

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 February 2020**

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

### Membership:

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

### Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1 Apologies for Absence</b>	
<b>2 Minutes</b>	<b>5 - 10</b>
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 16 December 2019.	
<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 - Scheme Presentation (<i>to follow</i>)</b>	
<b>6 Task Force Priorities List</b>	<b>11 - 30</b>
<b>7 Work Programme</b>	<b>31 - 34</b>

**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: **31 January 2020**

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

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

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

### **Recording of meetings**

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

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

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](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 16 December 2019 at 6.00 pm

---

**Present:** Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), Luke Spillman (Deputy Chair) (*arrived 18.35*), Andrew Jefferies, Sara Muldowney and Sue Shinnick

**Apologies:** Councillors Allen Mayes, Fraser Massey, Tom Kelly and Terry Piccolo.

Peter Ward, Business Representative

**In attendance:** Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing  
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer

Robert Quick, Resident Representative  
Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative  
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative

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

---

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.

### **32. Apologies for Absence**

Councillors Fraser Massey, Allen Mayes, Terry Piccolo and Tom Kelly sent their apologies. Peter Ward, Business Representative also sent his apologies.

### **33. Minutes**

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative highlighted page 9 of the agenda and clarified that she did not ask about PM2.5 and the new legislation, and had simply stated that if the bill passed the scheme would become untenable. She also asked for clarification regarding the dates for DCO submission as outlined on page 10, and asked whether DCO and construction would both begin in 2021. The Assistant Director LTC replied that DCO would aim to be submitted in 2020.

### **34. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **35. Declaration of Interests**

There were no interests declared.

### **36. Highways England Presentation - Cut and Cover**

The Highways England (HE) Development Director introduced the briefing note and stated that there had been high levels of engagement with Thurrock Council, including numerous technical workshops. He added that the HE community 'Chatty Van' had also received good levels of engagement from the public, and the local supply chain event that had been held had received over 200 visitors. He stated that HE still planned for Development Consent Order (DCO) submission in 2020, and they had now finished collating consultation responses, which would go on to shape the DCO proposal. He also clarified that HE were considering another round of consultation, but this would be communicated to Thurrock when agreed and would reflect the intensity of the next stage of proposals. The HE Development Director mentioned that a new Facebook page would be launching on 19 December 2019 and would be updated monthly to keep the public up-to-date with the latest developments.

The HE Development Director moved onto discuss the briefing paper and areas for cut and cover along the route. He stated that the proposal allowed for small sections of cut and cover in Thurrock, mainly at the tunnel entrance and at the junction of the A13. He clarified that although cut and cover did have some benefits to air quality and noise reduction, it was restricted in Thurrock by the location of junctions and ground conditions. He described Thurrock's hydrology, as there was lots of purge water and groundwater to the south of the borough, and if this was disturbed it would have a large environmental impact. He also described how, to the north of the borough, the ground became boggy and marshy due to the Mardyke Valley, which would make it difficult to include cut and cover as deep excavation and pilings would be needed. The HE Development Director also described the two large curves that were included in the proposed route, and would make it difficult to include cut and cover, as drivers needed clear forward facing visibility and this would not be achievable if the route was in a tunnel. He clarified that if the route were in a tunnel for these sections, the road would need to be twice as wide, which would increase the land needed and the footprint of construction works. He added that it would also increase the construction schedule and the delays associated with this.

The Chair opened debate and stated that he represented the town of Chadwell St Mary, where the proposed route would come very close to resident's homes. He understood that although cut and cover could not be provided along the entire route, he felt that it could be used in locations close to urban areas to protect residents. He felt that as the route would be in use for over 100 years, it should be right by design and include the correct levels of coverage and mitigation. The HE Development Director replied that HE were considering non-motorised users across the borough and would be looking at routes that crossed the LTC in detail. He added that HE were also working to mitigate environmental impacts by trying to connect bio-diversity



and non-motorised users. He stated that any changes made would be brought back to the Task Force in the New Year. The Chair added that residents of Chadwell St Mary already suffered from increased rates of COPD, which would only get worse if proper mitigation was not used along the route. The HE Development Director added that HE would consider pinch points such as communities in Chadwell St Mary, particularly along Brentwood Road, which were close to the route. He explained that small tunnels of 500-600m reduced air quality at the tunnel entrance and exits, which could only be slightly mitigated using ventilation stacks. He explained it was often better to use open cut and cover which would comparatively improve the air quality at a distance of up to 50m away from the road.

Councillor Shinnick asked for clarification on where cut and cover would be placed along the route. The HE Development Director responded that in current proposals there would be 400m of cut and cover on the shore of the Thames and at the junction of the A13. He stated that this issue was still up for discussion and HE were looking at a range of solutions. He added that HE's proposals would be rigorously tested against the National Policy Statement by external regulatory bodies. He added that on the maps provided at Appendix 1, the green sections outlined areas of planting schemes or landscaping, which would hide the route and provide some environmental mitigation.

The Resident Representative questioned the changes to the route, and asked how much time was left until DCO submission. The HE Development Director replied that the plans provided at Appendix 1 were the same as those provided at statutory consultation, and if any significant changes were proposed then another round of statutory consultation would occur. He then outlined the DCO submission process and highlighted that DCO would be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by summer 2020. He explained that the Planning Inspectorate would then have one month to ensure that the documentation and submission were correct, before spending 3-5 months hearing representations from stakeholders such as Thurrock Council, Heritage England and the LTC Task Force. He explained that this process would run until approximately the end of 2020, and only at this point would the examination phase begin. He described the examination phase and highlighted that at this stage individual representations would be heard, as well as representations from Thurrock Council, and would last for six months. He described how this was to ensure the impact of the scheme had been mitigated against, and due diligence had been paid. He then described how at the end of examination phase, the Planning Inspectorate had three months to judge the proposal, and if judged acceptable it would be sent to the Secretary of State who then had three months to decide if it should go ahead. The Assistant Director LTC added that once the DCO had been submitted, Thurrock's opportunity to influence the design was largely gone, as no major changes would be made. She stated that at the examination phase, the scheme was more likely to be refused than have major changes implemented, but 97% of schemes such as these were successful.

The TCAG Representative stated that she felt HE were only considering cut

and cover as a cost issue, and felt you could not put a cost on people's lives. She also felt that if the route was not mitigated properly then more residents would become ill and suffer health problems, which would increase the bill for the NHS. The Thurrock Business Board Representative then asked how much weight was being given to developments in the proposed Local Plan, and how close the route would come to those potential developments. The Assistant Director LTC replied that as the Local Plan had not been agreed upon, HE did not have to consider it. She added that numerous conversations had been held between Thurrock and HE, and officers were looking to work together to ensure that areas for development were not precluded due to the LTC. She also discussed how HE only had to have regard for the current Local Plan.

The Thurrock Business Board Representative asked what the current situation was regarding the proposed Rest and Service Area (RaSA), as he felt the site should be moved away from East Tilbury. The HE Development Director replied that responses from the statutory consultation highlighted local people's concern for the proposed location of the RaSA, and stated that if the decision was made for it to be moved, it would go back to statutory consultation. The Chair suggested an area for the proposed RaSA on the M25 near the Brentwood junction, as it was already 'spoiled' land, and was not near any residential sites. The Assistant Director LTC highlighted that it was not HE's role to identify locations, as these were developed by the market.

Councillor Jefferies voiced his disappointment that more cut and cover could not be provided along the route, and felt that cut and cover should be provided in those areas close to residential homes such as Ockendon and Chadwell St Mary. The HE Development Director replied that HE wanted to talk locally about cut and cover, but the scheme had to be aligned with the budget from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

*Councillor Spillman arrived 18.35*

The Chair listed areas where he felt cut and cover should be included on the route, such as Chadwell St Mary, Ockendon and south Grays, and used the examples of tunnels along the M25 that had cricket pitches on them. He asked HE to go back and look at these areas to ensure that the residents were protected, particularly those within 600m of the route.

Councillor Spillman felt that the Council had been working in a cross-party manner on the LTC and Local Plan to ensure that air pollution was reduced across the borough, and highlighted a motion that had recently been raised at Full Council regarding the reduction of air pollutants. He felt this was important as Thurrock already had an increased level of air pollution. He felt that the scheme in its current form did not benefit the wider area or the residents of Thurrock, and asked HE to take this into consideration.

The Thurrock Business Board Representative questioned whether HE had considered the existing alignment, and whether it would be possible to cover the route at ground level using excess spoil from the boring of the tunnel. The HE Development Director replied that this option had been considered, but

HE would go back and look in detail at this option where existing routes crossed the LTC. He added that lots of work would be done to ensure spoil would be used on landscaping around the LTC, and would take examples of best practice from Thurrock's work on the A13 widening scheme.

The Chair summarised and asked when HE would return to the Task Force with new ideas and updates. The HE Development Director replied that due to the election, activity had decreased, but this would now pick up again and announcements would start being made in the New Year. He felt that by February, HE would be able to come back to the Task Force with updates.

#### *Highways England left – 18.47*

The Assistant Director LTC highlighted that a bi-monthly meeting was held between the HE CEO, HE Complex Infrastructure Manager, Thurrock's CEO, Thurrock's Director of Place and herself to ensure that HE were taking Thurrock into consideration, as well as meetings between HE, the Leader and relevant Portfolio Holder. Councillor Jefferies asked if the CEO of HE could be invited to February's meeting of the Task Force, and the Assistant Director LTC and the Chair agreed this.

The TCAG Representative asked if a new Project Director had been appointed to the LTC, and the Assistant Director LTC replied in the negative. Councillor Jefferies asked if the Task Force could see the letter that was sent to the Secretary of State, and the accompanying reply as purdah had now finished. He also asked if the Task Force could write a letter to the Transport Select Committee to be able to lobby them directly. The Assistant Director LTC replied that she would distribute the Secretary of State letter, and would write to the Transport Select Committee towards the end of January, as this fell in line with another piece of work currently being completed. Councillor Jefferies also highlighted that individuals and residents groups could write to the Transport Select Committee. The Thurrock Business Board felt this was a good idea, and highlighted that HE had now agreed to set up a supply chain school to allow local businesses to get funding for the construction of the LTC.

The TCAG Representative highlighted the levels of PM2.5 in Thurrock, and described how this had been the focus of many local media reports, as Thurrock was 34<sup>th</sup> worst in the country. She described how the route would fail if the level of PM2.5 were tested against World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines, and asked if a press release could be made from the Council that highlighted this. The Assistant Director LTC replied that although this did not fall under her remit, she would discuss with the environmental health and communications teams.

### **37. Task Force Priorities List**

The Assistant Director LTC explained that the Priorities List had not been updated due to purdah, but felt that HE were now in a position to answer

some of the questions. She stated that she would send the document to HE for their input.

**38. Work Programme**

The Chair stated that HE and the CEO of HE would be invited to the February Task Force meeting.

**The meeting finished at 7.04 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](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)**

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

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

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

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

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

				<p>motorway network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved journey times to cross the river</li> <li>• Better reliability to cross the river</li> <li>• Improved access to labour markets and to jobs</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• To be affordable to Government and users: Option D was estimated to cost 40% more</li> </ul>	

				<p>than Option C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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</li><li>• Minimise adverse impacts on health and the environment: Option D would have had a significant effect on a number of SSSIs along the route.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				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 side. Robust network	Response from HE: there are references to a regional control centre to oversee traffic within our Guide To Consultation (Pp 130-132). There is a need to consider this further within HE's wider business and no further information is possible at this	

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

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



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

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

New Questions:

Qu	Mitigation Schedule	Topic	Question	Response	Actions
----	---------------------	-------	----------	----------	---------

Number	Reference				
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"> <li>• <u>To support sustainable local development and regional economic growth in the medium to long term</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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.</li> <li>○ Poor connectivity across the Thames east of London severs local labour and product markets, impacting economies in the surrounding area. Better connections across the river mean more job opportunities for those living in the region, and a</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

				<p>greater pool of potential employees. They also boost the market for local businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ New training and job opportunities created during construction will boost both the local and regional economies<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● <u>To be affordable to government and users</u></li><li>● <u>To achieve value for money</u></li><li>● <u>To minimise adverse impacts on health and the environment</u></li></ul></li><li>○ 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</li><li>○ We will work in partnership with local authorities and community interest groups to explore how we can improve accessibility and local connections</li><li>○ Structures along the route will be designed to blend in with local surroundings as sympathetically as possible. A number of green bridges</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>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"><li>○ 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</li><li>● <u>To relieve the congested Dartford Crossing and approach roads, and improve their performance by providing free-flowing, north-south capacity</u></li><li>○ 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 journey times and reliability</li><li>● <u>To improve resilience of the Thames crossings and the</u></li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p><u>major road network</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ improve journey times along parts of the A127 and M20</li><li>○ cut congestion on approach roads to the Dartford Crossing (including parts of the M25, A13 and A2)</li><li>○ 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)</li><li>○ allow nearly double the amount of traffic to cross the Thames</li><li>● <u>To improve safety</u></li></ul> <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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>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 discussions can then feed into the ongoing design development work and your Local Plan development, as</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				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

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Requested by Officer/Member</b>
<b>10 June 2019</b>		
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
<b>15 July 2019</b>		
Health Impact Assessment	Helen Forster	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>12 August 2019</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>16 September 2019</b>		
Health Impact Assessment: Briefing Note	Helen Forster	Officers
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members

Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 October 2019</b>		
Memorandum of Understanding – Highways England	Anna Eastgate	Officers
A14 Cambridgeshire – River Great Ouse Viaduct	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Modelling and Traffic Update	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>11 November 2019 - CANCELLED</b>		
<b>16 December 2019</b>		
Highways England – Cut and Cover	Anna Eastgate	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>13 January 2020 - CANCELLED</b>		
<b>10 February 2020</b>		
Highways England – Scheme Presentation	Anna Eastgate	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>16 March 2020</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>20 April 2020</b>		

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

This page is intentionally left blank