

Thurrock: A place of opportunity, enterprise and excellence, where individuals, communities and businesses flourish

Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

The meeting will be held at **6.00 pm** on **22 January 2018**

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

Membership:

Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), Gerard Rice (Vice-Chair), John Allen, Roy Jones, Tom Kelly, Steve Liddiard, Brian Little, Bukky Okunade and Terry Piccolo

Matt Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Linda Mulley, Resident Representative
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative

Substitutes:

Councillors Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Gary Collins, Oliver Gerrish, Clifford Holloway, Joycelyn Redsell, Sue Sammons and Graham Snell

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 12
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 18 December 2017.	
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	Update on liaison with Highways England	13 - 14
6	Highways England Action List	
	This item is to follow.	
7	Review of Task Force Priorities	15 - 18
8	Highways England Update: How and When can Thurrock shape Proposals?	
9	Work Programme	19 - 20

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Lottie Raper, Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **17 January 2018**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

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

Recording of meetings

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

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

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

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.

Vision: Thurrock: A place of **opportunity**, **enterprise** and **excellence**, where **individuals**, **communities** and **businesses** flourish.

To achieve our vision, we have identified five strategic priorities:

1. Create a great place for learning and opportunity

- Ensure that every place of learning is rated “Good” or better
- Raise levels of aspiration and attainment so that residents can take advantage of local job opportunities
- Support families to give children the best possible start in life

2. Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity

- Promote Thurrock and encourage inward investment to enable and sustain growth
- Support business and develop the local skilled workforce they require
- Work with partners to secure improved infrastructure and built environment

3. Build pride, responsibility and respect

- Create welcoming, safe, and resilient communities which value fairness
- Work in partnership with communities to help them take responsibility for shaping their quality of life
- Empower residents through choice and independence to improve their health and well-being

4. Improve health and well-being

- Ensure people stay healthy longer, adding years to life and life to years
- Reduce inequalities in health and well-being and safeguard the most vulnerable people with timely intervention and care accessed closer to home
- Enhance quality of life through improved housing, employment and opportunity

5. Promote and protect our clean and green environment

- Enhance access to Thurrock's river frontage, cultural assets and leisure opportunities
- Promote Thurrock's natural environment and biodiversity
- Inspire high quality design and standards in our buildings and public space

Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 18 December 2017 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), Gerard Rice (Vice-Chair), John Allen, Brian Little and Bukky Okunade

Matt Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Linda Mulley, Resident Representative
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative

Apologies: Councillors Roy Jones, Tom Kelly and Steve Liddiard

In attendance: Lyn Carpenter, Chief Executive
Steve Cox, Corporate Director Place
Ian Wake, Director of Public Health
John Lamb, Interim Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing
Dr Kim Yates, Independent Technical Advisor on Environmental Issues
Mark Gentry, Environmental Health Officer
Charlotte Raper, Democratic Services Officer

Ian Kennard, Highways England
Robert Audsley, Highways England

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

26. Minutes

The minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 20 November 2017 were approved as a correct record.

27. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

28. Declaration of Interests

There were no declaration of interests.

29. Actions from Previous Meetings

Councillor Little stated that the document was very useful. He would raise further actions at the meeting of the Task Force to be held on 22 January 2018, after speaking to Highways England personally.

The Corporate Director of Place requested an indication from Highways England as to when the traffic model would be available, since actions from the first Task Force meeting were still outstanding. Highways England were currently undertaking a review of the current model and hoped to share the data with Local Authorities around February 2018 but a more definite indication would be provided when available. The Chair highlighted that this had previously been discussed at meetings of the Task Force, at which point Highways England representatives had indicated the data would be available in December 2017; he queried the delay. The delay was due to major data regarding the movements of HGVs being fed into the model.

The Vice-Chair advised that there was currently a compound in place in Baker Street and questioned whether it was related to Highways England. After some discussion Members advised the site in question was owned by O'Rourke's and was likely the site of ground investigation, however Highways England would clarify outside of the meeting.

Councillor Little reiterated the issue of Members, and residents, not having been consulted prior to commencement of works. The Chair echoed that there seemed to be a consistent theme of poor communications from Highways England and delays in responses. He wanted to see Highways England be more proactive and ensure that the Council, and Members, were kept informed.

30. Highways England Update

The representatives from Highways England presented an update centred on engagement plans, outlining a brief summary of plans for the coming months. Highways England were currently seeking advice regarding the appropriate level of engagement within the Purdah period.

The Thurrock Business Representative queried whether Thurrock Council would be given longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days. Highways England were looking to extend the response period above the minimum. The Thurrock Business Representative advised Highways England that it the earlier the better since Thurrock Council, as the host Authority, could feed into the process and give advice and contact suggestions.

Various Members of the Task Force expressed their wish to see sections of the route tunnelled, particularly in areas of high population. Tunnelling would provide mitigation against noise pollution, light pollution, visual impact and increased air quality problems. There was tunnelling proposed where the route re-joined the M25 and it had formed a huge part of the Crossrail scheme to protect London residents, so why not for the benefit of Thurrock Residents? The Representative from Highways England advised there were any constraints around height and location. They were currently in the process of obtaining feedback and would need to consider concerns not only from residents but also environmental specialists and engineers. There were concerns such as flooding, air quality, noise pollution and the many factors

would be taken into account as part of the design process. Highways England would work to remove as many concerns as possible.

Councillor Little stressed that the Task Force should be a way of obtaining information and as such Highways England should regularly update Members as to what changes are being made to the design model. If variations were being considered that would be viewed positively it would be beneficial to know and similarly if certain aspects would not change Members needed to be aware so they could pick their battles. Highways England advised that they did not wish to be too early with their plans if they might still change, to which Councillor Little replied he would rather the Task Force receive minor updates at each meeting than an entirely new design after 6 months, to allow Members to understand how the design was progressing.

The Chair requested responses to the business case and the grounds upon which proposals for a crossing further East were dismissed. Officers at Highways England were still digesting the information within the response from the Planning Inspectorate but would be able to say more at the next meeting of the Task Force.

Councillor Okunade sought clarification as to what Highways England hoped to consult with residents upon, since many residents were unsure. The engagement plan was currently in the date-planning stage and as such precise details had not yet been established. It was hoped that they would be able to provide more details around route alignment, environmental impact mitigation and similar topics but the mobile information events were about receiving information from residents. These events would be an opportunity for Highways England to hear concerns prior to the formal consultation process.

The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative highlighted that a meeting was held the day after the previous meeting of the Task Force at which Highways England presented details which the Task Force had heard were not yet available. In his opinion Highways England were more willing to share information with potential investors than Local Authorities. Comments had been made regarding the proposed route opening up Green Belt for potential growth and he queried whether this land would be exempt from requiring approval to develop. The Highways England Representative was not present at the previous meeting of the Task Force but apologised assuring Members that no less information should have been shared with them than other groups. Highways England would have to apply under the development consent order to develop any Green Belt land, with clear justifications. As for any other development around the route, any application would be subject to the standard planning process.

Councillor Allen expressed his view that it would be better to spend more money to ensure the overall impact on the health and wellbeing of Thurrock residents was lessened. He didn't want the route to be entirely over ground simply because it was the cheapest option, since no price could be put on health.

The Task Force stressed that Highways England should provide a full and detailed outline of their engagement plan advising who would be contacted, when and where. There were also significant technical complexities involved with the scheme so he urged them to consider when it might be necessary to have technical experts present. Highways England agreed to take these points on board regarding the technical nuances, and further meetings would be held to provide more information regarding possible mitigation and any other necessary information to be relayed.

The Chief Executive had been assured a plan around engagement however what had been presented was not overly clear. She reiterated her point from the very first Task Force meeting that Officers, Members and residents all deserved to know what opportunity there was to influence the scheme yet these details had still not been provided. It was suggested that Highways England develop a detailed map which clearly outlined where the design was able to be influenced. The Chair echoed this and also requested that members of the Technical Design team be present at the next meeting of the Task Force.

Members agreed that there needed to be better engagement between Thurrock Council and Highways England. The Corporate Director of Place stressed that it was difficult for conversations to progress without the traffic modelling data to inform the process. The Interim Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing agreed that there were severe restrictions as to what work officers could undertake until they had access to the traffic model.

The Director of Public Health questioned, given the areas of poor public health the route would impact and the detailed rationale submitted, whether Highways England would support Thurrock's request for a full Health Impact Assessment. Highways England assured the Task Force that the request had been noted as part of the EIA Scoping report response and would therefore be taken into account as part of their reaction which should be expected mid-late January 2018.

The Task Force discussed previous comments made by a representative from Highways England around the possible declassification of the A1089. Members were concerned that such a change would have a negative impact on access to the Port, the London Distribution Park and the Amazon site. Members also felt Thurrock could not afford a reduction in its traffic network and the declassification would simply shift the problem from one place to another, especially since the new link proposed would be single lane and would struggle with the significant vehicle movements currently experienced on the A1089. Highways England were still assessing freight movements along the road as part of their traffic modelling.

The Independent Technical Advisor on Environmental Issues recalled that it had previously been advised that environmental surveys would begin in January. She expressed her concern that there would be insufficient time for

Thurrock to influence the process. Highways England agreed to respond with more details of their schedule outside of the meeting.

The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative felt Highways England had been very non-committal in discussions around tunnelling. He continued that tunnels would have no impact upon the Green Belt and would therefore be welcome.

Councillor Little urged the Task Force to prioritise their concerns to help ensure they were on the same page as Highways England. He stressed that the desire was to make the situation in Thurrock better than it was at present, not simply mitigate to ensure there was 'not too much impact' upon the borough. Highways England welcomed this suggestion and the Chair advised that a list of top priorities would be sent to Highways England to allow their presentations to be more focussed.

31. Council's Response to Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report; including Responses from Neighbouring Authorities

The Corporate Director of Place outlined that the Council's final response to the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report had been submitted at the end of November, with 269 comments from technical experts. A lengthy response had been received from the Planning Inspectorate on the day the agenda was published, which officers were still digesting. The response had not insisted that a full Health Impact Assessment would be required, however the request had been submitted by a number of authorities and so Officers should continue to press the point. Members were also in receipt of a summary of comments by other Local Authorities, which offered the potential for collaboration.

The Interim Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing steered the Task Force through the key responses from neighbouring Local Authorities. The Planning Inspectorate had supported the request for a full Transport Assessment, which was welcome, however did not require Highways England to undertake a full Health Impact Assessment. Both Thurrock Council and Gravesham expressed the economic connotations and the Department for Transport had recently changed the rules within WebTAG regarding the wider economic impact which meant Highways England would be required to understand these impacts more thoroughly. The Chair requested an item be added to the agenda to provide further information around these WebTAG changes.

Councillor Little queried whether there was an opportunity to appeal the Planning Inspectorate's decision regarding the Health Impact Assessment. The Task Force heard that appealing the decision was not the correct route, however the Planning Inspectorate reserved the right to ask Highways England for further information if necessary therefore Thurrock Council could make formal representation in collaboration with other Local Authorities that submitted the same request.

The Vice-Chair referred to the information on page 39 of the agenda and suggested the Task Force write to the local MP, Jackie Doyle-Price, to lobby on the borough's behalf given that the Council had already demonstrated the level of poor health within the borough. The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative urged caution as the health issues within Thurrock were based on more than just air quality and Jackie Doyle-Price had already highlighted the effect of life-choices. It would be important to be more explicit around detail of air quality issues or the lack of detail would be detrimental. The Director of Public Health agreed and continued that it was difficult to get explicit detail given the large number of causes, although it was generally understood that poor air quality was a contributing factor.

The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative stressed the need to work with Highways England to reduce dispersion rates and continue to pursue mitigation such as tunnelling.

32. Thurrock Air Quality

The Independent Technical Advisor on Environmental Issues gave a presentation around Air Quality and the details of particulate matter.

The Chair queried the World Health Organisation's acceptable level of Particulate Matter. These levels were lower than the UK's 'acceptable' figure but were very aspirational and at times were lower than natural levels. The Interim Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing highlighted that DEFRA had published a report quoting the World Health Organisation as having said there were "no safe levels of Particulate Matter as it is carcinogenic". The Independent Technical Advisor on Environmental Issues clarified that PM₁₀s also came from sea salt. The issue was polycyclic hydrocarbons, which were carcinogens.

Councillor Little sought a percentage comparison of diesel emissions, brake dust and tyre residue. Brake dust and particulates from tyres normally made up 5-10% but the precise figure would be circulated outside of the meeting.

The Vice-Chair outlined that the data showed with or without the Lower Thames Crossing air quality within the borough was poor and the Council should be lobbying for significant investment diverting from road networks into rail infrastructure as it was a cleaner way of transporting both freight and people. The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative agreed that there should be more pressure for improved rail infrastructure as it was a more sustainable approach. Brake and tyre dust generally ended up in watercourses and on farmland and would therefore get into the food chain. He stressed that there needed to be a change of approach as it was not logical to keep tarmacking Green Belt land for increased road networks. The Thurrock Business Representative stressed that there was a national capacity issue with rail, particularly given the interchanges around London which caused problems for rail freight.

Councillor Little had previously requested diffusion tubes at vulnerable points along the proposed route to provide baseline information and inform the Council's commentary. The Environmental Health Officer informed the Task Force that tubes had been installed in a number of places along the proposed route, including Station Road cottages, Heath Road, Baker Street and Stifford Road. Councillor Little also stressed that he had made a commitment to monitoring air quality at local schools and urged for diffusion tubes to be installed there too.

33. Cabinet Update

The Chair advised members of the Task Force that a report would be presented to the Cabinet meeting scheduled for 10 January 2018 to provide an update on the work of the Task Force so far. Within the Task Force's remit it would report back to Cabinet quarterly.

34. Work Programme

It was agreed that the Democratic Services Officer would request any additions Members wished to see, in addition to the suggestions made throughout the course of the meeting, and would then update the work programme and circulate for Members.

The meeting finished at 7.56 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

Lower Thames Crossing - Update on liaison with Highways England

January 2018

Following the Preferred Route Announcement last summer, Highways England has had a series of ad hoc contacts with Thurrock Council. Thurrock has been keen to ensure appropriate, regular and consistent interaction in order to challenge and review substantive items. Since September 2017 the LTC Task Force has continued to reinforce to HE the requirement for their structured engagement.

HE Meeting with Group Leaders

Highways England has also periodically met with the Thurrock Group Leaders and the most recent meeting was held on Monday 8th January.

- HE project director to attend all future Task Force meetings
- HE and Thurrock Officers to establish regular technical meetings.
- HE have also offered a session for all Councillors and would allow Tim Jones to provide an overarching scene setting & update that would be followed by the opportunity for Councillors to consider thematic issues through a 'market stall' approach.

As a result of the Task Force identifying their priorities, HE have been advised as to the focus of future meetings:-

- How and when can Thurrock shape the current Proposals (Jan Task Force)
- Visual impacts of the proposal (Feb Task Force)
- Health Impacts and Air Quality (March Task Force)

Ward Member Meetings

Consultants on behalf of HE have been undertaking a series of meetings with Ward Members. HE has been asked for details of the content of these meetings along with the outcomes and key points raised; this is awaited from HE.

Other contact with Highways England

January week 3

- Tunnel Design, Safety and Security – John Lamb attended a meeting with HE and consultants on what will be 8 weekly reviews on detailed engineering design and safety systems.

January Week 2

- 'Extraordinary Areas' – a meeting with HE and their consultants on the outline nature of the red line boundary and the technical process by which they will undertake surveys and investigations with officers.
- HE meeting with Group leaders (as described above). Note this was preceded the week earlier by conference call involving Highways England and Council officers).

The above excludes various emails and ad hoc phone calls.

This page is intentionally left blank

Thurrock Lower Thames Crossing Task Force - Summary of Key Priorities

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

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

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

1. Business Case

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

2. Involvement of Thurrock Council

- a. HE to commence full and detailed technical assessment with Thurrock Officers and how each and every scheme aspects is genuinely captured by HE and local harm fully mitigated and costed in their current understanding of their proposal.
- b. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project HE must
 - i. Accept that this scheme must be scrutinised in exactly the same manner as other NSIP's such as Purfleet, Tilbury 2 etc. albeit the

sheer scale, impact and potential lack of benefit to Thurrock makes this all the more concerning.

- ii. As developer, understand the full and significant impacts on Officer resources and democratic time and our ability to respond in advancing *any* Application of a DCO.

3. Alternatives to this proposal

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

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

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

5. Design of the new Crossing

- a. HE to provide detail of when and where Thurrock can genuinely influence HE proposals. HE must demonstrate where we can or cannot influence the scheme. The DCO process demands genuine consultation rather than keep telling us what you have decided.
- b. The tunnel portal as currently described is within the SSSI. HE must undertake full assessment (now) to adequately consider and respond to demands that it stay in tunnel until North of the railway line (*a key concern of the taskforce*).
- c. HE must provide alternative options for tunnelling and cut and cover at all junctions and sensitive areas. These worked up options to be discussed in detail with Thurrock Council prior to the Application for the DCO.
- d. All slips to have detailed designs developed for cut and cover as now being developed north of Thurrock on the M25. These designs to be open for genuine consultation and consideration by Thurrock Council.
- e. The legacy impact of road elevations – especially over the MarDyke valley needs to be fully recognised and addressed. A detailed understanding of the potential for cut and cover instead of highly elevated structures is needed including areas such as Chadwell St Mary, Orsett, Baker Street, Stifford Clays / Blackshots, Ockendon, Bulphan.

- f. More detail is needed beyond the current red line boundary and we need to have guarantees that HE is designing in robust mitigation including significant planting (5-10 metres) either side of the road (for masking the road, wild life protection, and creation of new community links for cycling, walking and equestrians).
- g. Where is HE's construction plan in terms of access routes / haul routes to enable construction to commence.

6. Incident Management

- a. Action needed now on current gridlock – can HE lobby DfT for strategic action.
- b. The incident management, delay in response and absence of smart management (including alerts, roadside information, recovery) is not as good as elsewhere in the country (i.e. as now being developed in the West Midlands). Why is it worth spending £6bn for a new crossing and not £60m for state of the art integrated traffic control 24/7 covering the current crossing and local road either side.
- c. Full Borough wide traffic micro-simulation is needed to understand the knock on effect of incidents on either network. Any new crossing is a decade away – so requires action now, especially with planned housing growth.
- d. Will the new crossing allow tankers to cross without escorts given currently delays?

7. Environmental, ecological and health impacts

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

8. Consultation

- a. HE has adopted approaches to consultation that removed over 10,000 voices against this scheme. Can HE confirm that they will work more transparently in the future to

ensure genuine consultation and show how Thurrock can genuinely influence the scheme?

- b. HE has yet to produce a detailed consultation timeline and the approaches to the Council and local community have lacked any visible plan, and appear ad hoc. When can we have presented a clear communication strategy?
- c. When will HE provide a basic 'fly through' of the current proposals as used in other schemes? Even if this subsequently changes it has been six months since the PRA.
- d. When can detailed drawings be presented to allow local communities to be informed?

9. Charges

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

**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force
Work Programme
2017/18**

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
Update on Officer liaison with HE	Steve Cox / John Lamb	Officers
Highways England Action List	Highways England	Members
Review of Task Force Priorities	Steve Cox / John Lamb	
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
19 February 2018		
Highways England Action List	Highways England	Members
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
19 March 2018		
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Q1/2018 report to Cabinet	Chair	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
23 April 2018		
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

Updated: January 2018

This page is intentionally left blank