

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 **20 July 2020**

Due to current government guidance on social-distancing and the COVID-19 virus, Lower Thames Crossing Task Force on 20 July 2020 will not be open for members of the public to physically attend.

Arrangements have been made for the press and public to watch the meeting live via the Council's online webcast channel:

[www.youtube.com/user/thurrockcouncil](http://www.youtube.com/user/thurrockcouncil)

### Venue

**Council Chamber, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL (for Members/co-opted members only) and Microsoft Teams**

### Membership:

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

---

### Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1 Apologies for Absence</b>	
<b>2 Nomination of Chair</b>	
<b>3 Nomination of Vice-Chair</b>	
<b>4 Minutes</b>	<b>5 - 12</b>

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 16 March 2020.

**5 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.

**6 Declaration of Interests**

**7 Terms of Reference** **13 - 14**

**8 LTC Design Consultation – report to follow**

**9 Task Force Priorities List** **15 - 34**

**10 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](mailto:direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)

Agenda published on: **15 July 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 March 2020 at 5.00 pm

---

- Present:** Councillors Gerard Rice (Chair), John Allen, Fraser Massey, Sara Muldowney and Sue Shinnick
- Apologies:** Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative  
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative  
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative
- In attendance:** Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing and Transport Infrastructure Projects  
Mat Kiely, Transportation Services Strategic Lead  
Scott Morrow, Communications Strategic Lead  
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer
- 

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.

### **46. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from the Thames Crossing Action Group Representative; the Thurrock Business Board Representative; and the Thurrock Business Representative.

### **47. Minutes**

The Democratic Services Officer, on behalf of the Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative highlighted page 13 of the minutes, and stated that the capacity of the Dartford Crossing was 135,000, rather than 125,000 as written.

With this amendment, the minutes from 10 February 2020 were approved as a true and correct record.

### **48. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **49. Declaration of Interests**

There were no interests declared.

### **50. LTC Supplementary Consultation Response**

The Assistant Director LTC introduced the report and stated that the supplementary consultation response was provided for Members to agree, and was to respond to the latest Highways England (HE) consultation, which was running between 29 January 2020 and 25 March 2020. She commented that this was a targeted consultation on specific design changes, based on the 2018 statutory consultation feedback. She outlined the major changes in the route for Thurrock which were:

- Removal of the Rest and Service Area (RaSA);
- Removal of the proposed Tilbury junction;
- Relocating the route approximately 60m north and closer to Linford;
- Changes to junctions between the LTC and the A13, A1089 and A1013;
- Reinstating Rectory Road, so the road did not cut through the Orsett Showground;
- Removal of one lane southbound between the M25 and A13 junction, which was due to traffic modelling predicting that there would be no need for an additional lane;
- Increasing the length of the Mardyke Viaduct by 50m and changing the alignment.

The Assistant Director LTC stated that officers had been working hard with consultants on the response, which totalled 466 pages, but highlighted that a non-technical summary had also been provided. She commented that the response was very detailed, but that the main themes regarded the impacts to the environment; health; and the community. She added that the response also looked at the impact of construction of the route, traffic modelling, the route design, and land sterilisation. She clarified that one of the main changes in the new consultation was related to utilities diversions, particularly around the A13 junction. The Assistant Director LTC added that the proposed route did not have regard for Thurrock's regeneration plans, as well as the development of the Local Plan, but an economic report had been commissioned and circulated to Members, as well as being included in the consultation response, as it quantified the impact of the route. She stated that the report sought delegated authority to make necessary changes in the consultation response until submission, and also considered the Council's response as a landowner, as a report would be produced that outlined the landowner impact on a plot by plot basis. She mentioned that the Council rejected any compulsory purchase of Council land by HE, and the Council's position remained the same as in December 2018, and were rejecting the route on an in-principle basis due to the harm it would cause the borough.

The Chair opened the debate and asked how HE had the authority to dig in areas of the borough, even though planning permission had not yet been granted for the route. The Assistant Director LTC responded that HE were currently working north and south of the Thames undertaking intrusive and non-intrusive survey works, such as trial trenches, archaeological trenches, and bore holes. She stated that the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act allowed agencies to undertake necessary works to facilitate a project, such as the LTC. She stated that she had received a number of complaints regarding



HE access routes to the survey sites, and officers had met with HE to discuss remediation works. She added that damage had also been caused to a bridleway near Fen Lane by HE survey works, but this damage had been repaired within five days of HE being notified of the problem, and new processes had been put in place. Councillor Allen asked if any items of archaeological interest had been found during the survey works, and the Assistant Director LTC responded that no findings report had been published yet. She added that part of HE's legacy plan was to display any significant findings, and a Service Level Agreement was in place with Essex County Council who employed experienced historic advisors, who were often onsite monitoring the works and potential finds.

Councillor Muldowney stated that there were a number of repeating themes throughout the supplementary consultation response, one of which was a lack of detail being provided by HE, and the impact this had on providing an informed response. She felt that the consultation response could not address major concerns because of the lack of HE information, and asked if the Council would get the opportunity to do this before Development Consent Order (DCO) submission. The Assistant Director LTC replied that the Council had a work programme in place with HE, and although this was currently behind schedule, she was expecting environmental information from HE soon, which would be submitted for technical approval. She stated that for large schemes such as the LTC a limited amount of information could be provided before DCO submission. She clarified that if the programme was met then a substantial amount of information would be provided, which would be difficult to analyse with current resources. She stated that HE's current timeline would mean that DCO would be submitted by late summer 2020, and at this point officers would have 14 days to provide an adequacy of consultation response. She added that once the DCO was submitted, the Council and its consultants would have thousands of pages of information to analyse, so Council and external consultant's resources would need to be increased.

Councillor Shinnick asked when the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) would be provided by HE, as this was a concern across Thurrock due to the increased rate of COPD. The Assistant Director LTC replied that the team were working hard on this, and quarterly meetings had been set-up between HE, Thurrock's health team and other local authorities. She stated that Thurrock and other affected local authorities had written to HE to express their concern regarding the HIA and asked for this to be presented pre-DCO submission. She added that the route had to be compliant with the National Policy Statement, and therefore HE were not legally obliged to produce an HIA, but the Council were still pushing for one. She stated that there was a presumption in favour of development from the government, and the Council were at the stage of trying to identify potential mitigation, unless there was a National Policy Statement review.

Councillor Massey asked if the Council or HE had considered the number of construction workers that would be entering the borough, and where they would be housed. The Assistant Director LTC stated that at the peak of construction there would be approximately 1200 construction workers, and the

plan was to build some Porta-cabin accommodation on site at Tilbury, similar to the accommodation currently being used on the A14 works. She added that an accommodation study would be completed by HE, which the Council would be able to access and review. The Assistant Director LTC stated that she felt concerned as HE also believed there would be enough housing within the borough to accommodate LTC construction workers. She also felt concerned about the construction workers need to travel into the borough, as roads were currently already congested and this could increase the problem. She stated that the supplementary consultation response needed to be strategic, so could not include this level of detail, but would be addressed by officers.

The Resident Representative asked if the traffic modelling had proven that the LTC would provide traffic congestion benefit. The Assistant Director LTC responded that the traffic model had used data from 2016, but had now been updated with more recent data. She highlighted that the Council had asked for the updated traffic model, but this had not yet been received. She clarified that traffic modelling was only a prediction, and not an exact science as you could not model people's behaviours. She stated that the proposed route would provide some level of mitigation, and explained that the capacity at the Dartford Crossing was 135,000 vehicles per day, but was currently operating at 155-160,000 vehicles per day. She stated that once the LTC was opened the number of vehicles at Dartford would be reduced to 135,000 vehicles per day, but this was still at capacity. She mentioned that HE predicted 30million vehicles would use the LTC within its first year of opening.

The Chair then asked if cut and cover could be provided along the route, as he felt the route passed close by residents houses and they needed some level of protection. He asked if there were exact figures relating to the cost to add cut and cover along the route. The Assistant Director LTC responded that although cost was one factor in refusing cut and cover along the entire route, there was other factors too such as land conditions, flooding and contamination. She stated that if the entire route was put into a tunnel there could be no future growth, as junctions could be not be added.

Councillor Allen felt that the HE should get the route 'right by design' and highlighted the contamination at Linford from a Victorian landfill. He asked if the Tilbury Link Road would be added to the proposal, now the RaSA had been removed. The Assistant Director LTC clarified that the Tilbury Link Road was not part of the LTC funding, but the published RIS2 had included funding for the road. She stated that it would be delivered as part of RIS3, which would be delivered between 2025 and 2030, and she hoped that one contractor would be used, as the opening date for the LTC would be 2028.

Councillor Muldowney highlighted figures from the economic report and stated that although the economic impact on the borough could be £200million, this did not include social development being lost, loss of land, or blight. The Assistant Director LTC stated that the economic report was a study that had been commissioned by the Council, and driven by enquiries from key stakeholders, such as the Port of London, who had needed quantified economics. She stated that Hatch Regeneris had quantified the impacts on

the borough, which had been summarised as four main themes: community and health impacts; economic impact; growth impact; and the environment. She stated that this report had put a monetary value on these impacts, such as loss of open space or increased rates of COPD, and the next piece of work would look into how the design of the route could be changed to deliver benefits for the borough.

The Chair asked if Coronavirus would have any impact on the route. The Assistant Director LTC replied that the Council and HE were currently unsure of the impact that COVID-19 would have on the scheme. She stated that HE consultation events were still going ahead as of the 16 March, but felt concerned for vulnerable residents who wished to attend. She highlighted that the Council were following Public Health England's advice, but that the adequacy of consultation response could consider the impact of COVID-19 and the public's ability to attend events. She added that although Coronavirus could delay the scheme or lead to further consultation, only one DCO had been refused at submission, and this was because of environmental factors, rather than inadequate consultation.

Councillor Allen felt there would be few benefits to the residents of Thurrock, but asked if profit made from the tolls could be given to Thurrock's healthcare system to help residents with respiratory issues. The Assistant Director LTC responded that as part of the supplementary consultation, HE had promised a residents discount scheme, which would run in conjunction with the discount scheme for the Dartford Crossing. She added that HE were also considering a percentage of the tolls being transferred into a sinking fund for community benefit.

The Chair highlighted potential problems with the removal of the third lane southbound at the A13/M25 junction, and felt this would create a bottleneck and problems on the strategic road network. The Assistant Director LTC replied that the third lane currently being added to the A13 would also be used as a slip road to the LTC, so would remove any additional capacity. She added that HE had to demonstrate that compulsory land purchases were proportionate, adequate and necessary, and as the traffic modelling showed the additional lane was not necessary, HE would not be able to provide the additional lane. She stated that as compulsory purchase of land interfered with a person's human rights, there was very strict criteria to be met before the purchase of any land.

The Resident Representative questioned whether any remedial works would be carried out at the Dartford Crossing to allow for unescorted tanker movements, as otherwise the LTC would become the focus for HGV movements, which would increase pollution. The Assistant Director LTC responded that it would not be possible to alter the Dartford Crossing to allow unescorted tankers through, due to the size of the tunnel. She added that she had attended a meeting on the LTC tunnel safety, but the detail had not been clarified yet. She felt that the blue light emergency responses were currently being stretched with the recent Coronavirus outbreak, but she had spoken to Essex Police regarding the impact that the LTC could have on the service.

She felt that funding to the emergency services would need to be increased to deal with the added pressures stemming from the LTC.

Councillor Muldowney questioned what potential benefits the route could bring to local businesses. The Assistant Director LTC responded that there were tangible benefits to the route which were the increase of Public Rights of Way, and the supply chain school which had been set-up by HE. She mentioned that the supply chain school benefitted local businesses as it equipped them with the knowledge to apply for contracts with HE. She stated that it benefitted smaller businesses such as caterers, stationers, and clothing shops, rather than Tier 1 contractors, but recent supply chain events had not been well attended. She felt that if HE could get the message to local businesses, then this could boost the local economy. She added that HE also wanted to increase skills training for local residents, and that she had been in contact with South East Essex College regarding new courses such as project management. She added that HE were behind on this work, as it needed planning and lead-up time to prepare. She felt that if HE upskilled residents and increased training resources, it would ensure residents were ready to be employed when the route entered the construction phase. She added that HE could not be un-competitive, and if there was a skill shortage in Thurrock then HE would need to go elsewhere.

Councillor Rice then read a note from the HE Local Government Lead as below:

*In the case of the Gammon Field Travellers' Site, which will be impacted by the Lower Thames Crossing, we are consulting on two replacement sites. We are currently consulting on these proposals and we want to hear people's views on them. After consultation closes, we will consider the responses and take an informed position on how to progress. It may be the case that the locations proposed during the supplementary consultation are not final. We will continue to engage with interested parties about the locations. If there are changes that require further consultation, then we will consult.*

The Assistant Director LTC commented that this statement was as a response to enquiries from residents and Councillors, and that she had spoken to HE who had stated that no decisions had been made. She highlighted that Thurrock Council were landlords to the residents of Gammon Fields, and they had to ensure their tenants were looked after. She added that there were two sites currently being considered, both of which were off Long Lane. She clarified that discussions would be held between HE, residents of Long Lane and Gammon Fields before any decision was reached, and a needs assessment would be undertaken. The Assistant Director LTC then ran through the proposed timeline for the LTC and clarified that any member of the public could register as an interested party and make a representation to the Planning Inspectorate at the examination phase.

## **51. Task Force Priorities List**

There were no updates to the Task Force Priorities List.

**52. Work Programme**

There were no updates to the Work Programme.

**The meeting finished at 6.30 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)

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 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"> <li>• Significant traffic relief to local roads – particularly west of the A1089.</li> </ul>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

New Questions:

Qu Number	Mitigation Schedule Reference	Topic	Question	Response	Actions
8	N/A	Benefits	What's in the scheme for 'us'? ie residents and businesses	<p>Response from HE: As you are aware, the broader benefits are set out within the statutory consultation material. However, in order to summarise, we believe these broader benefits will flow from the seven Highways England objectives for the project (three of which are less relevant for this discussion) and our subsequent technical discussions can be guided accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

				<p>job opportunities for those living in the region, and a greater pool of potential employees. They also boost the market for local businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><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</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--



				<p>sympathetically as possible. A number of green bridges are being considered with features such as timber barriers and bollards, gravel, coppice woodland, ground cover planting and shrubs. We will also keep the road as low as possible within the landscape and use natural screening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><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</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>opening, vastly improving journey times and reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>To improve resilience of the Thames crossings and the major road network</u> <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> </ul> </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</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

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

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

**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force  
Work Programme 2020/21**

Dates of Meetings: 15 June 2020, 20 July 2020, 17 August 2020, 21 September 2020, 12 October 2020, 16 November 2020, 14 December 2020, 18 January 2021, 15 February 2021, 15 March 2021, 19 April 2021

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Requested by Officer/Member</b>
<b>15 June 2020 - Cancelled</b>		
<b>20 July 2020</b>		
Nomination of Chair	Democratic Services	Officers
Nomination of Vice-Chair	Democratic Services	Officers
LTC Consultation Presentation	Anna Eastgate	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>17 August 2020</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>21 September 2020</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>12 October 2020</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members

Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>16 November 2020</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 December 2020</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>18 January 2021</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>15 February 2021</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>15 March 2021</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>19 April 2021</b>		
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers