

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 **10 June 2019**

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

Membership:

Councillors Gary Byrne, Andrew Jefferies, Tom Kelly, Allen Mayes, Sara Muldowney, Terry Piccolo, Gerard Rice, Sue Shinnick, Luke Spillman

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Nomination of Chair and Vice-Chair	
3 Minutes	5 - 12
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 11 February 2019.	
4 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.	
5 Declaration of Interests	
6 Terms of Reference	13 - 14
7 Task Force Priorities List	15 - 34
8 Work Programme	35 - 36

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

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

Agenda published on: **3 June 2019**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

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

Recording of meetings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

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

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

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

Evacuation Procedures

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

How to view this agenda on a tablet device



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

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

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

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

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

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

Helpful Reminders for Members

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

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

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



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

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

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

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

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

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

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

Pecuniary

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

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

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

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

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

Non- pecuniary

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



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

Our Vision and Priorities for Thurrock

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

1. **People** – a borough where people of all ages are proud to work and play, live and stay
 - High quality, consistent and accessible public services which are right first time
 - Build on our partnerships with statutory, community, voluntary and faith groups to work together to improve health and wellbeing
 - Communities are empowered to make choices and be safer and stronger together

2. **Place** – a heritage-rich borough which is ambitious for its future
 - Roads, houses and public spaces that connect people and places
 - Clean environments that everyone has reason to take pride in
 - Fewer public buildings with better services

3. **Prosperity** – a borough which enables everyone to achieve their aspirations
 - Attractive opportunities for businesses and investors to enhance the local economy
 - Vocational and academic education, skills and job opportunities for all
 - Commercial, entrepreneurial and connected public services

Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 11 February 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), Gerard Rice (Vice-Chair), John Allen, Andrew Jefferies and Sue Shinnick

Apologies: Councillors Luke Spillman, Tom Kelly, Terry Piccolo and Jane Potheary

In attendance: Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director Lower Thames Crossing
Mary Patricia Flynn, Strategic Lead Communications
Helen Forster, Strategic Lead Public Health
Mat Kiely, Transportation Development Manager
Luke Tyson, Business Manager
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer

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

Dermot Scanlon, Peter Brett Associates

David Manning, Highways England – Development Director
Chris Stratford, Highways England – LTC Stakeholder
Engagement and SoCG Advisor

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.

51. Apologies for Absence

Councillors Tom Kelly, Terry Piccolo, Jane Potheary and Luke Spillman sent their apologies.

52. Minutes

The minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 14 January 2019 were approved as a correct record.

53. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

54. Declaration of Interests

There were no interests declared.

55. Highways England Update

The Highways England (HE) Development Director began by stating that HE had visited the LTC Task Force at the end of 2018, and since then the consultation had ended and HE were currently individually analysing 28,000 responses. He stated that, of the responses that had been analysed so far, the main issues were the A13 connectivity; the proposed Rest and Service Area; the lack of the Tilbury Link Road; the vertical alignment of the road, particularly on the Mardyke Valley and Tilbury and Ockendon loop lines; the health impact of the road; and the air and noise pollution. He commented that once responses had been analysed, proposed changes to the plan would come back to the Task Force and the weekly meetings with Thurrock. The HE Development Director added that HE's ambition was to submit the Development Consent Order (DCO) at the end of 2019, although this would be reliant on changes made to the LTC due to consultation responses. He mentioned that HE were aware that Thurrock was working on its Local Plan and felt that HE and Thurrock Council could collaborate on land parcels. He added that HE were planning on undertaking environmental surveys later on in the year, but assured the Task Force that they would stay fully informed. He finally stated that although the LTC was not near the procurement phase yet, last week HE had published their EU Hiring Notice which stated their intentions subject to contracts and got the supply chain ready. He added that HE wanted to work with the local supply chain and were in talks with SELEP, Invest Essex, as well as other partners.

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative opened the debate and asked about the agricultural surveys HE were planning on undertaking, and asked what protection would be given to residents as some of the proposed survey areas ran over historic land fill sites. The HE Development Director replied that the agricultural surveys would consist of shallow soil testing, the same as what was currently happening in Kent. He added that HE had not yet applied for consent from Thurrock Council, so the surveys would not begin for some time. The Assistant Director LTC confirmed that Thurrock Council had not granted any licences for agricultural surveys on council land, but could not comment on licences for private land.

The Vice-Chair commented on the on-going Health Impact Assessment (HIA) as Thurrock had an increased level of COPD compared to other boroughs. He asked HE if they could provide cut and cover across the route, particularly around urban areas such as Chadwell St Mary, Tilbury, Bulphan and Stifford Clays. He wanted to ensure that progress was not detrimental to resident's health. The HE Development Director stated that the scheme had to meet the National Policy Statement National Framework which would give protection to residents by testing air quality and noise pollution. The Assistant Director LTC confirmed that Thurrock had shared all health data with HE and the Strategic Lead Public Health was attending health meetings with other local authorities that the scheme affected. She felt that that the Health Impact Assessment

was progressing slowly, and had written formally to HE to share these concerns. She stated that as part of the scheme it was a statutory duty to produce a HIA which covered noise, vibration and provide mitigation. She added that the HIA was an ongoing piece of work, which would be available at DCO submission, and would be reviewed in examination phase. She stated that Thurrock were currently talking to HE regarding the methodology of the HIA, but felt concerned at the timescales and amount of work to do before DCO submission.

The Vice-Chair stated that he wanted re-assurance from HE that adequate mitigation would be provided, as he felt it was not acceptable for residents to live so close to the LTC, without the LTC having cut and cover or being placed in an underground tunnel. He added that Thurrock Council would take HE to judicial review if it placed residents at risk. The Business Representative asked when consultation responses would be provided, as he had a number of concerns. The HE Development Director replied that the number of responses to consultation had been record-breaking and analysing them would take time. He added that HE would be sharing issues soon, but could not commit to changes that would be occurring to the scheme. He commented that changes made to the scheme following consultation may have to go through another round of consultation and engagement. He finally mentioned that HE were currently working on a legal agreement with Thurrock Council to be able to give access to the cordoned model for traffic modelling.

The Chair stated that the LTC Task Force had wanted to run a workshop regarding traffic modelling at the March meeting, but the software licence for the cordoned model had still not been given to officers. He felt that Thurrock Council needed facts and evidence to pursue ambitions for the Local Plan. He asked HE when officers would be able to see the licence for the software. The HE Development Director replied that it would be sent to officers by Friday 15 February. The Assistant Director LTC responded that if the software licence was received on Friday, it would still be too late to analyse all of the data in time for a workshop in the March meeting.

Councillor Jefferies stated that he felt concerned over HE's responses to questions as he felt they were open-ended. He also felt concerned that officers were waiting for information and this was causing delays. He stated that he felt HE were letting the clock run until DCO submission at the end of the year. The HE Development Director replied that HE were sharing information with officers every week, but wanted to ensure that they had a tight grip on the scheme, so problems such as the Tilbury Link Road did not re-occur. The Assistant Director LTC confirmed that Thurrock Council had asked for access to the cordoned model 12 months ago, as they had needed a minimum of 3 months to analyse the data that arose from this. She stated that Thurrock Council had heard from HE at the end of 2018 that they would receive access to the cordoned model, but still had not received it. She felt that when it was received, there may not be enough time to analyse all data and felt that HE programme was unrealistic and would not result in meaningful engagement. The Chair commented that he felt HE's ambition to submit DCO by the end of the year was looking doubtful as there was a lot for them to do.

The Business Representative stated that he agreed with the Assistant Director LTC as the Port of Tilbury were not receiving information from HE either, and added that if HE did not engage then they would be in a difficult position when it came to the examination phase. The HE Development Director answered that HE could not commit to any DCO submission date but their ambitions were to submit by the end of the year. He stated they would follow due process, but had to wait for data too. The TCAG Representative asked when HE would know if there would be another round of consultation, to which HE replied it would be by late spring.

Councillor Allen stated that he felt HE were pursuing the cheapest method and were not considering residents. The Assistant Director LTC commented that the Chief Executive had written a formal letter to the Chief Executive of Highways England voicing Thurrock's concerns regarding the impact of the LTC on health and traffic, and the lack of HE engagement. The Chair commented that he felt it would be helpful if HE could increase their communications effort, as officers and Members would like to know what was happening, and be able to offer advice to residents.

56. Task Force Priorities List

The Assistant Director LTC stated this was a standing item which had been requested by Councillor Tom Kelly to keep sight of the Task Force priorities. She stated this document was a pre-cursor to the Mitigation Schedule. She then drew the Task Force's attention to areas of the Priorities List which had been populated by HE in sections 1a (ii), 1a (iv), 1d, 2b (ii) and 7e. She ran through the changes which included:

1a (ii): HE had clarified that during the construction phase 900 construction workers would be needed at peak construction times in Thurrock. HE had stated jobs would grow as journey times would decrease, which would increase labour markets and help businesses.

1a (iv): HE had stated that a crossing at Canvey Island had been discounted in 2009 as it did not meet scheme objectives and HE could not justify it.

1d: HE had clarified they would be using local contractors as the PIN notice had been published last week, which could be shared with the Task Force and Thurrock Business Board.

2b (ii): Thurrock Council had now agreed a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with HE that could recover costs in terms of officer resources, and this had been backdated to September 2018.

7e: A group had been set-up regarding the HIA which had met in November 2018 and January 2019, and would continue to meet quarterly to discuss the Health Impact Assessment, as the Assistant Director LTC believed that work was not progressing quickly enough.

Councillor Allen asked for clarification regarding 1a (ii) as although 900 workers were needed for the construction phase, HE had put out to EU tender, and asked if local construction workers could receive these jobs. The Assistant Director LTC clarified that due to the scale of the project, and procurement rules, it had to go to EU tender. She stated that the tenders would be tiered, so both larger and smaller contractors could receive business. She added that through the DCO process, Thurrock Council wanted to ensure a certain amount of local goods and contractors were used on the project.

The Chair stated that at 1a (ii) part of the initial scheme had included a Tilbury Link Road to connect the docks. He stated that he remained opposed to the LTC, but had felt the Tilbury Link Road may have brought benefit. The HE Development Director replied that when HE had spoken to Thurrock businesses, the majority of feedback contained frustration at the Dartford Crossing. He stated that there was not the infrastructure to cope with a Tilbury Link Road, and if it was included in the scheme it could impact upon local roads. He added that HE were working with the Department for Transport and other partners to work on a different concept to connect the Port of Tilbury, either during or after the LTC had been built. The Assistant Director LTC replied that Thurrock needed access to the cordoned model to be able to analyse whether the Tilbury Link Road would affect the local road network. The Vice-Chair asked if the Tilbury Link Road had been removed due to cost, as it had been too expensive. The HE Development Director replied that if the LTC was connected to the local road network and the dock area, it would cause an increase in traffic. He added that HE wanted to collaborate with Thurrock and the Port of Tilbury to work with the port's expansion and the Local Plan. He added that they were looking at a variety of options, but in its current guise, the Tilbury Link Road would not fit in with the scheme. The Business Representative stated that he felt the Tilbury Link Road should be included in the scheme, and had been removed due to cost. He added that he felt it would only cost 1-2% of the £6billion total to add the Tilbury Link Road, which seemed insignificant. He also stated that the Port was currently submitting a DCO to expand by 152 acres. Councillor Allen reaffirmed his opposition to the scheme, but felt if it went ahead then HE should get it right by design. He felt it should be 'value for health' rather than value for money. The HE Development Director replied that they were not choosing the cheapest option, as the cheapest option would be a bridge, but HE were mitigating the scheme and would ensure there was adequate consultation.

The Chair stated that he had met with the Transportation Development Manager during the Congestion Task Force to discuss design elements and the use of a bridge. The Transportation Development Manager stated they had discussed the HE scheme to place a wind buffer system along the Dartford Crossing, as there was a trigger point when it became too windy and the bridge had to close. He stated that HE had done the academic work regarding the proposed wind buffer system to reduce closures, but Thurrock had not received much update from this and did not currently know the timescales. The Resident Representative commented that HE had not

improved the Dartford Crossing for some time, and there had been no discussion on ways to improve the existing tunnel, such as removing the need to shut down when tankers passed through. She felt it was disappointing as a resident that HE had not shown more of an effort to work on problems at Dartford. She asked if HE could make major improvements at Dartford, rather than building a new crossing. The HE Development Director replied that the Dartford Crossing did not meet the right safety specifications to allow tankers to pass through unescorted, and it would never meet those specifications. He added that they had done lots of work regarding this, but HE were working to improve Dartford, such as updating the traffic management systems; reducing recovery times; and installing the new Dart Charge system. He commented that Option A of the LTC had been to improve the Dartford Crossing, but this had been ruled out in favour of Option C, as Option C had increased the return on value for traffic times.

The Chair reiterated the point that the new crossing would be a toll road, so all monies spent would be returned to HE. Councillor Allen again commented that he felt HE were too focussed on money, and had not considered the impact of the road on resident's health, the environment and ecology. The TCAG Representative stated that HE had saved £15million at Dartford by not installing a wind buffer, and did not want the same problems to occur at the LTC.

57. Mitigation Schedule

The representative from Peter Brett Associates (PBA) introduced the report and stated this was the latest version of the mitigation schedule, having been updated on 5 February 2019. He stated that the mitigation schedule drove the agenda for technical meetings and covered key areas such as the Local Plan; operation and construction; community and health impacts; traffic and transport; environmental impact including air quality, landscape, water, ecology and stakeholders. He added that the technical meetings were grouped around issues such as the local plan workshop; the design elements of the scheme; the operation of the LTC; the construction and logistics; and community impact. He then listed the upcoming meetings and topics which would be covered, these included:

1. Thurrock Council and PBA had been invited to take part in the HE Design Panel which critiqued the design of the scheme.
2. The cordoned model and key elements for traffic.

He drew the Members attention to the areas of the mitigation schedule which were highlighted in red, as these signified areas which were now being dealt with elsewhere, as they were outside the scope of the LTC. He listed point 5, 30, 31, and 35 which were all highlighted red and were now being dealt with in another way. The Vice-Chair highlighted point 20 which commented on the crossing at East Tilbury as he felt many Local Plan developments could not take place in this area due to the LTC and its remedial works. The PBA Representative replied that this had been covered during the Local Plan

workshop and HE had said they would take ideas discussed regarding design away, to ensure potential development sites were not neutralised. The Vice-Chair replied that houses could not be built next to motorways unless the motorway was buried underground in tunnels. The PBA Representative commented that HE had to ensure there would be no adverse effects for residents as part of their design work.

The Resident Representative asked how land to the side of the LTC would be treated, as to mitigate the scheme the roadside should offer some protection to residents from pollution. The Assistant Director LTC replied that HE only had to mitigate against their scheme, and a 1km tree belt on the side of the road was not necessary in law. She added that HE could only compulsorily buy land where it was necessary to deliver the scheme, and the 1km tree belt could not be compulsorily bought. She stated that this was why point 5 in the report had been highlighted in red. She mentioned that Thurrock Council were working with HE to identify mitigation work, but the red-line boundary was not fixed as additional environmental work needed to be undertaken.

58. Work Programme

The Chair stated that as purdah started soon there may be some disruption to the meetings. The Assistant Director LTC stated that she had been expecting the March meeting to be a traffic modelling workshop, but there was now not enough time. She proposed the traffic modelling workshop take place in the April Task Force meeting, and invited HE to go into design detail, including architectural approach, during the March meeting. The HE Development Director replied that he would look into this. The Assistant Director LTC stated that Thurrock Council had met with other local authorities, and requested HE organise the upcoming meetings for the Stakeholder Advisory Panel. She stated that she had contacted the Planning Inspectorate and case workers to raise issues and concerns, and had requested the outreach planning inspectorate to discuss issues.

The meeting finished at 7.11 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 TASK FORCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Aim:

To create a responsive working group to discuss and make recommendations in relation to environmental, economic and social aspects of the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC).

Membership:

- 9 elected Members (3 Conservatives, 3 Labour, 3 Thurrock Independents)
- 1 representative from the Lower Thames Crossing Action Group, who is also a resident of Thurrock
- 1 representative from the Thurrock business community
- 1 representative of the Thurrock Business Board
- 1 Thurrock resident from the wider community

All members of the group have a right to vote if so required during a meeting of the group.

Chair:

The Chair will be elected by the membership of the Task Force on an annual basis to run within each municipal year. The election will take place at the first meeting of the Task Force each municipal year.

Duration:

The Group will be established to continue for an indefinite period until such time as all business of the task force is complete. The ultimate decision to discontinue the group will lie with the General Services Committee, but the Chair of the Task Force may make such a request to disband the Force upon completion of business.

Meeting Schedule:

The Task Force will meet each month at a date and time to be scheduled in advance. The schedule will be agreed at the first meeting of the Task Force.

Activities:

The Task Force will undertake all but not exclusively the following activities:

1. To act as a consultee for Planning Committee or any other executive/quasi-judicial committee on LTC matters if that committee so desires.
2. Receive any reports which it is required to make recommendations upon by officers, Cabinet or any other relevant committee of the Council.
3. Receive a monthly update of all Council activity in relation to the LTC (by way of an update report)
4. Invite strategic partners to meet with them to gather evidence to aid the Council's work in relation to the LTC.
5. Commission or undertake research on behalf of the Council in relation to the LTC.
6. The Chair to provide a monthly/bimonthly report to Cabinet on its work.
7. Any other duties within its powers to do so.

Decision-Making:

The Task Force has no executive powers and will refer all recommendations direct to the appropriate executive or quasi-judicial committee via a report for action.

Thurrock Lower Thames Crossing Task Force - Summary of Key Priorities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

			connection but with roads and junction either side at gridlock?		
5a	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	HE to provide detail of when and where Thurrock can genuinely influence HE proposals. HE must demonstrate where we can or cannot influence the scheme. The DCO process demands genuine consultation rather than keep telling us what you have decided.	HE response: we are open and listening to comments on the entirety of the proposals within our Statutory Consultation, as nothing is committed at this stage.	
5b	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	The tunnel portal as currently described is within the SSSI. HE must undertake full assessment (now) to adequately consider and respond to demands that it stay in tunnel until North of the railway line (<i>a key concern of the taskforce</i>).	Current proposal to be considered by the Council as part of the consultation response. Need to review the Preliminary Environmental Report (PEIR)	
5c	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	HE must provide alternative options for tunnelling and cut and cover at all junctions and sensitive areas. These worked up options to be discussed in detail with Thurrock Council prior to the Application for the DCO.	To be considered as part of the Council consultation response.	

5d	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	All slips to have detailed designs developed for cut and cover as now being developed north of Thurrock on the M25. These designs to be open for genuine consultation and consideration by Thurrock Council.	Not currently part of the proposal. Need to assess the junction with A13/A1089 but unlikely there is room in this location for the design suggested	
5e	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	The legacy impact of road elevations – especially over the MarDyke valley needs to be fully recognised and addressed. A detailed understanding of the potential for cut and cover instead of highly elevated structures is needed including areas such as Chadwell St Mary, Orsett, Baker Street, Stifford Clays / Blackshots, Ockendon, Bulphan.	Thurrock to be involved in discussions/detail around design. To be discussed with HE at technical meeting	
5f	2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38,	Design of the new Crossing	More detail is needed beyond the current red line boundary and we need to have guarantees that HE is designing in robust mitigation including significant planting (510 metres) either side of the road (for masking the road, wild life protection, and creation of new	To be considered as part of the PEIR and the development of the ES	

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

			side. Robust network management is now needed as any crossing is a decade away and once in place would secure additional capacity that supposedly is only possible with a £6Bn LTC. The incident management, delay in response and absence of smart management (including alerts, roadside information, recovery) is not as good as elsewhere in the country (i.e. as now being developed in the West Midlands).	information is possible at this stage. We would welcome any feedback on this matter within your consultation response.	
6c	19	Incident Management	Full Borough wide traffic micro-simulation is needed to understand the knock on effect of incidents on either network. Any new crossing is a decade away – so requires action now, especially with planned housing growth.	To be considered by the Council as part of the consultation response and the outcome from the assessment of the traffic modelling.	
6d	19	Incident Management	As HE have now confirmed that tankers will have unescorted use	Response from HE: if this is a requirement of	

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

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

7g	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	How much of the Greenbelt will be lost to this scheme and how might HE mitigate the risk of making the Borough being less attractive to house builders.	Approximately 7%. To be discussed at HE technical meetings	
7h	5, 6,7,8,11,15,16,17,18, 25, 27, 28,29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40-45, 49, 50,	Environmental, Ecological and Health Impacts	Each and every community, and heritage asset including Coal House Fort, Tilbury Fort and East Tilbury Village will be irreplaceably damaged – where has HE experienced and mitigated this across its many years of experience.	Response from HE: the effects on such assets will be considered fully within the Environmental Statement and is partially considered within the PEIR, submitted as part of the Statutory Consultation documents. Furthermore, there are various considerations relating to impacts that HE will be subject to within the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), particularly in Sections 5.120 – 5.142 on the historic environment.	

New Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
10 June 2019		
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		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

14 October 2019

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

11 November 2019

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

16 December 2019

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

13 January 2020

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

10 February 2020

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

16 March 2020

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

20 April 2020

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