

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

## Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

The meeting will be held at **6.00 pm** on **12 November 2018**

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

### Membership:

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

### Substitutes:

Councillors Russell Cherry, Mike Fletcher and Sue Shinnick

### Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1 Apologies for Absence</b>	
<b>2 Minutes</b>	<b>5 - 14</b>
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 15 October 2018.	
<b>3 Items of Urgent Business</b>	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
<b>4 Declaration of Interests</b>	
<b>5 Highways England Update on Consultation</b>	
<b>6 Task Force Priorities List</b>	<b>15 - 26</b>

- 7 Verbal Update: Response to Consultation**
- 8 Verbal Update: Business Views**
- 9 Next Steps for Consultation: Timeline and Decision Making**
- 10 Work Programme 27 - 30**

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

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

Agenda published on: **7 November 2018**

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

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

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

### **Recording of meetings**

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

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

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

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

- You should connect to TBC-CIVIC
- Enter the password **Thurrock** to connect to/join the Wi-Fi network.
- A Terms & Conditions page should appear and you have to accept these before you can begin using Wi-Fi. Some devices require you to access your browser to bring up the Terms & Conditions page, which you must accept.

The ICT department can offer support for council owned devices only.

## Evacuation Procedures

In the case of an emergency, you should evacuate the building using the nearest available exit and congregate at the assembly point at Kings Walk.

## How to view this agenda on a tablet device



You can view the agenda on your [iPad](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) with the free modern.gov app.

Members of the Council should ensure that their device is sufficiently charged, although a limited number of charging points will be available in Members Services.

To view any “exempt” information that may be included on the agenda for this meeting, Councillors should:

- Access the modern.gov app
- Enter your username and password

# DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

Breaching those parts identified as a pecuniary interest is potentially a criminal offence

## Helpful Reminders for Members

- *Is your register of interests up to date?*
- *In particular have you declared to the Monitoring Officer all disclosable pecuniary interests?*
- *Have you checked the register to ensure that they have been recorded correctly?*

## When should you declare an interest *at a meeting*?

- **What matters are being discussed at the meeting?** (including Council, Cabinet, Committees, Subs, Joint Committees and Joint Subs); or
- If you are a Cabinet Member making decisions other than in Cabinet **what matter is before you for single member decision?**



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

any of your registered interests and in particular any of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

- your spouse or civil partner's
- a person you are living with as husband/ wife
- a person you are living with as if you were civil partners

where you are aware that this other person has the interest.

A detailed description of a disclosable pecuniary interest is included in the Members Code of Conduct at Chapter 7 of the Constitution. **Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer about disclosable pecuniary interests.**

**What is a Non-Pecuniary interest?** – this is an interest which is not pecuniary (as defined) but is nonetheless so significant that a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard to be so significant that it would materially impact upon your judgement of the public interest.

### Pecuniary

If the interest is not already in the register you must (unless the interest has been agreed by the Monitoring Officer to be sensitive) disclose the existence and nature of the interest to the meeting

If the Interest is not entered in the register and is not the subject of a pending notification you must within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the register

**Unless you have received dispensation upon previous application from the Monitoring Officer, you must:**

- **Not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter at a meeting;**
- **Not participate in any vote or further vote taken at the meeting; and**
- **leave the room while the item is being considered/voted upon**

**If you are a Cabinet Member you may make arrangements for the matter to be dealt with by a third person but take no further steps**

### Non- pecuniary

Declare the nature and extent of your interest including enough detail to allow a member of the public to understand its nature



**You may participate and vote in the usual way but you should seek advice on Predetermination and Bias from the Monitoring Officer.**

## Our Vision and Priorities for Thurrock

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

1. **People** – a borough where people of all ages are proud to work and play, live and stay
  - High quality, consistent and accessible public services which are right first time
  - Build on our partnerships with statutory, community, voluntary and faith groups to work together to improve health and wellbeing
  - Communities are empowered to make choices and be safer and stronger together
  
2. **Place** – a heritage-rich borough which is ambitious for its future
  - Roads, houses and public spaces that connect people and places
  - Clean environments that everyone has reason to take pride in
  - Fewer public buildings with better services
  
3. **Prosperity** – a borough which enables everyone to achieve their aspirations
  - Attractive opportunities for businesses and investors to enhance the local economy
  - Vocational and academic education, skills and job opportunities for all
  - Commercial, entrepreneurial and connected public services

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 15 October 2018 at 6.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), Gerard Rice (Vice-Chair), Qaisar Abbas (*arrived 18.16*), John Allen, Andrew Jefferies, Tom Kelly, Jane Potheary (*arrived 18.03*), and Sue Sammons

**In attendance:** Steve Cox, Corporate Director Place  
Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director for Lower Thames Crossing  
Mary Patricia Flynn, Strategic Lead Communications  
Mat Kiely, Transportation Development Manager  
Luke Tyson, Business Manager  
Natalie Warren, Community Development and Equalities Manager  
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer

Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative  
Linda Mulley, Resident Representative  
Peter Ward, Business Representative

Dermot Scanlon, Peter Brett Associates  
David Manning, Highways England  
Gary Hodges, Highways England  
Chris Stratford, 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.

### **13. Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence received.

### **14. Minutes**

The minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 17 September 2018 were approved as a correct record.

### **15. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **16. Declaration of Interests**

There were no interests declared.

### **17. Election of Vice Chair**

Councillor Gerard Rice was nominated and elected as Vice Chair for the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force for this municipal year.

**18. Verbal Update: A13/A1089 Traffic Movement Update**

The Transportation Development Manager described how at the last Task Force meeting, additional information regarding traffic movement had been requested. He informed the Task Force that the transport team had then gone away and researched traffic flows for 2017 and 2030, including new proposed housing developments around the borough. He stated that the transportation team had predicted an increase in traffic across the borough, but predictions did not include traffic for the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC), as this was not possible until after the Statutory Consultation had finished. Laura Blake, the Thames Crossing Action Group Representative, questioned how recent changes to the LTC design including the removal of the Tilbury link road, would affect the traffic flow predictions. The Transportation Development Manager confirmed that the models did not include traffic from the LTC, so could not confirm.

**19. Verbal Update: East Facing Slip Roads**

The Transportation Development Manager began by stating how East Facing Slip roads had been an aspiration of the Task Force since its inception, which would help eastbound traffic at the junction of the A126/A13 at Lakeside. He mentioned that at the recent Conservative Party Conference, it was announced that funding had been allocated for East Facing Slips; and this was due to Thurrock Council's funding submission to the Department of Transport. He continued by stating that the scheme would be delivered between 18 months-2 years of construction commencement, and although construction would cause issues it would be beneficial in the long run. Councillor Kelly then discussed how the East Facing Slips and the LTC are connected. He debated that if Highways England had built the A13 correctly in 1986, it would not be an issue now; and the same problems could face the LTC at the A126/Baker Street roundabout.

Councillor Potheary congratulated the Task Force on this achievement, as East Facing Slips had long been an aspiration of the Task Force, because it was a difficult section of road. Councillor Potheary then asked Officers if the problem of the railway line at Chafford Hundred and South Ockendon were still a problem for the East Facing Slips, or if a solution had been found. She also asked if this was still in the application phase or if engineering problems were being resolved. The Transportation Development Manager answered that designs had been drawn up which take into account the engineering problems with the railway line; and that two phases of work would be undertaken for different sides of the road. He then added that additional topographical research was needed, and subject to no further issues being identified as a consequence of the site investigation, an engineering solution had been found.

**20. Verbal Update: Statutory Consultation**



The Assistant Director for Lower Thames Crossing opened by informing Members that the Statutory Consultation had begun on Wednesday 10 October, and would be continuing until Thursday 20 December. She described how Highways England were holding a number of public information events, beginning on 16 October at 2pm-9pm in the Orsett Hall Hotel. She explained that mobile units would also be travelling around the borough, and the dates for these were available on the website. It was explained that officers were working through thousands of pages of documents on the Statutory Consultation, along with an external consultancy team to be able to formulate the council's response. The Chair asked the Assistant Director for Lower Thames Crossing if Highways England were going far enough in terms of informing the public. The Assistant Director for Lower Thames Crossing replied that there were originally concerns over the number of events, but the number had been increased through the use of the mobile units. She also felt that there were issues in understanding the consultation documents, and felt some members of the public may struggle to comprehend some of the consultation paperwork.

Councillor Sammons mentioned how affected the residents of East Tilbury were by the proposed plans, but a consultation event was not happening in the town, the closest one being held in Linford. The Chair added to this that an information event may be useful in the SS17 postcode area and Stanford-le-Hope as these were also affected. The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative added that an event would be useful in Purfleet and Aveley.

## **21. Presentation by Highways England**

David Manning, the Development Director began by introducing the other Highways England representatives who were, Gary Hodge: Associate Director; and Chris Stratford: Lower Thames Crossing – Stakeholder Engagement and SoCG Advisor. The Highways England Development Director began by stating the presentation would cover the changes to the scheme since November 2017. He reiterated that Statutory Consultation was now open and the first event would be held on 16 October in Orsett Hall Hotel, followed by 59 other events. He explained that the event at Orsett Hall Hotel would be very busy, but 46 members of Highways England staff would be there to assist residents and answer questions.

The Highways England Development Director began by discussing the traffic impact of the LTC and how it would improve traffic management by reducing traffic at the Dartford Crossing by 14% at the opening of LTC, rising to a 22% reduction within 15 years, including a 25% reduction of HGVs. He went on to describe how between September 2016 and October 2017 there had been 1,500 accidents at the Dartford Crossing which, on average, led to the closure of one lane for 15 minutes, which created a ripple effect across Essex and Kent. He described how there was a lot of traffic pressure on local roads including the A127, A128, M25 and A12, which often pushed cars and HGVs onto local roads. He then added that Highways England were predicting that without the LTC, Thurrock would see a 20% rise in traffic at the Dartford

Crossing, and a 40% rise in traffic along at the A1089. In Highways England's predictions, with the LTC relieving traffic, the A13 would improve by 10-20%, and would stop delays at the A1089/A13 junction. The Highways England Development Director continued by stating that 27 million journeys would take place across the LTC, and would not struggle with incidents like the Dartford Crossing currently does. He felt it would also reduce traffic along A1089, Dock Road, London Road, the A13 and M25.

The Highways England Associate Director continued by urging residents to participate in the Statutory Consultation. He stated that there had been six major changes since the November 2017 design which were: three lanes in each direction; changes to the route height; removal of the Tilbury link road; a new rest area/ service station at Tilbury; changes to the alignment of the route at Tilbury; and optimisation of the A13. The Chair then opened questions to Members. The Business Representative began by discussing the removal of the Tilbury link road and how this would affect the port. He stated that as there was only north bound access, south bound traffic would have to go through the Manor Way which would cause lots of traffic as there were between 6000 and 8000 vehicles per day. He felt that this level of traffic should be directed to motorways as this would reduce pollution in the borough. In addition, he felt that the proposals did not fit with government policy. The Highways England Development Director responded that with the proposed north bound access, traffic would be improved by 50%, and south bound traffic would be improved as there would be a reduction of vehicles on the A13 and M25. He then discussed how there was not enough infrastructure or demand in East Tilbury and Linford for a south bound road, but as the port was growing there were future options to expand.

The Chair then asked Highways England if they felt that mistakes made on East Facing Slips were being repeated, as the council did not want to have to revisit the road in 20 years' time. He felt that as this was a circa £7 billion scheme, the cost of the link road was very small in comparison, but the port was one of Thurrock's largest employers and major pieces of infrastructure. The Development Director for Highways England replied that there was not currently enough demand for a Tilbury link road, but with the Local Development Plan there could be plans in the future to extend the scheme.

The Vice-Chair then asked whether the Tilbury service area could be moved as residents did not want it, as it would be illuminated for 24 hours a day. He stated that this service area would increase the risk of COPD for residents. In addition, he mentioned that there was no cut and cover, or deep cover, along any part of the route apart from the M25 junction which was almost out of borough. The Highways England Development Director answered that the rest area was a part of the Statutory Consultation as Highways England wanted feedback from residents. He further described that 65% of accidents were due to driver behaviour, including fatigue and rest areas could help prevent these. He discussed how the government proposed to ban fossil fuels, so pollution would be reduced and the rest area would serve as an electric vehicle charging point. The Highways England Development Director then mentioned that the rest area would also be a regeneration project as the

site was currently an old landfill and produced large quantities of methane gas, but would become a place for wildlife. The Highways England Development Director then discussed the issue raised of cut and cover, and how the depth of the road had been reduced, although cut and cover was too expensive to pursue.

The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative then discussed the traffic along the A1089, which did not just include port traffic, but also Amazon, Asda and residential traffic. She stated that there would not be access to key infrastructure as residents would have to drive to Stanford to drive back on themselves along the A13. The Highways England Development Director replied that residents would not need to drive all the way to Stanford, and traffic would be relieved along the A13 and M25. The Chair then questioned what would happen to the 1.5 million cubic metres of spoil that would come from the project, and hoped that it would not be discarded in East Tilbury. The Highways England Development Director replied that no dumped spoil would be left in Tilbury, and that it would be used for different projects or given to people who needed it, for example to fill in abandoned quarries. He also added that all spoil produced from the Lower Thames Crossing would be treated before being used again.

Councillor Kelly then queried whether the removal of the Tilbury link road would suffocate potential for growth for companies such as Tilbury Two and Amazon who were based along the A1089. He felt that as the link road had been designed as one lane, and now an extra lane north of the A13 had been added, money was being moved around the project. He felt that there was no justification for the removal of the link road and the loss of potential growth because of this. He felt that HGVs would be driven through the heart of the borough if no link road was included in the scheme. The Highways England Development Director replied that there was not enough infrastructure on the local road network to cope with a link road when Highways England had modelled both a one and two lane road.

Councillor Sammons asked Highways England if they had visited East Tilbury and the problems that could be caused by the railway line. She added that the proposed service area would close off a section of Station Road as traffic would be routed around the service area. The Associate Director for Highways England answered that he understood the issue, but there would be no connection to the rest area over the railway line.

The Chair asked if Highways England could continue with the presentation. The Highways England Development Director continued that there were multiple reasons for the new proposal of three lanes which were: a new traffic model had been used which accommodated peak hour traffic flows; to give increasing support when incidents occurred at the Dartford Crossing; and provide additional reliability. He then moved on to discuss the simplification of the A13 which had changed so at the A1089 connection to the A13, drivers cannot access the LTC from the Orsett Cock roundabout. He then discussed the eastbound A13 to southbound LTC; and northbound LTC to eastbound A13 as these junctions had been removed as viaducts would have needed to

be built, and not enough traffic would use these routes to justify this.

The Chair then opened to questions. Councillor Allen began by stating his position remained opposed to the Lower Thames Crossing, due to the poor air quality that would occur and the ecological problems it would cause. He made the point that it would be a toll road, so any money spent by Highways England would be returnable, so they should get the project right by design. He asked what Highways England proposed to do to improve air quality in the borough, as there were no safe levels of particulates. The Highways England Development Director replied that without the LTC the A13 and A1089 would become very congested, which would mean air quality would not improve. Councillor Pothecary asked why cut and cover had not been considered and was not being used on the project. She added that the money being saved by not using cut and cover, would have to be spent by the NHS in treating COPD within the borough. She asked how Highways England had reached the conclusion that HGVs would go through the LTC and not the Dartford Crossing. She mentioned that there were lots of accidents at the Dartford Crossing, and what would happen if accidents occur on the LTC as traffic would then be pushed through Grays. The Highways England Development Director replied that the budget for LTC would increase by 3-5 times if cut and cover was included, and Highways England had a duty to spend money efficiently. He added that using traffic modelling data from mobile phone data usage, the demand was highest from the South East to the Midlands, and the preferred route for this was across the Dartford Crossing. He explained that due to the LTC and the reduction in traffic, accidents at the Dartford Crossing would also be reduced. Problems at the Dartford Crossing were due to a number of factors, including the merging of numerous local junction, and convoys happening up to every 15 minutes for 90 seconds. He added that with the LTC, traffic would be reduced on the Dartford Crossing so cars would have more room to merge, and therefore cause fewer accidents. He explained that as the LTC would be a very large tunnel HGVs, tankers and abnormal loads could all go through without the need for convoys which stopped traffic.

The Associate Director discussed that road users could not join onto the Orsett Cock roundabout and the A1089 from the LTC due to the traffic weaving. He added that local roads including Green Lane, Stifford Clays Road, and Baker Street would be diverted, along with A1013 which would be diverted to west Orsett Cock roundabout. He then listed other diversions to local roads which were: Rectory Road A1013, which would go around the showground; Heath Road, which would be moved west; Long Lane, where a connection would be put in; and Hornsbury Lane, which would be deviated to cross the Lower Thames Crossing. He confirmed that Brentwood Road would remain unchanged. He added that the northbound LTC will be lowered by 4 to 5 metres across the Mardyke and false cutting up to 2 metres would be put in place. He then described how false cutting worked, and the deeper cutting which mitigate against the visual effect of the scheme.

The Chair then opened the debate for members to ask questions. The Business Representative began by discussing the assumption that southbound traffic would be using junction 30, and how the southbound traffic

from the port, which equated to 9% of all traffic, would access the port. He felt that by removing the Tilbury link road, the LTC would stop traffic from the port reaching Kent and Sussex, and would have a negative effect on the Manor Way roundabout and junction 30. He mentioned that the LTC was not taking into account port or business expansion, and the number of businesses based around the A1089, and as the LTC would not be open until 2027, these factors should be considered. The Highways England Development Director answered that slip roads would only be added where traffic would be reduced, and where expansion was proven. He added that southbound traffic to the port would be able to use the existing road network, which would be relieved by the LTC and therefore increase the speed and reliability of journeys. He also discussed how the relief on the Dartford Crossing and A13 would reduce journey times by 50%. The Resident Representative discussed how close the service area would be to residents, and how the slow moving or stationary traffic pulling into the service area would cause an increase in pollution across the area. She felt that light pollution would also be increased as the service area would be operational 24 hours a day. The Highways England Development Director replied that a service area needed to be provided to manage driver fatigue along the route, but that they would look at lighting and planting options.

Councillor Abbas then made the point that although Highways England had met with 50 business and 25 community forums, the borough was still against the proposals, and that Highways England should listen to the Task Force suggestions and make plans made on these. The Highways England Development Director stated that the public events were important to gain feedback and would include all the Statutory Consultation paperwork, including 'easy read' versions for young people and people with learning disabilities. He reiterated the point that mobile units would be travelling around the borough and information was on the website, as well as Grays library and Tilbury hub.

The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative discussed the problems with electric cars, including the lack of green electricity to power these cars. She also brought some problems with the Statutory Consultation to Highways England's attention which included; the information points being 'hidden' on the website; Upminster being listed as south of the river; and Gravesend being listed as north of the river. She also felt that the LTC would not solve problems at the Dartford Crossing as it would still be running over capacity.

Councillor Jefferies then discussed how pollution could be reduced by cut and cover, as a six lane motorway was passing by some villages including Ockendon. He felt the cost of LTC would be small in comparison to the money that would be spent by the NHS on problems caused by the motorway, particularly with new housing developments being proposed in Ockendon. The Highways England Development Director replied that to add cut and cover would push the LTC outside affordability.

Councillor Kelly asked three questions which were: if the service station could be moved along the route to Gravesham; if electric HGVs were included in the

government's proposal to ban fossil fuels by 2040; and if the road was being built for tomorrow to include proposed expansions of both housing and businesses. The Highways England Development Director replied that Tilbury was the best place for the service area as many of the operational facilities for the road, including turnaround areas and plant amenities were based in Tilbury. He also stated that the position of the rest area on the route was up for discussion, and would take into consideration responses from the Statutory Consultation. He confirmed that HGVs were included in the government's plan to ban fossil fuels by 2040, and would be moving towards electric.

Councillor Rice asked what permanent areas around East Tilbury would be taken by Highways England, and which would only be taken during the construction period. He suggested using tunnels as cut and cover around large residential areas such as Chadwell St Mary, North Grays, Stifford Clays and Tilbury, as the population of the borough is predicted to grow by 300,000, and the LTC needs to be built to last. The Highways England Development Director discussed how Highways England had to talk to every landowner who would be affected by the scheme, and would undertake environmental mitigation.

The Highways England Development Director then discussed how there were currently 155,000 vehicles using the Dartford Crossing every day, and if the LTC was not built, this would rise to 172,000 per day. He added that if the LTC was built, traffic over the Dartford Crossing would reduce to 132,000 per day, which would again rise to 155,000 by 2041.

## **22. Task Force Priorities List**

The Corporate Director Place stated that these questions had been brought back to the Task Force as they had not been on the agenda recently. He stated the priorities list had been turned into the mitigation schedule, which would be used as a baseline for issues which had been discussed for example, visual impact, the Tilbury railway line, and the impact on the local road network. Councillor Kelly stated he was glad to see these back on the agenda, even though they were outdated now and some questions had been answered. The Chair discussed that the questions would come back to November's Task Force meeting, so they could be improved and additional comments made.

## **23. Work Programme**

It was agreed that the mitigation schedule would be added to November's Task Force meeting.

## **24. Any Other Business**

It was confirmed there was no other business.

**The meeting finished at 19.36**

Approved as a true and correct record

**CHAIR**

**DATE**

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

This page is intentionally left blank



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

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

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

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

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	Request information from HE	
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	Request information from HE	

			at Canvey		
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	To request a response from HE. 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	
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 is being negotiated to assist with providing resources	
3a	20, 21	Alternatives to this proposal	The Planning Inspectorate has demanded that these be set out – when will HE share with Thurrock	Alternatives that have been considered are included within	

			how they intend to respond	the preliminary environmental information. Further assessment of the alternatives will be provided with the DCO application and should conform with the National Policy Statement for National Networks	
3b	20, 21	Alternatives to this proposal	All the historic crossing capacity (1963, 1980, 1991). This crossing will last 120 years at least. Will there ever be anything other than more roads when there is a need to safeguard and future proof for alternative modes	To be considered as part of the transport assessment work	
4a	9,	What is the scheme and how will the network operate?	When will we know the precise capacity of the crossing? This has already become 3 lanes through the tunnel, then up to the A13 but no detail thereafter.	The scheme is now three lanes throughout. This will be answered as part of the Council's analysis of the consultation material	
4b	9	What is the scheme and how will the network operate?	What is the capacity of the Tilbury Docks Link road and will the proposed design work?	This no longer forms part of the scheme	
4c	9	What is the scheme and how will the network operate?	M25 / A2 Junction will be diversion point for the LTC; then back on to the M25. Can you prove that the entire network will be able to cope and that LTC does not simply create a new	To be considered by the Council as part of the transport modelling work to inform the Council's consultation response	

			connection but with roads and junction either side at gridlock?		
5a	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	HE to provide detail of when and where Thurrock can genuinely influence HE proposals. HE must demonstrate where we can or cannot influence the scheme. The DCO process demands genuine consultation rather than keep telling us what you have decided.	To seek clarity from HE on this point	
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	Question to be answered by HE	

			side. Robust network management is now needed as any crossing is a decade away and once in place would secure additional capacity that supposedly is only possible with a £6Bn LTC. The incident management, delay in response and absence of smart management (including alerts, roadside information, recovery) is not as good as elsewhere in the country (i.e. as now being developed in the West Midlands).		
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	To be answered by HE. Unlikely that will happen as there will	



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

	37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,				
7d	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	More road trips will result in greater pollution than would otherwise be the case and an air quality assessment must be undertaken.	This will form part of the ES. There is some information in the PEIR which will be considered as part of the Council's consultation response	
7e	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	A Full Health Impact Assessment must be produced by HE to consider the full health impact of the proposed route on local populations.	This has been agreed and work is ongoing. The Council is co-ordinating the other LA DPH's and representatives to identify commonality of approach and consistency	
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	Approximately 7%. To be discussed at HE technical meetings	

			attractive to house builders.		
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.	For HE to answer	

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	To be asked of HE	
9	N/A	Future-Proofing	Why are lessons not being learned	To be asked of HE	

			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		
--	--	--	---	--	--

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

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

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

<b>15 October 2018</b>		
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
LTC Questions	Anna Eastgate	Members
Deep Dive A13 (A1089)/ East Bound Slip Roads	Anna Eastgate	Members
Consultation Explanation	Anna Eastgate	Members
Mitigation Schedule	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>12 November 2018</b>		
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Task Force Priorities List/ Mitigation Schedule	Anna Eastgate	Members
Response to Consultation	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Business Views	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Next Steps for Consultation	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>10 December 2018</b>		
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 January 2019</b>		
Highways England Update	Highways England Update	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

**11 February 2019**

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

**11 March 2019**

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

**29 April 2019**

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

This page is intentionally left blank