

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

## Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

The meeting will be held at **6.00 pm** on **12 July 2021**

**Council Chambers, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM16 7SL**

There is very limited space for press and public to physically attend this meeting due to social distancing requirements. We advise anyone wishing to physically attend to book a seat in advance via [direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk) to ensure a place.

Arrangements have been made for the press and public to watch the meeting live via the Council's online webcast channel: [www.thurrock.gov.uk/webcast](http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/webcast)

### Membership:

Councillors Fraser Massey (Chair), John Kent (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Adam Carter, Daniel Chukwu, Sara Muldowney, Terry Piccolo and Sue Sammons

---

### Agenda

Open to Public and Press

### Page

#### 1 Apologies for Absence

#### 2 Minutes

5 - 10

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 14 June 2021.

#### 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

<b>5</b>	<b>Highways England Attendance</b>	
<b>6</b>	<b>HEQIA QA Review: Update Paper</b>	<b>11 - 16</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Work Programme</b>	<b>17 - 20</b>

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

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

Agenda published on: **2 July 2021**

## **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, there will be limited seating available for the press and members of the public to physically attend council meetings. Anyone wishing to attend physically should email [direct-democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:direct-democracy@thurrock.gov.uk) to book a seat. Alternatively, council meetings can be watched live via the Council's online webcast channel: [www.thurrock.gov.uk/webcast](http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/webcast)

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 live streamed and recorded with the video recording being published via the Council's online webcast channel: [www.thurrock.gov.uk/webcast](http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/webcast)

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.

### **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 14 June 2021 at 6.00 pm

---

<b>Present:</b>	Councillors Gary Byrne, Adam Carter, Daniel Chukwu, John Kent (Vice-Chair), Fraser Massey (Chair), Sara Muldowney and Sue Sammons
<b>Apologies:</b>	Laura Blake: Thames Crossing Action Group Representative Westley Mercer: Thurrock Business Board Representative Peter Ward: Business Representative
<b>In attendance:</b>	Colin Black, Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery Lucy Tricker, Senior Democratic Services Officer  Chris Stratford, Senior Consultant – Stantec Robert Quick, Resident Representative

---

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being recorded, and livestreamed onto the Council's website.

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Laura Blake (Thames Crossing Action Group Representative); Westley Mercer (Thurrock Business Board Representative), and Peter Ward (Business Representative).

### 2. Nomination of Chair

Councillor Fraser Massey was nominated and voted as Chair of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force for the 2021/22 municipal year.

### 3. Nomination of Vice-Chair

Councillor John Kent was nominated and voted as Vice-Chair of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force for the 2021/22 municipal year.

### 4. Minutes

The minutes from the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) Task Force meeting held on 15 March 2021 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 interests declared.

## **7. Economic Mitigation List**

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that it had been sent to Highways England (HE) in November 2020, and had been published on the Council's website on 24 February 2021. He explained that since then, nine meetings had been held between HE and Thurrock Council to discuss the 57 mitigation items. He stated that they were split into three groups: 23 direct mitigation measures, for example future proofing and construction impact; 12 council-led support mitigation measures; and 24 legacy mitigation measures, which included the A13 trunking, East Facing Slips, the Asda roundabout, 5G provision on bridges, and the Tilbury loop line bridge. The Senior Consultant confirmed the HE had not agreed to 6 measures, and some of the remaining measures, such as the East Facing Slips access required high-level political intervention. He stated that the rest of the measures were still being discussed and that there had been some agreement on lower order matters, but discussion on bigger ticket items had been slow. He stated that Thurrock Council, including the Portfolio Holder, continued to meet with HE and the Department for Transport to discuss these mitigation measures.

The Senior Consultant then explained that only some measures could be agreed before Development Consent Order (DCO) submission, and some measures would need to be agreed later in the process, for example during the Examination phase. He explained that the Council were working hard to ensure as much mitigation was secured before DCO submission, and an update report outlining the developments of each mitigation measure would be brought before the Task Force later in the year. The Interim Assistant Director of Regeneration and Place Delivery added that there was also currently lots of work being undertaken to understand the finer detail of each mitigation measure, and numerous meetings were underway.

The Chair thanked the Senior Consultant and Interim Assistant Director of Regeneration and Place Delivery for their presentation, and asked for confirmation of the measures HE would not agree too. The Senior Consultant responded that these included:

1. M8 – construction phase trial initiatives for innovative public transport. He explained that HE had agreed to use electric buses to transport LTC workers, but no other mitigation measures had been agreed.
2. M12 - smart speed limits along the route, which would help control traffic flow and pollutant levels. He stated that although this had been ruled out at this stage, it may be possible to install these later on in the life of the project if required.
3. M18 – Hypothecation of LTC charges. He stated that a similar scheme as the one previously used some 10 years ago on the Dartford Crossing had been suggested, where charges were retained by the Council, but HE had not agreed to this.
4. L3 – Use of alignment of Haul Road to match the Tilbury Link Road



scheme. He explained that Haul Road would now be used as part of the Tilbury 2 'infrastructure corridor' and would be utilised along with the private routes inside the Port of Tilbury, so this mitigation measure was now academic.

5. L11 – legacy housing provision. He explained that HE were proposing to build 400 workers accommodation units, and 80 hyperbaric units for tunnel workers. He explained that HE believed all other workers would travel to the construction site, or would find local accommodation.

6. L20 – low emission vehicle usage targets, whereby Thurrock Council would be paid if HE exceeded these targets.

Councillor Kent queried the hypothecation measure, as it was not included in the report. He felt this was an important mitigation measure for the medium and long term. He felt that this measure should be pushed harder with HE to seek their agreement. He also queried L11 regarding workers housing, as both the LTC and London Resort being built in Kent would require lots of housing. He explained that London Resort planned on using old cruise ships parked in the river to accommodate workers. Councillor Kent added that the local housing market would not be able to cope with lots of additional workers, and there would also be an indirect impact on areas such as policing and anti-social behaviour. Councillor Muldowney felt disappointed that the report had not been updated, including the L15 mitigation measure and areas of additional concern surrounding Chadwell St Mary. She asked if the Task Force could see the full version of the report. The Senior Consultant stated that the full version of the report should have been published on the Council's website, as well as the updated version of the Executive Summary report dated November 2020 (subsequently requested to be updated accordingly by the Council's web team – [www.thurrock.gov.uk/thames-crossing](http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/thames-crossing)).

Councillor Carter queried the M4 mitigation measure, and asked if the Task Force could see the full data background and respective measurements. The Senior Consultant responded that HE were planning to install air quality and noise monitors along the proposed route this year. He explained that the Council were currently negotiating the exceedance framework, which would include what would happen if air quality or noise levels were exceeded. Councillor Muldowney stated that of the 58 mitigation measures, only two related to mitigation of economic effects, even though the scheme would have a significant financial impact. She queried whether the economic impact of the scheme would balance out. The Senior Consultant stated that he would respond in writing after the meeting.

The response in answer to Cllr Muldowney question is, as follows:  
'The initial 'LTC Economic Costs Study' identified a range of quantified and unquantified negative impacts of the proposed LTC scheme upon Thurrock. This included impacts upon the transport network, business operations, local communities, the environment and future growth within the area. It considered impacts during both the construction phase, as well as the completed operational phase of the LTC, subject to the information made available by the LTC Team.'

The 'LTC Mitigation Benefits Report' began the process of compiling a list of measures to directly mitigate against the identified shortfalls in the LTC design and construction process, but largely in an improved/qualitative way. This included the blight and disruption caused by construction, alongside a range of improvements to the transport network to ensure the LTC does not negatively affect local traffic movements. The report also sought to identify the direct and indirect resource requirements of Thurrock Council to ensure sufficient support for local workers, businesses and communities during the construction and/or operation of the LTC scheme. Then, recognising the negative impact of LTC upon the local environment, a series of mitigation measures were developed to enhance green space, support biodiversity, as well as reduce carbon emissions. Finally, a series of other infrastructure-related measures were identified to support the future growth of the area and to deliver legacy benefits that off-set the impact that the LTC infrastructure will have in terms of land losses and community severance.

Whilst it was not feasible to identify quantifiable measures that directly off-set all individually identified/quantified 'costs', the package of measures, taking into account elements already incorporated into the LTC design and DCO, is designed to ensure that Thurrock communities, businesses and the Council offset these overall costs and begin to build more positively on the impacts of the LTC scheme, as it was currently proposed in late 2020'.

The Chair asked if there was any alternative proposals regarding worker accommodation, as the Task Force and local residents did not want lots of non-permanent accommodation across the borough. He asked if HE would be willing to give the issue of worker accommodation to the Council. The Senior Consultant responded that there would be 480 worker accommodation units on-site, and HE proposed that other workers would need to travel to the site, obtain public/private rented accommodation, or purchase properties. He felt that HE believed these additional workers would not have an impact on the local housing market, but Thurrock Council were questioning this extensively. The Senior Consultant added that regarding the summary of the worker accommodation document Thurrock had sent lots of questions to HE regarding this document. He explained that so far no amendments had been made, and Thurrock had received no satisfactory responses to their questions. Councillor Kent felt that an influx of people looking to private rent in the area would increase the cost of rent for local residents, and queried if Thurrock Council housing officers were involved in discussions with HE. The Senior Consultant replied that the previous Assistant Director of Housing had been involved in discussions, and Thurrock were currently trying to receive the final figure of the number of workers who would travel into and out the borough from HE.

Councillor Byrne questioned L11 and asked if all worker accommodation units would be situated in Stanford-le-Hope. The Senior Consultant responded that this had originally been the plan under the previous Assistant Director of LTC,

but stated this had changed in recent months. Councillor Muldowney felt that construction workers travelling into and out of the borough would increase the pressure on the local road network, and queried if this had been captured in other documents. The Senior Consultant responded that this was captured in the Construction Framework Travel Plan, but Thurrock felt that this document was not detailed and did not make enough commitments. He stated that the Council would make it clear to HE that the document was not good enough, and would also question the reduced level of on-site parking, and required commitment that all construction worker buses would be electric.

The Resident Representative suggested that instead of updating the Hatch report, officers could bring a separate report which detailed updates on all mitigation measures. The Senior Consultant confirmed that an Update Report would be brought before the Task Force in the next couple of months. The Interim Assistant Director of Regeneration and Place Delivery added that the Council were currently negotiating on numerous mitigation measures, so a fully updated report might take some time. The Chair suggested a report be brought to the July Task Force meeting and to use a traffic light system for each mitigation measure.

Councillor Chukwu questioned L19 and if a low emission charge could be utilised in Thurrock. The Senior Consultant replied that this could form part of the government's draft decarbonisation plan, which included input from local stakeholders on how these measures would be delivered. He stated that it had been due to be published in the spring, but this had been delayed, and would therefore it was expected to be published soon. He explained that until the plan was published, he was not sure how it would relate to Thurrock.

## **8. Work Programme**

The Senior Consultant stated that the July Task Force meeting was being held two days before HE's next round of consultation, and asked if the Task Force would like to invite the HE Executive Director to the meeting to discuss the consultation. He added that an update on the mitigation measures could also be provided at the meeting. The Chair, and the rest of the Task Force, agreed to invite HE to the July Task Force meeting. The Chair stated that he would speak with the Transport Action Network and postpone their presentation to a later date.

Councillor Muldowney also requested an update on the Health Impact Assessment, which would include a copy of the shortcomings letter signed by nine local authorities, as well as the response from HE. The Senior Consultant confirmed that this would be included at the July Task Force meeting as an Update Paper.

**The meeting finished at 6.43 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)**

## LTC Task Force Paper

### Lower Thames Crossing Task Force – HEqIA Review Update

---

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. This paper has been prepared to provide an update to the LTC Task Force on an independent review of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA) associated with the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) project. This note covers the review process; the review conclusions and recommendations and next steps.

#### 2. The Review Process

- 2.1 Stantec UK was appointed by Thurrock Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Medway Council, Gravesham Borough Council, Essex County Council, Havering Borough Council, Kent County Council, Dartford Borough Council and Brentwood Borough Council (the 'commissioning authorities') to undertake an independent quality assurance (QA) review of the DCOv1 HEqIA report (the HEqIA) prepared by Highways England for the LTC. Objectives for the review were identified by the commissioning authorities through a Brief. Conclusions are provided against the Brief Objectives in Section 3 of this note.
- 2.2 Key elements of the approach to the review were agreed with the commissioning authorities and included the following:
- Review of the HEqIA against the Wales Health Impact Assessment Support Unit (WHIASU) Quality Assurance Review Framework for Health Impact Assessment (HIA). The framework is based on the extensive experience of the WHIASU, literature, and engagement and experience of professionals in the wider HIA community. The outcome of the completion of the framework is to enable the reviewer to understand the level of trust and confidence they can place in the content of the HIA, its findings and process and give clear feedback. Each criteria of the framework is graded from Good to Inadequate.
  - Review of the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) element of the HEqIA through consideration of whether 'due regard' (as enshrined in the Equality Act 2010) has been achieved. This considered robustness of baseline data selection against Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), robustness of consultation against Equality Act 2010 and PSED and review of the application of baseline data against the characteristics protected.
  - Review of Health and Wellbeing Strategies and equality objectives of the commissioning authorities to understand priorities identified for these areas. These have been reviewed against the HEqIA to help understand if the assessment has sufficiently considered local priorities for health, wellbeing and equality.
  - Engagement with technical experts who have reviewed the assessments and reports which have informed the HEqIA to understand if there are any technical deficiencies/ concerns that would have an impact on the conclusions stated in the HEqIA. This has included discussions with technical experts in relation to: air quality, noise and vibration, transport, stakeholder consultation, climate change, land contamination and flood risk and drainage. All other assessments and reports referenced within the HEqIA were checked to see that the conclusions have been appropriately incorporated into the HEqIA. A full technical review of these documents has not been undertaken.

## LTC Task Force Paper

- 2.3 Initial outcomes of the review were discussed with commissioning authorities and an agreed version of the review report was issued to the LTC team and discussed at a Community Impacts and Public Health advisory group (CIPHAG) meeting on 16 June 2021. This was attended by the LTC team, representatives from the commissioning authorities and Stantec. The LTC team noted that the report was a useful document and subsequently provided a response to the recommendations which is provided in Table 1 (Section 4).

### 3. The Review Conclusions

- 3.1 The HEqIA was predominantly undertaken to accord with Highways England's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges guidance (DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6, LA 112 Population and Human Health) and Highways England's EqIA, Screening Analysis and Monitoring template. However, it also makes reference to the use of WHIASU guidance. Based on the review undertaken, it is considered that the HEqIA does not fully meet the best practice requirements of the WHIASU HIA guidance. The following conclusions were made, against the commissioning authorities Brief Objectives:

***1. To determine if the evidence used to inform decisions on health impact are sufficiently robust and inclusive.***

- 3.2 A number of concerns have been raised with the source documents, e.g. Transport Assessment. Ongoing discussions are being undertaken between technical reviewers and Highways England. Concerns have also been raised regarding the consultation and stakeholder engagement activities undertaken, including how hard to reach groups have been engaged and how comments and concerns raised by stakeholders have been addressed. This is not made clear in the HEqIA,

***2. To determine if the LTC project is proportionately mitigating the negative health impacts and is also delivering health benefits and improved quality of life to the population. As part of this, for negative health impacts explicitly highlighted, whether these can be mitigated against or not.***

- 3.3 Limited information is provided on residual effects anticipated once mitigation measures are implemented and if these measures are effective. There is also limited information regarding proposed monitoring, the differentiation between mitigation and enhancement (measures to improve quality of life) and how these will be secured.

***3. To determine if the LTC project is giving sufficient attention to Health Inequalities and that health, wellbeing and inequalities have been considered in a systematic and robust manner. Adequate consideration should be given to findings at a ward, Borough/District and project level in order to determine this.***

- 3.4 The baseline data is predominantly reported at the local authority and ward level, with deprivation data shown at the Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA) level. This data has been used to determine the sensitivity of wards. However, it is unclear how the different sensitivities have been determined, how this has been considered in assessment and how localised effects on specific communities (within wards) have been considered.

***4. To consider the HEqIA in relation to local Health and Wellbeing Strategies.***

- 3.5 The HEqIA identifies local health and wellbeing strategies. The links between these and assessment have not been made explicitly clear and there is a lack of detail/documentation about how and why the topics and sensitive groups were scoped in, or which were considered and scoped out.

## LTC Task Force Paper

### **5. To determine if local residents have had sufficient opportunity to participate in decisions which affect their health and well-being through the HEqIA.**

- 3.6 There are concerns regarding the statutory consultation that has been undertaken, including the accessibility of the consultation events and material, including the impact of COVID-19. There is a lack of detail provided in relation to how vulnerable and hard to reach groups have been engaged and the outcomes of discussions which makes it unclear if all groups have had sufficient opportunity to comment.

## **4. The Review Recommendations**

- 4.1 Several areas in the review were identified as requiring clarification, in particular with regard to setting out the context of the LTC project, the HIA approach and the evidence base. Recommendations for areas identified as requiring strengthening or inadequate are provided in Table 1 and were predominantly in relation to the process and outcomes of stakeholder engagement and the appraisal, assessment and the identification of impacts. Responses provided by LTC to the recommendations, as received on 1 July 2021, are noted.

**Table 1: Review Recommendations and LTC Response**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>LTC Response</b>
<b>HIA</b>	
Provision of further information on construction phasing, how this may influence assessment and an explanation of how HEqIA has been planned and timed to inform decision making.	<b>Agreed.</b> Construction phasing has been presented and discussed at the June CIPHAG meeting and will be incorporated within the revised HEqIA for DCOv2.
Provision of further commentary and evidence to understand how the scope of the HEqIA was identified and agreed.	<b>Noted.</b> Further commentary and evidence around outcomes of discussions with CIPHAG concerning the scope of the HEqIA will be included in DCOv2. Discussions regarding scope have been held over the course of the past two years in CIPHAG meetings. Recent discussions have suggested that the scope of the HEqIA has now been agreed following the preparation of the Independent Review.
Provision of further information on how stakeholders were engaged and how this influenced assessment including the CIPHAG, focus groups and hard to reach groups.	<b>Partially agreed.</b> Further discussions have related to how information from stakeholder engagement can be incorporated into the revised HEqIA for DCOv2, together with measures used to reach hard to reach groups. There are ongoing discussions around what has been agreed across all CIPHAG meetings. Ongoing discussions around the focus groups which were held – LTC position is that these have formed just one part of engagement with sensitive groups and that wider conclusions have not been drawn from this sample.
Clarification of methodology including how ward sensitivity has been determined, through clear links to the baseline.	<b>Agreed.</b> Further detail around how ward sensitivity has been assessed will be included in the revised HEqIA for DCOv2.

## LTC Task Force Paper

<p>Justification /provision of methodology for aggregating impacts at general population / ward level. Use of GIS mapping for baseline and assessment information would enable a clearer understanding of the baseline and specific impacts, including effects on health inequalities.</p>	<p><b>Agreed.</b> More detail around impacts at local level to be provided within revised HEqIA for DCOv2.</p>
<p>Provision of further information about the duration of effects and severity and likelihood of the health outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Partially agreed.</b> It is noted within the Limitations section of the Independent Review that WHIASU guidance on undertaking HIA is regarded as best practice, but that the use of this guidance is not a statutory requirement. It is also noted that the review does not assess the HEqIA against other guidance and standards which may have been used, such as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) assessment criteria. This is a fundamental point to raise in that the HEqIA has been prepared taking into account a <i>range</i> of guidance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health, which requires a qualitative assessment of health to be undertaken, identifying changes to health determinants;</li> <li>• WHIASU guidance, particularly in relation to checklists of health and wellbeing determinants and vulnerable / disadvantaged groups; and</li> <li>• guidance provided by the Mental Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment Toolkit (National Mental Health Development Unit, 2011).</li> </ul> <p>The methodology for assigning impacts on health outcomes is set out in DMRB LA 112, which states that health outcomes should be described as positive, negative, neutral or uncertain. Whilst LA 112 states that <i>'it is not possible to quantify the severity or extent of the effects which give rise to these outcomes'</i>, the guidance also states that information should be presented relating to changes to health determinants as a result of a scheme or project, together with evidence provided to support conclusions. The HEqIA currently provides information around the plausibility of health outcomes as part of the review of evidence for each assessment topic. Whilst an assessment of severity as requested in the Independent Review is not proposed to be undertaken for each assessment topic, the provision of further evidence around the assessment made will increase understanding of the level of health outcomes anticipated.</p>
<p>Some concerns were identified with the technical data sources used to inform the HEqIA these should be considered. Clarification should be provided on how the</p>	<p><b>Noted.</b> The technical concerns raised in Appendix A of the Independent Review relate to a variety of other documents and assessments produced as part of DCOv1. We</p>



## LTC Task Force Paper

level of effect identified in the source assessment has been translated into the effect identified in the HEqIA.	have been reviewing these comments in line with our technical teams. Where appropriate, technical documents may be updated and amended accordingly, however there will be instances where agreement has not yet been reached and these areas will be described within the Statements of Common Ground prepared for each local authority.
Provision of further information regarding effectiveness of mitigation / enhancement measures e.g. a conclusion on the residual health outcome anticipated after mitigation measures is implemented.	<b>Agreed.</b> Further information will be provided regarding the effectiveness of mitigation / enhancement measures, based on professional judgment.
Provision of further information on monitoring (impacts, mitigation, and enhancement – to be clearly specified), how this will be secured and anticipated timelines.	<b>Noted.</b> This is an area currently being explored within the wider LTC Team and with the CIPHAG group.
Provision of an assessment of cumulative effects (in relation to inter project effects) to see that cumulative effects on vulnerable groups are appropriately considered.	<b>Agreed.</b> An assessment of cumulative effects will be provided in the revised HEqIA for DCOv2.
Provision of a limitations sections to clearly outline any limitation or constraints of the assessment.	<b>Agreed.</b>
In addition to the review against the WHIASU framework, the review against local priorities concluded that the links between local health priorities and the assessment should be made clear in the HEqIA. Where the local priorities include specific topics (determinants – e.g. community cohesion, education including schools as receptors) or sensitive groups, (e.g. parents with young children, those with dementia), these should be clearly scoped out with justification or considered in the assessment.	<b>Agreed.</b> The revised HEqIA for DCOv2 will incorporate a new section within each assessment topic setting out the links with local health priorities and how these have helped to inform the assessment.
<b>EqlA</b>	
A need for further specificity about the rationale behind decisions when evidencing that they meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty.	<b>Agreed.</b> A review of the EqlA document (Appendix B of the HEqIA) has been undertaken to ensure that sufficient information/detail is provided.
Providing important context, to give a clearer picture as to whether <b>resources</b> /consultation efforts have been correctly apportioned. Where shortfalls are identified, analysis of possible reasons for this and reasonable mitigations should be included.	<b>Agreed.</b> The revised EqlA for DCOv2 will include further detail relating to context and consultation undertaken, including potential barriers to involvement and how these have been overcome. A member of the Consultation Team has attended a CIPHAG meeting to outline those barriers to involvement which have been identified and the mitigation in place to overcome these barriers.

## LTC Task Force Paper

There is a large disparity between numbers of male and female consultees. Gender plays an important role in travel patterns and this should be considered.	<b>Noted.</b> The revised EqlA for DCOv2 will include further detail relating to consultation undertaken, including potential barriers to involvement and how these have been overcome.
The reported 'neutral' impact on Sex and Religion or Belief characteristic groups should be reviewed and consultation with representatives of these groups evidenced and reconsidered.	<b>Noted.</b> The assessment will be reviewed as part of the work in advance of DCOv2.
Effects of Covid-19 in relation to travel habits and consultation efforts should be considered more comprehensively	<b>Agreed.</b> The revised HEqlA for DCOv2 includes further consideration of Covid-19 and the associated impacts this may have on local people, including protected characteristics. The revised EqlA for DCOv2 will include further detail relating to consultation undertaken, including potential barriers to involvement and how these have been overcome.
Intersectional characteristics (i.e., Religion and Gender, Age and Disability) should be considered in identifying hard-to-reach groups and providing important context.	<b>Noted.</b> The revised EqlA for DCOv2 will include further detail relating to potential barriers to involvement and how these have been overcome.
Alternatives to the use of 2011 census data should be researched in some instances, with acknowledgement if no better data is available.	<b>Agreed.</b> A review of the baseline (Appendix C of the HEqlA) has been undertaken to update information and use new data sources where appropriate / relevant.

### 5. Next steps

- 5.1 It is anticipated that there will be additional discussion and agreement via separate CIPHAG meetings with HE and between the nine local authorities in other meetings, prior to the drafting and issue of DCOv2 HEqlA and/or the Environmental Statement, Chapter 13 (Population and Human Health).

**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force  
Work Programme 2021/22**

Dates of Meetings: 14 June 2021, 12 July 2021, 16 August 2021, 20 September 2021, 18 October 2021, 15 November 2021, 13 December 2021, 17 January 2022, 14 February 2022, 14 March 2022, 11 April 2022

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
<b>14 June 2021</b>		
Nomination of Chair	Democratic Services	Officers
Nomination of Vice-Chair	Democratic Services	Officers
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>12 July 2021</b>		
HEQIA QA Review: Update Paper	Colin Black	Members
Highways England Attendance	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>16 August 2021</b>		
Transport Action Network Presentation	Colin Black	Members
Economic Mitigation List: Update Report		
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>20 September 2021</b>		
Health Impact Assessment Update	Colin Black	Members

Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>18 October 2021</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>15 November 2021</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>13 December 2021</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>17 January 2022</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 February 2022</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 March 2022</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>11 April 2022</b>		
Economic Mitigation List	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

Clerk: Lucy Tricker  
Last updated: 1<sup>st</sup> June 2021

This page is intentionally left blank