

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

This meeting will be held at **6pm on 21 September 2020**

Due to government guidance on social distancing and the COVID-19 virus, the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force on 21 September 2020 will not be open for members of the press and public to attend. The press and public will be able to watch the meeting live online at the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/thurrockcouncil>

Venue (for members only):

Council Chambers, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, RM17 6SL

Membership:

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

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 14
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 20 July 2020.	
3 Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	

4	Declaration of Interests	
5	Highways England Attendance	
6	Task Force Priorities List	15 - 34
7	Work Programme	35 - 36

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

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

Agenda published on: **11 September 2020**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Due to current government guidance on social-distancing and the COVID-19 virus, council meetings will not be open for members of the public to physically attend. Arrangements have been made for the press and public to watch council meetings live via the Council's online webcast channel: www.youtube.com/user/thurrockcouncil

Members of the public 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 will be recorded with the audio recording being published on the Council's website. The meeting will also be filmed and live streamed. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

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

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

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

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 20 July 2020 at 6.00 pm

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

In attendance: Anna Eastgate, Assistant Director of Lower Thames Crossing and Transport Infrastructure Projects
Lucy Tricker, Democratic Services Officer

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

Gareth Protheroe, Highways England Representative
Phil Stanier, Highways England Representative

Dermot Scanlon, PBA Consultants Representative

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being live-streamed onto YouTube.

1. **Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence received.

2. **Nomination of Chair**

Councillor Fraser Massey was elected Chair of the LTC Task Force 2020/21 with 5 votes.

3. **Nomination of Vice-Chair**

Councillor Gerard Rice was elected as Vice-Chair of the LTC Task Force 2020/21 with the agreement of the Task Force.

4. **Minutes**

The Resident Representative stated that his name had been missed from the attendance list.

With this amendment, the minutes from Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 16 March 2020 were approved as a true and correct record.

5. **Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

6. Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

7. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference were noted by the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force.

8. LTC Design Consultation

Mr Protheroe began his presentation by introducing himself and stating that he was the Development Director for Cascade, who worked on behalf of Highways England (HE). He introduced the design refinement consultation that was currently taking place and stated that he would be providing an overview to the consultation through his presentation, and wanted as many responses from stakeholders and residents as possible. He moved on and stated that the proposed LTC would be the biggest investment in Kent and Essex since the M25, and the Department for Transport and Highways England believed it would double road capacity, whilst supporting local and regional growth by opening up markets. He mentioned that there would be opportunities for residents both during the construction phase and in the longer term.

Mr Protheroe moved on to outlining the refinements to the scheme that had been made since supplementary consultation, including a reduction in the overall size of the development boundary and other changes such as, updated pedestrian paths, and fewer utilities diversions. He added that more detailed landscaping work had also been undertaken, and HE had completed some ecological mitigation measures. He clarified that because of COVID-19 no in-person consultation events would be taking place, and HE were adopting a 'digital first' approach, which included postal and telephone consultation. He stated that deposit locations and information points for consultation documents had been limited by government guidelines on COVID-19.

Mr Protheroe then discussed the reduction of the size of the development boundary, which had been reduced from 26.21km to 22.89km, which equalled a reduction of 12.5%. He stated that the homes affected by the scheme had also been reduced by 45% to 150 homes, and these reductions had been achieved through utility diversions. Mr Protheroe understood that the scheme would have a large personal impact on those homeowners affected, but felt this was relatively small for such a large scheme. He clarified that certain parcels of land would only be needed during the construction period for utilities diversions and construction sites, and would be returned to landowners in its previous condition once the scheme was complete.

Mr Protheroe moved on to discuss the environmental impacts of the scheme, and stated that the design refinement had also managed to decrease the impact of the scheme on areas of ancient woodland, and improve habitats for some species, through the introduction of green bridges. He added that 17 noise barriers had also now been added along the route, as well as landscaping proposals to minimise the visual impact of the project on above ground infrastructure. He added that the scheme also required a small number of permanent substations, some larger substations, and a switching station, which would all be fenced off to ensure security. He added that the refinement consultation also outlined the new plans for connecting the water mains to the Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM), and the use of trenchless technology for below ground utilities.

Mr Protheroe then explained the differences at the north tunnel entrance from supplementary consultation to design refinement. He clarified that the main improvement was the earthworks provision of nice views to Coalhouse Fort and Tilbury Fort, which had been added to the tunnel entrance. He stated that these earthworks would be used from construction spoil, and the area around the tunnel entrance would be returned to its current grazing usage. Mr Protheroe then moved onto the differences at the design refinement stage in Tilbury, and outlined the four noise barriers that would be over 700m long and 1-2m high. He stated that these would be positioned in Tilbury between the tunnel and Muckingford Road. He added that footpath 61 had also been realigned and amended slightly, and footpath 200 had been diverted to allow better connectivity for pedestrians between Tilbury and Chadwell St Mary. Mr Protheroe added that a new water supply would also be added in Linford to provide water to the TBM, which would be placed in the Fort Road, Lower Crescent, Muckingford Road, Coopers Shaw Road, Gun Hill area.

Councillor Allen questioned whether any water from the Thames could be used for the TBM. Mr Protheroe confirmed that HE had considered this option, but was not viable due to water quality, reliability, water extraction, and the lack of fire suppressant. Councillor Allen asked if the water used for the TBM would reduce water pressure for residents in Linford. Mr Protheroe confirmed that this was the reason a new water main was being added in the Fort Road area, and confirmed that water pressure would not be affected. Councillor Allen queried whether the noise barriers would be on the elevated sections of the LTC, near to the old power station. Mr Stanier confirmed that noise barriers in Tilbury would be located east near Station Road, and would be up to 2m high, as well as near Muckingford Road, where they would also be 2m in height. He added that noise barriers would also be added where the LTC crossed the Tilbury Loop Line and these would be approximately 1m in height. Councillor Allen queried when the Council and Task Force would be able to see the Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA), and Mr Protheroe confirmed that a working version of the document had been shared with Council officers, but would not be published until Development Consent Order (DCO) submission in autumn 2020. The Assistant Director LTC confirmed that various chapters of the early draft EIA had been shared with Council officers on the same day that the design refinement consultation had been announced, so officers had not had a chance to review it yet.

The Resident Representative questioned how effective the noise barriers would be. Mr Protheroe replied that he could not comment as HE were working with Thurrock to complete the Local Landscape Impact Assessment. He clarified that this document would take into account the landscape to ensure that noise barriers were as effective as they could be, but it could be difficult as the barriers required regular maintenance access. He added that HE created noise calculations based on traffic figures in surrounding areas, and the standard noise barrier was a 2m high timber fence. He mentioned that this would not be confirmed until the standard pre and post surveying had been completed. He highlighted that the EIA would set out the performance of the noise barriers, and further potential mitigation would be detailed at this phase.

Mr Protheroe continued with his presentation and outlined the changes at design refinement consultation to the Orsett Cock roundabout. He stated that the proposed location for the travellers site had been moved to adjacent their current site, with access from Gammonfields Way. He commented that the potential site would be 1.5 hectares, with an additional 1.5 hectares for access and landscaping. Mr Protheroe stated that changes had also been made to the A13 merge layout, as this would now be a two lane merge, rather than one lane. He stated that false cutting had also been removed between A128 Brentwood Road and Hoford Road due to a watercourse, but additional planting and fencing, including noise barriers 550m long and 6m in height, would be included to visually screen the road. Mr Protheroe mentioned that seven small substations would also be near the A13/LTC junction, as well as necessary maintenance tracks, and the previously proposed shared path under the A13 had been removed. He stated that at supplementary consultation a new footpath under the A13 had been considered, but had not been progressed to this stage due to the closeness to the A13. He added that HE had also considered the woodland near Baker Street, and in the new design, the public would be able to access this. He added that noise barriers would also be put in place at the Orsett Cock roundabout, which would be 500m long and 5m in height. The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative queried this figure, as in the consultation documents on page 59, it stated 2m high. Mr Stanier confirmed this was an error in the presentation and the noise barriers at Orsett Cock would be 2m high.

Mr Protheroe continued the presentation and confirmed that part of the Orsett Showground site would be permanently required for construction, as a gas pipeline would have to be moved. He added that a replacement site adjacent to the current site had been proposed. Mr Stanier confirmed that because of this, there would be a larger noise barrier near Brentwood Road. Mr Protheroe stated that in the Mardyke Valley, noise barriers up to 1500m long and 1m high would be in place, as well as long sections of the viaduct and embankment. He added that utility works would also be permanently created in this area, with access from Green Lane, which had increased the boundary development there. Mr Protheroe moved on to describing the changes at design refinement consultation at the junction between the LTC and M25, and stated that noise barriers would be in place which would be 200m long and

2m in height. He added that woodland planting would also have to be reduced in The Wilderness as a result of a watercourse diversion. He added that a small 3mx3m substation would be added near to Clay Tides Farm. Mr Protheroe confirmed that the Thames Chase Forest Centre (TCFC) would also need a new maintenance track due to multi-utilities diversion to the north of the site, but a proposed footbridge over the M25 would reconnect the TCFC with the wider environment. He added that sewer diversion works would also be needed from Ockendon Road to St Marys Lane, as well as overhead electricity cable diversion works around B186 North Road. Mr Protheroe also confirmed that a new footbridge would be added at junction 29 of the M25, over the A127, as well as gas diversion works near Folkes Lane, and the movement of electricity cables underground around the LTC.

Mr Protheroe stated that the design refinement consultation would last between 14 July and 12 August, and there was a specific consultation website, as well as moderated webinars and telephone surgery. He stated that consultation documents were available online and via post, and the online website also contained exhibitions, such as interactive maps, boards and videos. He added that there were also live events that had been promoted through various social media channels, and a leaflet drop to every affects resident within a 2km radius of the route. He mentioned that a total of 135,000 leaflets had been distributed, as well as print media and stakeholder engagement with the consultation.

Mr Protheroe moved onto outlining the progress of the scheme so far, starting with the first public consultation in spring 2016, the preferred route announcement in April 2017, and the statutory consultation in October 2018, the start of ground investigation works in July 2019, and finally the supplementary consultation in January 2020. He outlined the next steps of the project which included the conclusion of the design consultation in August 2020, DCO submission in autumn 2020, DCO examination, with a decision being made in 2022, and a targeted road opening of 2027/28.

Mr Protheroe hoped that residents and stakeholders would get involved with the design consultation, as 74,000 people had visited the consultation website for the supplementary consultation, with 6,000 responses submitted.

Councillor Jefferies opened questions and stated that as there were no public consultation events, large sections of Thurrock residents might not be able to access the consultation. He added that as leaflets had only been dropped within a 2km radius of the route, large sections of Thurrock such as Chadwell St Mary and Ockendon, may not be aware that the route might affect them. Councillor Jefferies asked if HE could write to all residents outlining the proposals. He also asked what HE plans were for woodland in Ockendon, and what footbridge work would be undertaken in that area. Mr Protheroe stated that residents who would be affected by the scheme had received two weeks' notice prior to the design consultation, to give residents enough time to request paper copies of the consultation. He added that a footbridge in Ockendon over the LTC had been included in the supplementary consultation, and had been wrongly listed in the presentation as a new feature at design

refinement. Councillor Jefferies felt that not all residents were aware of the route, even though it could affect their lives and asked for HE to consider all Thurrock residents, including those in Ockendon, Chadwell St Mary and Tilbury. Mr Protheroe confirmed that residents should have been made aware of the scheme during statutory and supplementary consultation, and the design refinement had not made any significant changes. The Assistant Director LTC felt that the design refinement consultation should have been postponed due to the lack of in-person consultation events. She highlighted that Thurrock Council had currently postponed any consultations due to concerns around engagement, particularly as deposit locations such as libraries and the civic offices. She stated that some areas of Thurrock had poor internet infra-structure, and Thurrock had documented this and raised concerns with HE.

Councillor Rice asked if HE had considered proposals to move the route further east, towards Canvey Island, which had better connectivity routes to A120, M11, A14, A1/M1, A127, A12 and A130. He felt that the proposed crossing would not offer a long-term solution to the problems at the Dartford Crossing, and would negatively impact the countryside and green spaces in Thurrock. He felt noise barriers should be put in around Foxes Green and Orsett Heath as some residential properties in this area would come within 200m of the proposed route. He stated that Thurrock residents have the highest rates of COPD outside of London, and the new route would increase pollution and respiratory problems amongst the population. He asked if HE had considered putting the route into a tunnel, or cut and cover, as had been done along section of the M25. He asked if HE could send a copy of the presentation made at the meeting to every resident, with particular focus on those in East Tilbury, South Ockendon, Orsett, Bulphan and Chadwell St Mary. Councillor Rice added that 6m high noise barriers should be added along Heath Road, Godman Road and Cedar Road, as well as near the tower blocks in Chadwell St Mary. Mr Protheroe responded that lots of investigation work had been done before the preferred route announcement in 2017, and the current location had been optimum. He added that the EIA would show the impact on air quality across the borough, and would present potential mitigation, when it was published at DCO submission. He added that cut and cover and tunnels along the route had been considered, but were not cost-effective. He added that the consultation documents were available to all residents for their consideration, and would be sent free of charge in the post, if residents needed it.

The Assistant Director LTC added that in general, noise barriers ranged from 1m to 6m in height, and asked HE if the height of the noise barriers along the route would be linked to land and road level. She felt concerned that a 1m high noise barrier would not be useful if the road was elevated higher than the existing ground. Mr Protheroe replied that no detailed designs had been developed, but the height of the noise barriers was based on the use of 3D land models of the surrounding area. He stated that HE also used traffic forecasting and webtag approved software to model the road conditions, before modelling with mitigations included to see the difference. The Assistant Director LTC shared her concerns regarding the visual impact of the noise

barriers, as this could negatively affect residents who would live near the proposed route. Mr Protheroe replied that the visual impact of the noise barriers would be discussed in the EIA.

Councillor Muldowney felt that the supplementary consultation had been flawed due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, which had distracted people. She added that she felt the design refinement consultation would also be flawed, for example the phone number to request consultation documents was not a Freephone number, and libraries were not open for deposit locations. She stated that at the last Task Force meeting, they had considered the response to the supplementary consultation, and asked how this response had fed into the design refinement consultation. She felt that she was not able to answer resident's questions, as the EIA was not being published until DCO submission, which she felt was too late. She added that she had also been having problems with the online supplementary consultation, as she had had to submit her response three times, and then received a bounce back email. She felt that all consultations should be accessible for everybody, including those that did not have access to the internet. Mr Protheroe noted Councillor Muldowney's feelings towards the supplementary consultation, and stated that it had been extended by two weeks due to the outbreak of the pandemic. He stated that all government guidelines had been followed, such as no face-to-face meetings, but felt that the consultation was still accessible. He added that he would look into Councillor Muldowney's problems with the email bounce back. He added that the response from supplementary consultation had been included in this consultation, such as the reduced impact for ancient woodland, and highlighted that a consultation response document would be included at DCO submission, in which all responses would be summarised. Mr Stanier confirmed that to call HE to request consultation documents was a standard local rate.

Councillor Spillman sought assurance from HR that the responses from all consultations would be considered before the proposal went to DCO submission. He felt that the borough had seen massive change in travel usage post-COVID19, as more people worked from home, which was a trend that was likely to continue. He asked if HE would pause the scheme to consider the fundamental changes in usage of cars, and if the scheme would still be necessary. Mr Protheroe responded that HE's current traffic model did not take into account travel post-COVID, but this position would be included as the scheme progressed. The Assistant Director LTC questioned the inclusion of green vehicles in the traffic model. Mr Protheroe replied that HE used conservative estimations in the number of green vehicles at road opening, as the EIA always considered the 'worst case scenario'. He stated that there was a piece of work to be completed regarding the level of traffic post-COVID, but people did not currently know the long-term effects or changes in working environments.

Councillor Shinnick queried the movement of the traveller's site, and the Assistant Director LTC confirmed that the petition had been submitted to Full Council asking for the Council not to consider any sites in the Blackshots area. She stated that the current proposal moved the traveller's immediately

west of their current location, which was approximately 350m away from the nearest properties.

Councillor Rice queried the proposed construction hours for the site, and asked if HE were going to try to reduce the number of construction vehicles. Mr Protheroe responded that HE would work with Thurrock to develop a Code of Construction Practice, which would set out the construction constraints and performance specification. He stated that the finalised construction hours would be set out in the local road impact report, which would be submitted at DCO. The Assistant Director LTC clarified that although Thurrock could impact the Code of Construction Practice, HE would have final sign-off of the document. She shared Councillor Rice's concern over the currently proposed construction hours.

The Thames Crossing Action Group (TCAG) Representative stated that she had been liaising with residents across the borough, and confirmed that some had received letters when they were outside the development boundary, and others inside the development boundary had not received anything. She added that HE's Lower Thames Crossing website had not been updated to reflect the design refinement consultation, which could also be confusing for residents. She added that the map books had some errors, such as wrong place names and spellings, and map book three was also incorrect. She felt that the design refinement consultation was rushed, and that HE needed to listen to the supplementary consultation responses before launching another consultation. She felt that some residents were also experiencing consultation fatigue, as there had now been three lengthy consultations. Mr Protheroe began his response by stating that if residents felt concerned regarding any letter they had received, they could call HE who would discuss the matter with them. The TCAG Representative stated that the land and property team took a long time to respond, in some cases up to fourteen days. Mr Stanier replied that if residents received a letter stating they were in the development boundary, they could schedule a follow-up call the next day.

Councillor Allen stated that the route needed to be right by design, and should mitigate the long lasting impacts that the route would cause to residents health. He stated that as the route would be a toll-road, any cost of the scheme would be repaid in full, and asked if some of this money could go towards protecting people's health across Thurrock. Mr Protheroe replied that this was not within the remit of HE, and would fall under the Department of Transport. Councillor Muldowney asked when an update would be received regarding the Health Impact Assessment, as the borough already had increased rates of COPD and other respiratory problems. Mr Protheroe replied that the HIA would be made public at DCO submission.

The Assistant Director LTC stated that she had written formally to HE and documented all the concerns that had been raised by the Task Force. She felt that the consultation was rushed and there was a lack of information sharing from HE. She added that once the DCO had been submitted, the Council's ability to change the route was dramatically reduced. She questioned what economic growth and improvement would be seen by Thurrock residents, and

questioned who the new earthworks and views from the north tunnel portal could be viewed by, whether for the resident or road user. Mr Protheroe replied that the scheme would benefit Thurrock as the Benefit-Cost Ratio proved this. He stated he would set out the specific benefits and look to share this at a later date. The Assistant Director LTC highlighted that the Benefit-Cost Ratio highlighted the benefits for the wider Essex area, Kent and the East Midlands, but did not show the benefits for Thurrock specifically. Mr Protheroe added that the earthworks views over the northern portal would be for the resident, as they would be able to access this area.

9. Task Force Priorities List

The Task Force Priorities List was noted.

10. Work Programme

Councillor Rice asked if HE could attend the Task Force meeting in September, and the Chair confirmed he would look into it.

The meeting finished at 9.22 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

Thurrock Lower Thames Crossing Task Force - Summary of Key Priorities

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

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

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

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

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

				<p>was estimated to cost 40% more than Option C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To achieve value for money: The low traffic demand, limited relief to Dartford and greater cost of Option C indicated that Option D would provide low value for money• Minimise adverse impacts on health and the environment: Option D would have had a significant effect on a number of SSSIs along the route.• To relieve the congested Dartford Crossing and approach roads and improve their performance by providing free flowing north-south capacity: Option D would take around 3% off the traffic at Dartford and would take 50% less traffic than at Option C.• To improve resilience: Resilience would be provided, however, being distant from the M25 and existing Dartford Crossing would mean that were there a problem at Dartford, it would be a very long diversion to use a route at Option D's location.• To improve safety: Only limited safety improvements would be gained from Option D.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

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

1d	3, 9, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54,	Contracts	When can local contractors access all current and future HE contracts	<p>Should also request an indicative programme for the procurement process for the scheme. Market engagement day was held in April this year with A303 Stonehenge scheme which has just been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for consent.</p> <p>HE Response: local labour, suppliers and contractors are essential to delivering this project, should the scheme be approved and subsequently constructed. The Procurement Strategy, currently being drafted, will include the relevant commitments and our approach to early market engagement. The procurement process timetable is currently under review.</p> <p>A Prior Information Notice (PIN) was issued to inform the market that the LTC may, at a future date, wish to buy goods and services. This is standard practice for a project of this scale and does not commit Highways England to carrying out work or issuing contracts.</p> <p>On 6 March the LTC will attend the Thurrock Business Conference, where local businesses will be able</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"> • <u>To support sustainable local development and regional economic growth in the medium to long term</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTC will support this by strengthening and connecting local communities and improving access to jobs, housing, leisure and retail facilities on both sides of the river. ○ Poor connectivity across the Thames east of London severs local labour and product markets, impacting economies in the surrounding area. Better connections across the river mean more 	

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

				<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">○ By creating habitats for wildlife, protected species such as otters, water voles and bats, establishing new woodlands and ensuring landscapes are sensitively designed we aim to protect and enhance this rich landscape● <u>To relieve the congested Dartford Crossing and approach roads, and improve their performance by providing free-flowing, north-south capacity</u>○ LTC will reduce the number of vehicles using the crossing by 22 per cent with 13 million fewer vehicles using the crossing at	
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
15 June 2020 - Cancelled		
20 July 2020		
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
17 August 2020 - Cancelled		
21 September 2020		
Highways England Attendance	Anna Eastgate	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
12 October 2020		
Proposed Economic Mitigation	Anna Eastgate	Members
Task Force Priorities List	Anna Eastgate	Members

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