfT), Essex County Council and Thurrock Council. He stated that HE continued to pressure the government to continue the project and generate a legacy, as the area was in need of infrastructure and support for growth of businesses and housing.

The HE Development Director then moved onto discuss the construction phase of the project, and commented that in 2018 it was predicted that the construction of the project would mean an extra 17,000 lorry movements per month, and this had been a concern for residents during statutory consultation. He commented that because of this HE had considered a variety of options to reduce lorry movements, such as river transport and the re-use of spoil, and had been able to reduce predicted lorry movements to 13,000 per month. He explained that although this figure was still high, HE would be working with Thurrock Council to develop a Code of Construction Practice to reduce disruption and noise, and this Code would form part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and would be a legal commitment. The HE Development Director described how HE were also working with local businesses regarding employment and had held business events across the borough in 2019, with more planned for later in the month. He stated that they had spoken with 100 businesses from a wide spectrum of areas, such as travel agents, recruiters and builders. He stated that schemes of this size had to rely on local labour as there would be lots of demand during construction. He added that HE were providing lots of support for businesses that wanted to get involved, such as hosting webinars and workshops.

The HE Development Director summarised and described the next planned phases of the project. He explained that the high-level business case had been submitted to government in December 2019, which needed sign-off by the Secretary of State for Transport and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He stated that this business case did not give HE permission to build or provide funding, as this would only happen when the final business case was submitted in 18 months to two years' time. He added that DCO would hopefully be submitted later this year, and at this point marketing engagement would also begin, depending on the outcome of consultation. He added that the hope was to deliver the project in 2027, but before then the scheme would have to be assessed and examined by the Planning Inspectorate, with the recommendation from this going to the Secretary of State for final agreement. He stated that this would be a rigorous process as due diligence needed to occur, but throughout this time, HE would continue to engage with the public

and hold mobile information events. He stated that once the planning application had been granted in 2021/22, the aware of main works contracting would take place, and there would be a process of controls in place to ensure responsible delegation of functions. He added that it would take roughly six months to ensure all contractors and external partners understood their legal obligations. He outlined the next phase of development which would be tunnel excavation, which would be the longest construction phase and would take approximately four to five years to complete. He added that during the tunnel boring phase, work would also begin on the junctions at the A13, M25 and A2, as the majority of these could be completed offline, to ensure peak period capacity could be maintained. He commented that some night closures would be necessary for safety and build quality, and the HE Development Director recognised the impact these could have on people's lives. He added that the projected opening for the road was 2027, but additional consultation could still be required, and the outcomes of the ground investigation were not yet known. He stated that ground investigations could find low quality soil, heritage or archaeology findings, which could delay the scheme.

The Chair opened the debate and asked what members of the public could do to respond to the consultation, if they could not access the internet. The HE Development Director replied that there were consultation deposit locations in libraries and hubs across the borough, as well as public information events where consultation response forms could be collected. He added that at statutory consultation, residents had felt there had been a lack of coverage across the borough, so a new public information had been added for this consultation round in Stanford-le-Hope. The Chair stated that he had received a representation from a local resident in the high-rise flats in Chadwell St Mary, who was concerned about the proposed route coming within 500 yards of their house. The Chair asked what HE were doing to protect communities living near to the proposed route, particularly the Courtney Road estate and Orsett Heath, from the noise and air pollution the route could cause. He asked if HE were prepared to use cut and cover along the route to protect people's health, as Thurrock had the highest rate of COPD outside London. The HE Development Director replied that the route was positioned as low as possible in deep cutting, and the alignment had been moved due to gradients. He added that enhanced cutting would be used so the route could not be seen from ground level if you were at the flats in Chadwell St Mary. He added that the route could not be obscured from those living in higher levels of the high-rise flats. The HE Development Director added that wider structure had also been added to the route in Chadwell St Mary, such as additional footpaths for non-motorized users. He described how an Environmental Report had been carried out and showed that 50m away from the route, the impact on air quality due to the road had largely gone. He added that environmental experts from HE would be attending the mobile events, so more detailed questions could be answered there.

The Chair then questioned if important access roads such as Heath Road, Brentwood Road and Hornsby Road would be closed due to the scheme. He asked how the impact of this would be mitigated if they were to be closed. The HE Development Director replied that Heath Road and Brentwood Road

would not be shutting as the alignment of the road had been changed after statutory consultation. He added that one of the proposals was to shut Hornsby Road, but HE wanted residents viewpoint on this, as they better understood this impact this could cause. He added that a live traffic count had been taken of Hornsby Road, and this information had been shared with Thurrock Council.

Councillor Spillman stated that he had received a representation from residents living in Linford and East Tilbury, who felt that during construction there would be increased lorry movements on the access roads into and out of the town, as there were limited access options. He felt that these increased lorry movements would cause a bottleneck for residents, which would be compounded by the proposed quarry in the area. He asked if HE would build new roads into East Tilbury to manage LTC construction traffic, to ease congestion which already built up due to the inconvenience of the railway line. The HE Development Director stated that HE had received lots of concerned residents representations regarding the proposed quarry, and the affect this would have on Linford. He commented that HE would try to keep lorries of the local road network, and they would have a separate entrance from Tilbury Port to A1089. He mentioned that lorry movements across the borough would be halved by using river traffic, and HE were currently in discussion with London Gateway and Tilbury Port to facilitate this. He stated that internal haul road would also be used to avoid using local roads, and spoil from construction would be used as false cutting near to where it was taken from to reduce lorries carrying spoil across the borough. The Assistant Director LTC highlighted that during peak construction it would not just be an increase in LTC lorry movements, but also an increase in commuters as 800 people would be working on the site. The HE Development Director responded that HE wanted to use local labour to reduce the number of commuters, and the key access to the site would be at the Port of Tilbury on the A1089. He stated that as well as this site, there would be satellite construction compounds across the borough to spread the workers out, and sustainable transport such as buses would be used to pick up workers across the borough.

Councillor Spillman asked the temporary haul roads would go through existing green-belt, and asked if the precise location of these haul roads was available for the public to view. The HE Development Director responded that the temporary haul roads were included in the temporary land and corridors needed during the construction phase, as well as the location for offices. He stated that if any temporary haul roads passed through green-belt, then once construction had finished HE had a duty to reinstate the green-belt to the quality it had been beforehand to ensure no net loss of bio-diversity. Councillor Muldowney asked a question on behalf of Councillor Shinnick, and asked if HE had considered holding an event in Ockendon, as the Brandon Groves event could not cover all residents, particularly those that lived on the other side of the town. The HE Development Director stated that he would look into this suggestion and would write back separately. Councillor Muldowney then asked if cycle ways that would be affected by construction would be replaced. The HE Development Director replied that it was the hope of HE not to lose any cycle networks, and where any existing routes did cross

the LTC, these would be replaced and improved. He commented that HE were working with Thurrock Council to ensure the LTC was multi-modal use and footpaths could be widened where suitable. Councillor Muldowney then questioned how the environmental impact of the route was being managed, and if in future, the road could be used for electric vehicles only. The HE Development Director responded that HE were working with government to get predictions on the future use of electric vehicles, particularly with the proposed ban on fossil fuels, although this had not been legislated for. He stated that HE wanted to work with Thurrock and government to ensure the route could be future proofed for electric vehicles and other technological developments.

The Resident Representative stated that Linford and East Tilbury would not be able to cope with an additional 13,000 HGV movements every month, and asked how drivers and lorry companies could be controlled to ensure they did not speed or drive dangerously. The Assistant Director LTC replied that Thurrock Council were working with HE on the Code of Construction Practice, which would be enforced by the Council. She added that although the detail of this still needed to be agreed, it would sit within the control of the Council. She commented that as the Code would be agreed at DCO, it would be a criminal offence to breach it, which would receive a minimum £25,000 fine, or unlimited fine if taken before Crown Court. The Resident Representative then asked if the movement of the road 60m northeast had been to save money due to the location of the pylons, and it had moved the road 60m closer to the residents of East Tilbury. The HE Development Director stated that this proposal was one being considered by the current consultation, and residents could have their say by filling out the consultation response document. He stated that if the power lines had to be moved it would increase disruption for residents as it would lead to power outages. He commented that additional mitigation would be done to protect the residents, as at planning stage every decision would need to be justifiable.

Councillor Jefferies agreed with Councillor Shinnick's request for an additional consultation mobile event on the other side of Ockendon. He felt that the route would provide no benefits for the residents of Ockendon as they would be in the middle of a 'toxic triangle' of the LTC, A13 and M25. He stated that residents would be circled on all sides by major roads, as well as the landfill site, and asked if the route could go into a tunnel when it passed near Ockendon. The HE Development Director stated that if residents felt that mitigation did not go far enough, then this should be included on their consultation forms. He added that the green bridges along the route would be the second largest in Europe, and significant investment would be taken to ensure walkers, horse-riders and cyclists could benefit from the route.

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative asked if the LTC would be classified as a smart motorway by HE, and also asked how the M25/A13 southbound LTC junction would go from five lanes down to two, as this would cause significant bottlenecks, particularly when there was an incident on the Dartford crossing. The HE Development Director replied that HE were still in talks with government regarding the classification of the road,

and it would either be classified as a motorway or an all-purpose trunk road, and this would be decided at the planning application stage. He responded to the TCAG Representatives' second question and stated that there would be reduced demand on the LTC/A13 southbound so only two lanes would be necessary. He mentioned that incidents on the Dartford Crossing that led to closure only happened on average of six times per year, but the environmental footprint of the route had to be balanced against the route capacity. He stated that increased capacity at this point in the LTC would hold traffic in Thurrock, and could cause lots of other bottlenecks on local roads, compared to current proposals which would spread traffic out over the network. The Assistant Director LTC added that the route could not be completely future-proofed as all decisions had to be justified as necessary, particularly when HE had to use Compulsory Purchase Orders, so if there was only a need for five lanes during occasional incidents, it would not be agreed at DCO. The TCAG Representative felt that HE should have a duty of care to ensure that traffic could migrate easily onto the LTC, but there were currently not enough adequate connections. She felt that incidents occurred at the Dartford Crossing more than six times per year. The HE Development Director responded that incidents would reduce at Dartford once the LTC had opened as reliability would improve, the number of HGVs would decrease, and the number of abnormal loads convoys would also decrease. He added that traffic modelling data showed a relief on local traffic once the LTC opened. He stated that currently 200,000 vehicles used the Dartford Crossing per day, when capacity was only 125,000, so incidents would reduce.

Councillor Massey stated that residents of East Tilbury already felt worried regarding the access that would be needed for LTC construction lorries. He asked if a detailed 3D model or physical model would be produced for areas along the LTC, particularly the new proposals at Muckingford Road, or if a model could be produced that would show the view from residents homes of the proposed road. The HE Development Director replied that as this was only a small consultation, those graphics would not be produced, but would be available at the planning application stage. He added that the static images would be blown up and on display at the public information events, as well as engineering viewpoints. He stated that some feedback from residents highlighted their concerns over the proposed height of the route and clarified that the numbers shown were the height from sea-level rather than ground-level.

The Chair asked why the route could not be placed further east, for example on Canvey Island, as that location had routes onto the A130, A12, A120, M11, A14 and A1/M1. The HE Development Director stated that consultation response forms had a section at the back for any other comments, and comments about the route location could be raised there. He added that there may be future crossings further East due to growth in South Essex, but one of the reasons for the proposed location of LTC was to reduce East to West travel. The Chair felt that the proposal was London-centric and added that with the advent of climate change, more incidents may occur at the Dartford Crossing due to increasingly periods of high winds and heavy rainfall.

Councillor Spillman commented that congestion on the Dartford Crossing were predominantly northbound, with the majority of the A13 running freely. He felt that the proposed LTC roundabout at the A13 would create pinch points along the A13, and would affect the quality of life for people living in Stanford-le-Hope, East Tilbury and other areas around the borough. The HE Development Director replied that the route would be rigorously tested at examination phase. He added that members of the public and Councillors could also make representation to the Planning Inspectorate. The Assistant Director LTC added that HE had to meet the standards of as responsible promoter, by meeting the standards laid out in the National Policy Statement (NPS) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). She felt this bar was relatively low when considering the affect the route would have on people's lives, and there was a gap in the duty of care between policy standards and the moral responsibility towards residents. She felt that this difference was not necessarily the fault of HE, and was a systemic and policy fault. She explained that companies such as National Grid took a different approach to HE and took social responsibility for their projects by attaching a moral value.

Councillor Spillman asked how the route would benefit people living in the East of the borough, as he felt the majority of mitigation was planned for the West. The HE Development Director replied that by the time the LTC was completed in 2027, traffic would have increased across the borough, particularly east to west traffic due to port expansion and traffic using the A1089. He felt that without the relief provided by LTC, this traffic increase would increase delays and journey times. The HE Development Director clarified that there would be hotspots for traffic in the East of the borough, but HE had been open and transparent and were working on solutions. He added that HE were currently lobbying for further schemes to improve traffic across south Essex.

Councillor Muldowney asked what developments had occurred regarding the Health Impact Assessment (HIA), as a briefing note had been provided to the Task Force, but no updates had been received. The Assistant Director LTC replied that she felt the HIA was moving at a relatively slow-pace, although meetings were still happening quarterly, with the next meeting planned for the end of February. She stated that the CIPHAG meetings had currently agreed methodology and the approach for the HIA, but added that the work needed to increase in speed to ensure the HIA fed into the PEIR. Councillor Muldowney felt that as Thurrock had increased health inequalities compared to other boroughs, and increased rates of COPD, the HIA could help to mitigate the potential health effects of the route. She asked if an update could be provided on the HIA to the Task Force, to which the Assistant Director LTC agreed.

The TCAG Representative asked if HE were planning to send leaflets to houses to inform them of the mobile information events, as not everyone had internet access. She also asked if the large amounts of mud on Brentwood Road were due to HE archaeological surveys. She added that there had been problems with HE ground investigation lighting blinding oncoming drivers, but this had been dealt with. The HE Development Director replied that leaflets had been dropped to 4000 houses as they were affected landowners, but he

would double check regarding a general mobile information event leaflet drop. He stated that the mud on Brentwood Road presented a concern and would be looked into. The Assistant Director LTC added that a meeting was due to take place with Thurrock Council officers regarding the planned survey works, so would highlight the problem of mud on Brentwood Road during this meeting. The TCAG Representative explained that she had also received feedback on HE recruitment events and had received mixed messages from the attendees. The HE Development Director responded that HE received feedback on their recruitment events, and would look into these concerns.

The Resident Representative asked if the proposed route had been finalised, and queried why the route further east, which linked with the A14, had not been considered, as this could be put in a tunnel for its entirety and not affect peoples lives. The HE Development Director replied that during traffic modelling, an A14 route further East only provided short term traffic relief, and had been shut-down by the Treasury as it did not provide value for money. He added that the current proposed route improved journey times for a variety of local and major roads. The Assistant Director LTC stated that HE needed to balance a combination of measures, for example environmental concerns, and asked why no public transportation links had been proposed for the route. She also asked for clarification regarding construction hours, as these were listed as 7am-7pm with an hour either side for site set-up and closure, and queried whether these were during weekends and during all seasons. The HE Development Director replied that talks were currently underway with bus companies, as journey times for buses would be improved on arterial roads due to the LTC. He added that the route would be future-proofed for non-motorized users, and would contain extra capacity for electric vehicles and digital era cars. He explained that the tunnel would also include information and signage for drivers which would warn about incidents and emergencies along the route. The HE Development Director added that HE were also considering rail links through the tunnel to cope with the increased use of rail freight. The HE Development Director then answered the question regarding construction hours, and stated that 7am-7pm was the maximum working hours, which had to be included in the planning application. He stated that some sections of the route were far away from residents' houses, so these hours would be adhered to, but construction hours would be tailored when work commenced near residences. He clarified that the construction hours would be included in the Construction Code of Practice and will limit disruption to members of the public.

Councillor Muldowney described how an accident had occurred along Brentwood Road during the time the HE security lights were blinding drivers, and although the police had not yet linked the two, the Councillor felt it was worrying. She asked how residents could contact HE directly if they serious concerns. The HE Development Director replied that HE had a 24-hour hotline that could be used if drivers were in distress or safety issues occurred. The Assistant Director LTC added that she felt the hotline was not very efficient as it could take days for a response, and asked if a dedicated email address could be set-up which would be actively monitored. The HE Development Director replied that during construction phase a dedicated email address

would be set-up.

The Chair then queried the cost of the scheme, and asked how much it would cost to put cut and cover along the entire proposed route. The HE Development Director replied that introducing cut and cover along the entire route would cost HE between six and twenty times more than the current scheme, which would push the scheme outside the budget envelope, and potentially shut the project down. He stated that the LTC would solve problems that currently occurred at the Dartford Crossing, and would reduce journey times across the borough. The Chair stated that there was concern across the borough, particularly in East and West Tilbury and Linford, and asked for the exact costs of additional cut and cover, as he felt that a price could not be put on peoples' lives, particularly with the high rates of COPD in Thurrock. The HE Development Director stated that he would take the question away and reply in writing. The Chair highlighted that the Task Force would speak to the boroughs MPs, Prime Minister, and Secretary of State, to ensure the necessary safeguards were in place for residents of both Thurrock and Kent.

Councillor Spillman asked HE how the commitment to using local labour would be formalised to ensure that local people and businesses were employed. He asked if LTC workers would be subsidised to ensure money was spent in Thurrock businesses. The HE Development Director replied that he felt use of the local labour force was important to the success of the scheme. He explained that employment law meant that HE could not mandate just local workers for the scheme, but HE were working to ensure that local businesses had the opportunity to participate in the scheme. He highlighted that HE were currently promoting local supply chain events, which offered free training for employers, and ensured they had the correct 49 policies in place which would allow them to work on the scheme. He described how all contractors that worked for a government agency on a scheme such as the LTC needed a variety of policies in place, such as sustainability and anti-slavery policies before they could be offered contracts. He stated that free training would be offered to help businesses write these policies, and these training sessions had already proved successful on the A14 scheme. The Assistant Director LTC added that to secure DCO, there were limits that HE had to follow in regard to local labour. She felt that although HE were making efforts for training, it was slightly late, as current school leavers would need training now to ensure they had the right skills to work on the project. The Assistant Director LTC highlighted that Thurrock currently had low unemployment levels, which would mean that some workers would have to travel into the borough, and would therefore need accommodation, which would be difficult to provide due to the shortage of houses. Councillor Spillman stated that although employment was low, many people in Thurrock were on minimum wage jobs, and asked what training would be provided to upskill those people, such as apprenticeships. The Assistant Director LTC replied that discussions were taking place, and Thurrock Council officers were attending workshops to set-up the necessary apprenticeships. The HE Development Director added that central government mandated that 5% of all workers be apprentices, and HE would be working with the Port of Tilbury to

ensure that apprentices and workers could continue working once the scheme had been completed. Councillor Spillman felt this was positive as, due to the scheme length, it would allow new apprentices to become qualified by the time the scheme was finished. The Assistant Director LTC asked if the Task Force could see statistics regarding workers from the A14 scheme, and the HE Development Director replied that HE could share video testimonies from current workers.

The Chair welcomed the news that the proposed RASA would be moved away from Tilbury, and asked HE to consider a site near Brentwood on the M25, as it was before the Thurrock Services and the junction with the LTC. The Assistant Director LTC clarified that this area has been considered by HE, but was designated as a new employment centre by Brentwood Council. She added that it was not under the remit of the HE LTC team to decide the location of the RASA, and was decided by the HE policy team. The HE Development Director also responded that numerous areas had been considered for the RASA, but they had to be located roughly every 26 miles.

44. Task Force Priorities List

The Assistant Director stated that once the HE consultation had finished, the document would be updated.

Members had no comment on the Task Force Priorities List.

45. Work Programme

The Assistant Director LTC stated that the Council's consultation response would be considered at the March Task Force meeting, and the April meeting would discuss updates to the HIA.

Members had no comment on the Work Programme.

The meeting finished at 8.03 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

This page is intentionally left blank

16 March 2020	ITEM: 5
Lower Thames Crossing Task Force	
Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) – Supplementary Consultation Response	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Key
Report of: Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director Lower Thames Crossing & Major Transport Projects	
Accountable Assistant Director: Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director Lower Thames Crossing & Major Transport Projects	
Accountable Director: Andrew Millard, Director of Place	
This report is Public	

Executive Summary

This report sets out the draft response of the Council to the Supplementary Consultation by Highways England on the proposals for the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) which commenced on 29 January 2020 and closes on 25 March 2020. The current consultation follows consideration by Highways England of the feedback received in response to the Statutory Consultation which ran between October and December 2018 and generated 28,500 responses. The Council submitted a full and detailed consultation response at that time.

Members will recall that in April 2017, the preferred route for the Proposed LTC was announced. Since then, the Council has been clear in its unanimous objections to the LTC, setting up the cross-party LTC Taskforce, including resident and business representation, and has continued to raise objections to the proposals.

The Council has been actively working with stakeholders in sharing its concerns about the proposal including no discernible benefits for Thurrock or the surrounding South Essex areas.

The summary of the detail of the consultation response is set out in section 4 below.

This report comprises two parts as follows:-

- (1) The consultation response from the Council in its capacity as a statutory consultee pursuant to Section 42(1)(b) of the Planning Act 2008, that is a local authority for the purposes of the area in which a Development Consent Order (DCO) application is to be made (**Appendix A**); and

- (2) The consultation response from the Council in its capacity as a landowner pursuant to Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008, that is being an owner, lessee, tenant or occupier of land.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 That the Task Force comments on the Council's proposed response to the Highways England Supplementary Consultation

2. Introduction and Background

Statutory Consultation October 2018 to December 2018

- 2.1 Highways England commenced a statutory consultation on the LTC scheme at the end of 2018 and the Council provided a full and detailed response to that consultation which was considered by Council on 10 December 2018. The consultation was preceded by the milestones set out below.

Preferred Route Announcement (April 2017) to July 2018

- 2.2 The Secretary of State for Transport announced the preferred route for the Lower Thames Crossing in April 2017. In November 2017, Highways England made a further announcement in relation to changes to the proposed scheme announced seven months earlier. Those changes included a link road at Tilbury to facilitate access to the area south of Tilbury and the removal of the link road from the LTC to the Orsett Cock roundabout. It is understood that these changes were made in response to feedback received to the preferred route announcement earlier that year.
- 2.3 Between November 2017 and the statutory consultation in 2018, there was little further information released or shared either with Thurrock Council or its residents and businesses. During this period however, Thurrock Council prepared for the statutory consultation phase of the project. This was the point at which Highways England consulted on its proposed application for development consent and represented a significant milestone in the project development.
- 2.4 Thurrock Council established a Task Force specifically for the LTC in September 2017, which is representative of the Council and its affected residents and businesses. Councillors across all three groups are involved and are working alongside representatives from the Thurrock Business Board, Port of Tilbury, residents and the Thames Crossing Action Group. This has provided a platform to challenge and review the development of the scheme.
- 2.5 One of the key points that the Task Force focussed on was the need to include a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of the development consent order application. Officers worked collaboratively with other

neighbouring authorities to bring significant pressure to bear on Highways England to obtain agreement to produce an HIA. This was a significant step forward and would enable collaboration to continue between the affected authorities to get a positive outcome for the health and wellbeing of residents. However the HIA has not yet been completed and therefore the Council is currently unable to comment fully on the health impacts of the LTC and any mitigation arising from it. This will form a significant part of the Council's ongoing work regarding the LTC post submission of the supplementary consultation response.

- 2.6 In July 2018 Highways England released an enlarged red line boundary for the proposed scheme, increasing the land take from approximately 12 square km to over 21 square km. This change constituted approximately a 68% increase in the land required for the scheme and has had a significant impact upon the Borough and its green belt. It is highly likely that further changes to the red line boundary will continue to be made up to the point of DCO submission

3. **Supplementary Consultation Scheme**

- 3.1 On Wednesday 29 January 2020, Highways England announced the commencement of its supplementary consultation which will run until Wednesday 25 March 2020. Further changes have been made to the proposed scheme which is subject to a targeted consultation. The main elements of those changes are:

South of the River Thames:

- the tunnel portal has been extended further south by approximately 350 metres. Members will recall at the statutory consultation it was moved by approximately 600m south;
- realignment and changes to the slip roads to minimise local impacts
- reduction in the width of land 4 on the M2 to minimise impacts on the Kent Downs AONB

North of the River Thames:

- Removal of the Rest and Service Area (RaSA);
- Removal of the previously proposed junction at Tilbury;
- Relocating the route between Tilbury and the A13 junction approximately 60 metres north-east;
- Changes to a number of slip roads at the junction between the LTC, A13, A1089 and A1013 to reduce visual impacts;
- Removal of one lane southbound between the M25 and A13 junction;
- Changes to the structures over the Mardyke River, Golden Bridge Sewer and the Orsett Fen Sewer;
- Changes to the southbound link from the M25 to the LTC; and
- Changes to the layout of junction 29 of the M25.

3.2 In addition, as part of the Supplementary Consultation exercise, Highways England has reported its progress in relation to:

- Funding – the project is now being developed as a fully publicly-funded scheme rather than as a privately financed initiative;
- Charging at Dartford and LTC – it is proposed that the charging regime will be the same for both the Dartford Crossing and the LTC; and
- Local Residents Discount Scheme (LRDS) – Highways England intends to apply a LRDS to residents of Thurrock and Gravesham for the LTC. The intention is that this will be on a similar basis to that which applies to the Dartford Crossing.

Ongoing Work

3.3 The services of experienced consultants have been retained to provide support and advice to the Council in order to continue to challenge and review the Highways England proposals and to support the Council in producing a robust supplementary consultation response.

3.4 Current guidance relating to consultation is set out in DCLG Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process March 2015. In that guidance, reference is made to the communities and environment in which infrastructure projects are located and therefore a ‘one size fits all’ approach is not appropriate. The guidance goes on to reference that consultation should be thorough, effective and proportionate with sufficient time for consultees to understand proposals and formulate a response. Paragraph 30 specifically states that ‘The Planning Act recognises the role that local authorities play as bodies with expert knowledge of the local community, business and other interests as well as responsibility for development of the local area’.

3.5 Part of the role of the Council in the DCO process is to provide an ‘Adequacy of Consultation’ representation at the point at which any DCO application is made (currently anticipated to be summer 2020). The Secretary of State, in determining whether to accept the DCO application, must have regard to this representation made by the Council, although this will not be the only determining factor in deciding to accept the application or not, as the case may be. As part of the representation, it is important to note that the Council can reference and evidence issues and concerns from the local community that have been raised about the consultation.

4. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

4.1 The Council continues to make clear its objection in principle to the LTC scheme. This position will not change as a result of the current proposal which delivers very little benefit for local people or indeed does not deliver on Highways England’s own scheme objectives ‘to support sustainable local development and regional economic growth in the medium to long term’ or to ‘minimise adverse impacts on health and the environment’.

- 4.2 With regard to the strategic planning of the future of the Borough, it remains the position that there is an imperative to progress the Local Plan in order to support the Council's position in relation to the LTC. This is consistent advice which has been received from the Council's legal representatives as well as from discussions which have taken place with MHCLG and the Planning Inspectorate. In its response to Highways England's Statutory Consultation, the Council highlighted the challenges presented by the proposed LTC in relation to the development of the new Local Plan. The parties have since participated in a workshop, in January 2019 and had numerous exchanges including meetings and letters to discuss the matters at issue. Members will be aware that the Local Plan is being progressed and a task force has been set up to support the delivery of that key corporate document.
- 4.3 The Council continues to engage with Highways England in order to fulfil its statutory obligations and to protect the interests of the borough. This is important in order to comply with the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note two: The role of local authorities in the development consent order process, which states at paragraph 6.2 'Local authorities should engage proactively with a developer even if they disagree with the proposal in principle... Local authorities are not undermining an 'in principle' objection to a scheme by engaging with a developer at the pre-application stage'.
- 4.4 With this in mind, the Council has a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) in place with Highways England which will provide some financial support for resources needed to respond and engage with Highways England on technical matters. This aligns with the Council's usual practice for major development applications within the borough.
- 4.5 Thurrock residents should continue to be encouraged as much as possible to attend consultation events and engage in the consultation process and submit their responses by the relevant date. It is an important part of the DCO process to provide feedback on the proposals. Highways England has a statutory obligation under Section 49 of the Planning Act 2008 to have due regard to the responses received by the deadline. Residents should also be encouraged to report any concerns they have about the consultation to the Council at the earliest opportunity to ensure that officers can provide the necessary support in an attempt to resolve concerns, albeit this consultation is a Highways England initiative.
- 4.6 The Council's consultation response as a statutory consultee is set out in full at Appendix A. The response is detailed and includes a technical assessment of the supplementary consultation scheme. The Council's position in relation to the consultation scheme has four strands as follows:-
- i. the Council has an in-principle objection to the proposal as it gives rise to substantial harm to the borough; and
 - ii. the supplementary consultation material focuses on detailed design changes and does not address the wider issues, relating

- to strategic policy and encouraging sustainable growth in the Borough, raised by the Council at the Statutory Consultation stage; and
- iii. that progress on Highways England's environmental and health impact assessment work has been slow such that the potential effects of the scheme, and the effectiveness of mitigation proposals cannot be properly determined at this late stage in the Highways England programme; and
 - iv. if the scheme were to proceed, there will need to be substantial changes to mitigate and compensate for the worst of its impacts (although the Council does not believe full mitigation of these impacts can be secured).
- 4.7 The consultation response sets out the Council's current position with respect to the proposed LTC as well as a detailed response to Highways England's proposed design changes presented in the Supplementary Consultation materials. A summary of the consultation response is as follows:
- 4.7.1 National and strategic policy: the proposed LTC does not meet several of the national and Highways England's strategic policy tests and scheme objectives, particularly relating to option testing, the delivery of economic growth and achieving sustainable local growth. The policy context and the 'tests' against which the proposed LTC scheme has been considered were presented by the Council in its response to the Statutory Consultation Scheme;
 - 4.7.2 Emerging Local Plan and interface with proposed LTC: the proposed LTC does not make provision for, and is inconsistent with, the housing and development potential for Thurrock and the aspirations for the borough and for the wider South Essex area. Specifically, there are design elements which require modification and/or further consideration by Highways England in order to contribute to meeting the Government's and LTC's policy and scheme objectives;
 - 4.7.3 Scheme configuration and design quality: elements of the scheme configuration and design - notably at the A13 connections, the treatment of the crossing through the Mardyke Valley, the potential for a crossing over the Tilbury Loop Line, the reduction of the LTC from 3 to 2 lanes southbound from the M25 to the A13 – require further discussion with HE in order to minimise potential adverse effects and optimise the potential benefits for the Borough;
 - 4.7.4 Effects on Thurrock's community and assets: the LTC would give rise to potential adverse effects arising from its construction and operation, in particular in relation to air quality, noise, health impacts and community severance, historic environment, effects on general amenity, cumulative effects, the waste handling and disposal strategy, and mitigation proposals including habitat replacement. The Supplementary Consultation materials rely on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), published as part of the Statutory Consultation exercise at the end of 2018. The PEIR contains significant information gaps and the potential for under-reporting

potential impacts, such that the effects of the scheme, during both the construction and operational phases, have not been and cannot be properly considered. Officers have agreed further engagement with Highways England, particularly in relation to the assessment of health impacts, and are anxious to see the outcome of the assessment work prior to the submission of the DCO application;

- 4.7.5 Effects on Thurrock's economy and the Council's operation: a separate report has been prepared which relates to the potential 'cost' to the Borough of hosting the LTC on the current alignment. The Council has published a non-technical summary of the report to enable residents and stakeholders to understand the impacts and position with regard to the LTC scheme. This report is an important step in moving forward to understand how the scheme could be improved and designed to deliver benefits to Thurrock as a host borough, supporting the ambition for growth and meeting Highways England's objectives for the scheme.
- 4.7.6 Technical assessments: specific elements raised in relation to HE's ongoing assessment work are as follows:
- 4.7.7 Traffic modelling: the traffic modelling update presented as part of the supplementary consultation materials does not include the results of any option testing nor make provision for any Thurrock growth scenario. It has insufficient detail to understand the impacts of the Supplementary Consultation Scheme on the local road network as well as residents, businesses, open countryside and designated environmental areas in the borough;
- 4.7.8 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP/Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)): the supplementary consultation material puts a strong reliance on developing a CoCP and CEMP in order to control potential environmental impacts during construction. It also includes proposals for construction site working hours which are unlikely to be acceptable to the Council. To date, the Council has received (and commented upon) only a 'skeleton draft' of this critical document, issued 2 Dec 2019. Concern has also been raised about the discharge of DCO Requirements, effectively planning conditions, the approval of which is likely to be retained by HE/DfT rather than the Council;
- 4.7.9 EIA scoping: the changes to the application boundary and the scheme made since the EIA Scoping Opinion was issued in 2017 are likely to give rise to new or altered likely significant environmental effects. It is believed that the Supplementary Consultation Scheme should undergo a further scoping exercise to ensure that all potential likely significant environmental effects are identified and that any Scoping Opinion will reflect the scheme for which consent is being sought;
- 4.7.10 Utilities diversions: a large area has been identified, within the LTC works, for utilities diversion work. It is understood that HE's design work is still evolving

and the extent of works and the rationale for and effects of undertaking these works requires further explanation from HE;

- 4.7.11 LTC application programme and technical engagement: Officers have raised a number of concerns with HE and the Planning Inspectorate regarding the limited amount of meaningful technical engagement which has taken place on the scheme to date. In particular, commencing the level of technical engagement recently suggested by Highways England at this stage presents the Council with numerous challenges which would have been otherwise avoided by undertaking meaningful engagement and better planning earlier in the pre-application process. The timing of the engagement means that the Council will be under the pressures of a compressed programme, in effect HE has compressed the time within which the Council can review the information and meaningfully inform the scheme design and pre-application process prior to the submission of the DCO Application. This remains a considerable concern to the Council as it limits the time in which suitable and appropriate measures to mitigate and to compensate the adverse effects of the scheme can be explored and agreed with Highways England.
- 4.7.12 DCO process: the Council has raised concerns in the past about the general adequacy of consultation by Highways England throughout the DCO process. It still has reservations about this, particularly in relation to the amount and accessibility of consultation documents, and this point will again be raised with the Planning Inspectorate.
- 4.8 The Council's consultation response as a landowner is still a work in progress.
- 4.9 Highways England has extended the red line boundary such that there are additional Council land holdings now affected by the scheme.
- 4.10 A plot by plot review is currently underway to ascertain the precise impact on those land holdings which comprise elements of permanent acquisition, temporary acquisition and permanent rights over the land.
- 4.11 The Council's position in relation to the Supplementary consultation at this stage is to object to the compulsory acquisition of its land.
- 4.12 Further detailed consideration of the land plans is required in consultation with Highways England to enable officers to understand the impacts of the scheme not only as a landowner but also in relation to any obligations that exist under landlord and tenant legislation.
- 4.13 In this regard, Officers are seeking delegated authority to agree the land owner response to ensure that the appropriate level of challenge and review is undertaken within the remaining consultation period.

5. Reasons for Recommendation

- 5.1 It remains the position that the LTC supplementary consultation scheme in its current form delivers substantial harm but delivers no discernible local benefit for Thurrock.
- 5.2 The Council should, in order to protect the interests of the borough and its resident and business community, submit an agreed consultation response both as a local authority and as a landowner by the deadline.
- 5.3 The consultation response may need to be amended to include any specific issues which arise as part of the debate. As a consequence, a delegation is sought to enable officers to give effect to those changes.
- 5.4 Further consideration of the scheme and its impacts on Council land holdings is required to ensure a full and proper consideration of the issues and implications is required. Consequently a delegation is sought to enable officers to give effect to that process.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 Lower Thames Crossing will have a significant impact on the emergent Local Plan as well as associated policies and documents.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Sean Clark**
Corporate Director of Finance, Governance and Property

The Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) being negotiated currently caps the financial support being provided to the Council which could add to financial pressures. Further the PPA will not provide financial support for anything which is considered to be a statutory function. This includes the response to statutory consultation.

The Council has currently agreed a recurring annual budget to fund a dedicated Assistant Director post and further lump sums of £380k and £490k were allocated through the 2017/18 and 2018/19 budget surpluses.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Tim Hallam**
Acting Head of Law, Assistant Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer

Most of the legal implications are considered elsewhere in this report. This report seeks authority to submit a response to the 'supplementary' non-statutory pre-application consultation being carried out by Highways England as a precursor to its proposed submission of an application for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') in relation to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing project, which is classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project ('NSIP'). The application is expected to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), acting on behalf of the Secretary of State, later in 2020.

As the Secretary of State rather than the Council will not be the decision-maker in respect of the proposed application, the Council is being consulted in its roles as both a local authority and as a landowner with interest in some of the land comprised in the proposed application. This approach reflects the status and roles of the Council as a statutory consultee under the Planning Act 2008 regime.

It should be noted that the Council will also have an opportunity to submit an adequacy of consultation representation and, should an application be accepted, submit a Local Impact Report to PINS and participate in the Examination of the application including in any hearings. The Council would also be consulted by PINS at the pre-application stage if Highways England were to seek a further EIA Scoping Opinion from the Secretary of State.

It should also be noted that the DCO process obviates the need for the applicant to separately seek and secure a range of consents (such as planning permission, approvals for highways works and compulsory acquisition of land) that may be required for a scheme. Accordingly, the Council's response should, as necessary, seek to address the key issues raised through the consultation process, which may include (but not be limited to): requirements on the DCO and/or planning obligations that the Council considers should be provided to mitigate the impact of the development; the potential requirement for the stopping up or diversion of highways (including Public Rights of Way and Bridleways); the potential need for highways works and /or Traffic Regulation Order type provisions in any DCO ; any objections that the Council may have including with respect to environmental impacts including to air quality and health, proposals for the compulsory acquisition of land (or interests on, under or over land) owned by the Council and any protective provisions the Council may wish to secure in the DCO in its capacity as an affected landowner

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Natalie Smith**
Strategic Lead, Community Development and Equalities

All public bodies have a legal obligation to complete an equality impact assessment for new schemes under the Equality Act 2010. An equality impact assessment will be a requirement for the submission of the DCO. As set out

at 2.5, Thurrock worked with other neighbouring authorities to obtain agreement from Highways England to also produce a Health Impact Assessment to address our concerns about the effect on local residents. Thurrock has participated in an Advisory Group convened by HE to assess community impacts and public health concerns, including vulnerable groups covered by the Equality Act. The focus of the work in this group has been on the methodology to inform the assessment. To date the results of this work have not been shared with any Local Authority and so we are unable to consider the impacts or mitigation suggested by HE.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder, and Impact on Looked After Children)

The scheme includes the proposal to compulsorily acquire land from the Council to facilitate the delivery of the scheme. Some of the land in question is leased in particular some of the land affected which is agricultural land. The true impacts of this will not be understood until the DCO application is submitted and therefore the red line boundary of the scheme will become fixed. Any acquisition of land will be subject to rigorous scrutiny to ensure it passes the legal, policy and guidance tests. Ultimately any land will not be acquired compulsorily until after the DCO were to be granted which on the current programme is anticipated to be early 2022. The Council would be compensated under the statutory code for compensation for land taken either permanently or temporarily for the scheme.

8. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- Thurrock Council Paper 10 December 2018, Lower Thames Crossing
- Thurrock Council Paper 26 July 2017, Lower Thames Crossing
- DCLG Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process March 2015
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note two: The role of local authorities in the development consent order process
- Lower Thames Crossing Guide to Supplementary Consultation January 2020 www.lowerthamescrossing.co.uk

9. Appendices to the report

- Appendix A – Local Authority Response (to follow)

Report Author:

Anna Eastgate

Assistant Director Lower Thames Crossing & Major Transport Projects, Place

This page is intentionally left blank

Thurrock Lower Thames Crossing Task Force - Summary of Key Priorities

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

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

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

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. 	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better access to the motorway network • 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 	

				<p>was estimated to cost 40% more 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</p>	
----	---------------------------------------	-----------	---	---	--

				to find out more about the project 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 –	Alternatives that have been considered are included within	

			when will HE share with Thurrock 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 side. Robust network	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 information is possible at this	

			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).	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 of any new crossing, can they	Response from HE: if this is a requirement of Thurrock Council, then please include it	

			confirm they will ban / restrict tankers using the current tunnels and thereby remove the delays currently seen?	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, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	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	

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 coordinating 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 across the river mean more 	

				<p>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<ul style="list-style-type: none">● <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 with local surroundings as	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>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	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>opening, vastly improving 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</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				environmental enhancements and major utility diversion routes. Such 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 - CANCELLED		
10 February 2020		
Highways England – Scheme Presentation	Anna Eastgate	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
16 March 2020		
LTC Consultation Response	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

20 April 2020

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

This page is intentionally left blank