

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 **17 January 2022**

**Training Room, The Beehive Community Resource Centre, West Street, Grays, RM17 6XP**

### 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
<b>1 Apologies for Absence</b>	
<b>2 Minutes</b>	<b>5 - 22</b>
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 18 October 2021, 15 November 2021, and 13 December 2021.	
<b>3 Items of Urgent Business</b>	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
<b>4 Declaration of Interests</b>	
<b>5 Thames Freeport - Verbal Update</b>	
<b>6 Health Impact Assessment - Verbal Update</b>	
<b>7 Work Programme</b>	<b>23 - 26</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: **7 January 2022**

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

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

#### **Advice Regarding Public Attendance at Meetings:**

Following changes to government advice there is no longer a requirement for public attendees to book seats in advance of a committee meeting. All public attendees are expected to comply with the following points when physically attending a committee meeting:

1. If you are feeling ill or have tested positive for Covid and are isolating you should remain at home, the meeting will be webcast and you can attend in that way.
2. You are recommended to wear a face covering (where able) when attending the meeting and moving around the council offices to reduce any chance of infection. Removal of any face covering would be advisable when speaking publically at the meeting.
3. Hand sanitiser will also be available at the entrance for your use.

Whilst the Council encourages all who are eligible to have vaccination and this is important in reducing risks around COVID-19, around 1 in 3 people with COVID-19 do not have any symptoms. This means they could be spreading the virus without knowing it. In line with government guidance testing twice a week increases the chances of detecting COVID-19 when you are infectious but aren't displaying symptoms, helping to make sure you do not spread COVID-19. Rapid lateral flow testing is available for free to anybody. To find out more about testing please visit <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/testing/regular-rapid-coronavirus-tests-if-you-do-not-have-symptoms/>

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 scheduled for 18 October 2021, and held on 13 December 2021 at 6.49 pm

---

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

---

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being recorded, with the recording to be made available on the Council's website.

### **27. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Sue Sammons, Adam Carter and John Kent. Apologies were also received from Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative, and Peter Ward, Business Representative.

### **28. Minutes**

The minutes from the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 20 September 2021 were approved as a true and correct record.

### **29. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **30. Declaration of Interests**

There were no interests declared.

### **31. Employment and Skills Strategy**

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that since it had been published, there were some minor amendments that needed to be made. He

explained that the table on page four suggested there would be nine new support posts required within Thurrock, but this should have been six posts. He added that the cost outlined on page four was listed as £450,000 but the following wording should be included 'the costs includes both salaries and compensation, as well as an events and training programme'.

The Senior Consultant explained that the Skills, Education and Employment (SEE) Strategy overlapped with elements of the Hatch report and National Highways (NH) had been advised of Thurrock's comments on the SEE Strategy through discussions regarding the Hatch report. He stated that the SEE Strategy had first been developed by NH approximately fifteen months ago, and Thurrock had provided their comments on that version. He stated that an update on the SEE Strategy had then been received from NH in May, and comments on this update had been provided in August. He stated that the table in section three of the report outlined the main comments that Thurrock had made, and the team had felt that there were no ambitious job targets included, for example the scheme would include 22,000 new jobs, but only 437 apprenticeships and not all of these would be based in Thurrock. He clarified that NH were currently working with some Thurrock-based businesses that would be involved in the supply chain. He added that Thurrock Council had also asked NH for additional resources within the Council to ensure work could be completed, but so far NH had only agreed to five additional posts, with only one of these being based in the northern area which included Thurrock.

The Senior Consultant stated that Thurrock had been developing a proposal for a grant scheme for small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), which would help NH meet its target of £1 in every £3 spent on SMEs, but this had not been agreed or explained by NH yet. He added that the team had also asked for more ambitious jobs targets, legal targets, and an increased Community Grant sum. He stated that the NH had only just now accepted in principal using Section 106 agreements, but Thurrock Council were pushing for the SEE Strategy to be a control document. He summarised and stated that NH had not agreed to the SEE Strategy becoming a control document as they only wanted the measures to be included in the S106 Agreement. The Global Director for Urban Solutions at Hatch added that the SEE Strategy in its current form was not specific to Thurrock and did not show any local employment benefits. He stated that the team would be pushing for more ambitious and legal targets as Thurrock were the main local authority that the scheme would pass through.

The Chair questioned when the SEE Strategy would be agreed upon, whether it would be before or after Development Consent Order (DCO) submission. The Senior Consultant explained that the SEE Strategy may form part of the DCO submission, but if it was included in an S106 Agreement, then this would only be agreed just prior to or during the Examination Phase. Councillor Muldowney questioned why it was significant that the SEE Strategy should be a control document. The Senior Consultant replied that contractors who worked on the scheme were only obligated to follow control documents and it would set an overall tone for positive targets and actions, even though



compliance with S106 would also be necessary. He stated that the team would continue to push for the SEE Strategy as a control document and would report any updates back to the Task Force when appropriate. Councillor Muldowney questioned the jobs targets outlined by NH and queried whether the actual numbers would be different to the targets, and if any jobs would be specific to Thurrock. The Senior Consultant replied that NH had not yet disclosed the specific jobs that would be targeted at Thurrock, but the team were expecting approximately 20-20% of the workforce to be local, some of which would be from Thurrock. He explained that although this figure seemed quite low, some jobs were specialised and could only be completed elsewhere, such as the tunnel boring machine build, which may happen in Germany. He explained that NH were proposing 22,000 jobs would be developed from the scheme, but stated that Thurrock had not seen the calculations behind these figures. He stated that NH had announced that there would be approximately 2,500 construction workers on site during the peak of the construction phase, with most additional jobs probably being from within the supply chain.

The Resident Representative stated that he had recently attended a NH meeting regarding recruitment and the supply chain, during which they had provided a brief explanation on their supply chain plans. He stated that NH had explained that although there would be 22,000 jobs overall, there would only be 10,000 jobs during the peak of construction as the majority of jobs would be occurring at different times and in different locations. He stated that NH had highlighted the SME Directory that 550 businesses had signed up to, but clarified that only 54 of these businesses were based in Thurrock. He explained that during the meeting he had also questioned worker accommodation plans, and NH had explained that the majority of workers would commute to their jobs or find houses in the local rental market. He summarised and stated that during the meeting only two businesses had requested more information regarding the supply chain. The Senior Consultant stated that Thurrock Council officers had been working with businesses and had tried to encourage them to take part in NH recruitment and supply chain meetings. He explained that as construction was due to start in 2024, if the DCO was granted, this was still a long way away for businesses and many were not willing to engage this early in the process. He stated that Thurrock had also provided comments on NH worker accommodation strategy, as the Council had felt that 480 on-site units would not be enough to accommodate all workers. He clarified that Thurrock had not received an updated strategy which answered their comments and concerns.

The Chair stated that Thurrock currently had an unemployment rate of 5%, which equated to approximately 4000 people. He asked how local unemployed residents would be able to take up the opportunities presented by NH during the LTC scheme. The Senior Consultant replied that Thurrock's aim was to increase skills and training opportunities for local residents, particularly those that were currently unemployed, and the team would be working closely with NH in the coming years to ensure local people would be able to be upskilled through the scheme. He explained that until DCO was

submitted, NH could not contract with the main works contractors, so companies may be unable to employ or upskill people until then.

### **32. Health Impact Assessment: Verbal Update**

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that there had currently been no progress on the HIA. He stated that an independent audit had been commissioned with other local authorities affected by the scheme, and NH had agreed to incorporate between 60-70% of the ideas from the audit, but so far Thurrock had not received any proof that this was taking place or a timeline for delivery. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery added that Thurrock had been meeting regularly with NH through CIPHAG meetings, but were waiting on greater clarity to be provided on the health impacts of the scheme. He added that the LTC website had recently been updated which stated that air quality across the region would be improved by the scheme, but so far no data had been provided to prove this claim. He stated that NH would be going out to consultation next year due to significant scheme changes and amendments, as this was a planning requirement, but felt that NH would struggle with this consultation if air quality information was not provided before the consultation begun.

### **33. Development Consent Order (DCO) Submission: Verbal Update**

The Senior Consultant introduced the report and stated that NH were planning to submit their DCO next year, but still had to go out to consultation first. He stated that the reason for consultation was due to approximately 50% of the Tilbury Fields area being released to the new Thames Freeport. He stated that NH were planning for the consultation to begin in February, but the team were doubtful the consultation could start before Spring 2022, as NH also needed to consult on changes to the A13 junction and needed to provide comments on the 3-4,000 responses to the previous consultation, including significant key stakeholder comments. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery replied that NH were under pressure from the Department for Transport to submit their DCO and so the consultation would probably be streamlined. He stated that NH were currently in the middle of lots of major work, including the configuration of the Orsett Cock junction, so he could not see how the consultation would be ready by February. He added that Thurrock were still also waiting on air quality, health and noise impact data, so he felt that DCO would not be submitted until the Summer or Autumn of 2022. He stated that this also depended on the government's carbon emissions approach and decarbonisation strategy, and how this could impact upon the scheme.

The Chair asked if Thurrock Council would have a chance to influence the consultation before it went live. The Senior Consultant answered that NH had always asked Thurrock Council for their thoughts on the LTC consultation approach before it went live in previous years, and hoped that they would continue to do so before this upcoming consultation. He stated that the Task Force had previously also made comments regarding consultations, so

hopefully NH now knew what would be expected of them, for example in-person consultation events needed to be held in Corringham/Stanford-le-Hope.

The Resident Representative asked if there was any update on the East facing access on the A13 at Lakeside, or the bridge over the Tilbury loop line in East Tilbury. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery replied that NH were currently determining how to best deliver the East facing slips using the best approach. He added that Thurrock Council were also consulting with NH on the potential provision of a permanent bridge over the Tilbury loop, but there was still some way to go on this issue and any NH contributions that would be made. He stated once NH had clarified its offer any decision would then need to be taken through the appropriate democratic processes and Heads of Terms would need to be agreed. Councillor Muldowney queried how much the current delays were costing NH, and if there was an approximate figure. The Senior Consultant replied that many people were employed by NH on the LTC scheme, so the current delay of one year may be costing several million. Councillor Muldowney questioned the effect on the LTC of funding being pushed into RIS3 rather than RIS2. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery replied that it was likely the budget for RIS2 had not all been spent, so some of this money would be rolled over into RIS3. He stated that this would not likely affect the LTC scheme as it was more likely to reflect accounting practices.

#### **34. Work Programme**

The Chair asked if a report on the Orsett Cock junction could be presented to the Task Force. This was agreed by officers and the Task Force.

**The meeting finished at 7.31 pm**

Approved as a true and correct record

**CHAIR**

**DATE**

Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact  
Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force scheduled for 15 November 2021 and held on 13 December 2021 at 6.00 pm**

---

<b>Present:</b>	Councillors Fraser Massey (Chair), Gary Byrne, Daniel Chukwu and Sara Muldowney
<b>Apologies:</b>	Councillors John Kent (Vice-Chair), Adam Carter and Sue Sammons Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative Peter Ward, Business Representative
<b>In attendance:</b>	Colin Black, Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery Lucy Tricker, Senior Democratic Services Officer  Chris Stratford, Senior Consultant Stantec, engaged by Thurrock Council Darren Wisher, Global Director Urban Solutions at Hatch  Robert Quick, Resident Representative  Chris Todd, Transport Action Network (TAN) Representative

---

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be was being recorded, with the recording to be made available on the Council's website.

**35. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Sue Sammons, Adam Carter and John Kent (Vice-Chair). Apologies were also received from Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative, and Peter Ward, Business Representative.

**36. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

**37. Declaration of Interests**

There were no items of urgent business.

**38. Transport Action Network: Question and Answer Session**

The Transport Action Network (TAN) Representative introduced himself and stated that TAN were a national organisation that worked to support local communities who would be affected by national road schemes, and had been

in operation for two years. He stated that in March 2020 the government budget had committed to Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2), but TAN had challenged this decision on climate grounds and carbon emissions. He explained that this had been heard in the High Court in June who had ruled in favour of the government, but TAN had applied to appeal this decision in the Court of Appeals, and would be hearing next week if this had been accepted. He explained in recent years, and particularly since COP26 in Glasgow, the UK had been more aware of climate change and the effect of road building on the climate. He stated that this year the UK had committed to a carbon emission cap as part of the Paris Agreement, and had agreed to reduce carbon emissions by 68% of 1990 levels by 2030. The TAN Representative explained that the sixth Carbon Budget had been agreed in June which outlined the acceptable levels of carbon emissions between 2033-37, and was much stricter than the previous fifth Carbon Budget. He stated that NH would compare the scheme's emissions against the Carbon Budget, but TAN had raised issues with how the emissions levels were applied in this instance. He added that the budget for RIS2 had decreased from £27bn to £24bn due to delays with the LTC, and therefore LTC funding could be pushed into RIS3 in 2025.

The TAN Representative explained that recently the government had made the Environment Bill into a law, which instituted new air quality limits. He added that in September 2020 the World Health Organisation (WHO) had also reduced their maximum emission guidelines for PM2.5 to 5mg per cubic metre. He explained that UK limits on PM2.5 were currently 25mg per cubic metre, which was five times the WHO limit. He stated that TAN and other organisations were lobbying the government to enshrine WHO limits on PM2.5 as the UK limit. He added that WHO had also recently updated the maximum emissions guidelines on nitrogen dioxide to 10mg per cubic metres, compared to the current UK limits of 40mg per cubic metres. He explained that WHO had updated these guidelines based on evidence and facts, but had admitted that there were no safe levels of these emissions. He clarified that WHO had not yet updated their guidance regarding other pollutants, but were working to develop maximum emissions guidance for these pollutants too. He stated that these guidelines would add weight to communities' arguments regarding pollutants, particularly the fact that there were no safe levels of pollutants.

The TAN Representative added that the Business Department had updated their values for emissions in September, and these had been adopted by the Department for Transport, which provided the official guidance for National Highways (NH). He explained that these emissions values assessed the economic value of carbon emissions, and had increased the carbon cost by ten times. He stated that currently the carbon cost for constructing a road that emitted 2mn tonnes of carbon dioxide, would have an economic cost of £0.5bn. He summarised and stated that the landscape for NH submitting their scheme was changing as the UK government and people became more aware of the impact on climate change of road building. He stated that people were working hard to reduce carbon emissions and NH would have to prove their carbon emissions levels during examination phase. He stated that TAN

were working closely with the Thames Crossing Action Group and others to monitor the work of the LTC closely, as it would be the biggest road programme in a generation and would be significant to the people of Thurrock and the wider communities.

Councillor Muldowney asked how the target to reduce carbon emissions by 68% by 2030 would relate to the LTC scheme. The TAN Representative replied that there was a Climate Change Committee that set the Carbon Budget on a yearly basis to ensure the UK would hit the target of net zero emissions by 2050. He stated that the Carbon Budget reduced the allowed carbon emissions every five years and ensured that the UK were meeting its targets set out in the Climate Change Act. He explained that NH had to meet emissions targets outlined in the Carbon Budget, and as the scheme was so significant it would compare its proposed emissions to the UK total allowed. He clarified that the 68% reduction by 2030 was much stricter than any Carbon Budget that had come before, and although the LTC scheme emissions were small in comparison to the UK total, the government had to add all road schemes and other additional areas of emissions together to ensure it remained within the Carbon Budget. He felt that even though the LTC scheme would be a small percentage of the total UK Carbon Budget, it was moving in the wrong direction by increasing road capacity and therefore increasing emissions. Councillor Muldowney agreed that the LTC scheme was at odds with the UK's carbon emissions goal. She stated that the government were planning to go out to consultation regarding PM2.5 levels, before the government could commit to new targets in October 2022. She asked if this could affect the DCO submission for the LTC scheme, as if the WHO guidelines were agreed then the LTC scheme would fail. She asked that if the LTC scheme did not meet WHO guidelines, would there be a system of legal address for Thurrock to oppose the scheme on these grounds. The TAN Representative replied that it would depend on the legal limits of PM2.5 set by the government, who were currently resisting adopting WHO limits. He stated that TAN and other groups were lobbying the government to accept WHO PM2.5 limits. He felt that if the LTC did not meet limits on PM2.5 then Thurrock and other local authorities would have a case against the scheme, although this might not stop the scheme altogether. Councillor Muldowney highlighted that the proposed route would come within 200 yards of a school, a special school, and a care home, and felt that the route would damage the health of local residents due to pollutants and particulate matter. She felt disappointed that NH had not provided an update of the Health Impact Assessment. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery replied that Thurrock Council were in discussion with NH regarding all of the points that TAN had raised, including the claim from NH that emissions from the LTC would be insignificant. He stated that the LTC would increase traffic across the Thames by approximately 50% which would increase emissions significantly for local residents and the UK as a whole. He stated that the Council continued to seek data from NH regarding noise, health and air quality, and were also asking for access to the air quality modelling data from NH.

The Resident Representative asked if emissions levels would be different

during construction and route operation. He asked if both of these would fail PM2.5 guidelines if adopted by the government. The TAN Representative replied that significant emissions would be released during both construction and operation. He explained that emissions during construction would include land clearing, tree felling, earth and spoil and moving, and steel and concrete emissions. He stated that NH were seeking to dump spoil and earth near the tunnel entrance which would reduce carbon emissions, but emissions would still increase overall as the majority of HGVs and dumper trucks currently run on diesel. He moved on and stated that once the scheme was opened the majority of emissions would be from users, and local authorities would need to compare current emissions levels to emissions levels once the route had been opened. He stated that he was confident emissions would increase as traffic would increase substantially. He stated that TAN were currently undertaking assessments into the accuracy of the NH assessment regarding the proposed 2 million tonnes of carbon emissions. Councillor Byrne asked for clarification regarding what elements were included in the carbon emissions data. The TAN Representative replied that all elements, such as tree felling and steel production were included in the carbon emissions data, and NH predicted that this would be 2mn tonnes of carbon produced during construction. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery added that the figure for carbon emission during route operation should also include the increased traffic generated across the wider local road network, for example on the A13 and A130.

Councillor Muldowney stated that emissions from cars was heavily regulated, but non-exhaust emissions such as from brakes and tyres remained relatively unregulated. She added that electric vehicles produced more non-exhaust emissions as they were heavier because of the battery, and therefore the tyres on these cars wore down more quickly. She asked if these pollutants and emissions had been taken into consideration. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery replied that it would take decades for the majority of cars on the road to become electric, even with the government's ban on the sale of petrol and diesel cars in 2030, unless there were additional government interventions. He stated that this was compounded by the fact that HGVs and LGVs were not yet making significant moves to electric due to their size and amount of energy needed. He stated that the Council had asked NH to release their emissions and air quality data, which they still had not done, so the team did not know if these non-exhaust emissions had been factored into their data. Councillor Chukwu asked what additional measures were being undertaken to ensure the government met its target to reduce emissions by 68% by 2030. The TAN Representative replied that the UK needed to reduce its overall traffic levels to meet this target, which undermined the need for new roadbuilding projects. He stated that the majority of cars on the road still used petrol and diesel, including HGVs and LGVs. He highlighted that Wales and Scotland were working to reduce traffic levels by reducing the number of miles that cars drove and reducing the number of personal journeys that people made. He summarised and felt that NH needed to implement strategies regarding demand management rather than increasing traffic through road building.



*The TAN Representative left the meeting at 6.47pm.*

### **39. Work Programme**

The Chair asked if a verbal update on the impact of the Freeport on the LTC could be provided in January's meeting. This was agreed by officers and the Task Force.

**The meeting finished at 6.48 pm**

Approved as a true and correct record

**CHAIR**

**DATE**

Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact  
Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 13 December 2021 at 7.38 pm**

---

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

---

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being recorded, with the recording to be made available on the Council's website.

### **40. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors John Kent (Vice-Chair), Daniel Chukwu, Adam Carter, and Sue Sammons. Apologies were also received from Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group, and Peter Ward, Business Representative.

### **41. Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **42. Declaration of Interests**

There were no interests declared.

### **43. Hatch Report Update (to follow)**

The Senior Consultant Stantec introduced the report and stated nineteen fortnightly meetings had now been held between the Council and National Highways (NH). He stated that the team had had some measure of success in agreeing some of the mitigation measures, and the Hatch report would contribute to the Statement of Common Ground. He commented that NH had started an 'issues log' which had recently been re-evaluated and now

incorporated all of the comments made by Thurrock Council in previous consultations and on most technical documents. He explained that the issues log had been grouped into three sections, the first including duplications, statements and issues which had been superseded or were of no consequence anymore. The Senior Consultant explained that 1100 issues were included in this section and Thurrock Council would be likely to agree to about 90% of them. He stated that the second section included technical matters, which was made up of 1,500 issues, the majority of which were still under discussion and needed review. He stated that the third section was made up of 400-500 significant issues between NH and Thurrock Council that needed further detailed discussions or agree to disagree. He explained that these would be discussed in the New Year, although Thurrock will try to identify a summary of 20-30 important issues, and possibly 5-6 critical issues.

The Senior Consultant stated that the Hatch report update was colour coded. He commented that there were 5 purple measures, which meant NH had declined these and considered that these should not be challenged as they largely fell under the remit of the Department for Transport. He explained that there were 17 red measures which were currently unresolved issues, which had not yet been resolved even after numerous meetings. He felt that NH were happy to make minor amendments to these measures, but would not make any amendments that would result in a significant change for the scheme or programme. He explained that there were 20 amber measures, which were close to agreement. He stated that therefore 37 out of the 58 issues, approximately 70%, were rated as either purple, red, or amber. He summarised and stated that the measures marked as green in the report had not been formally agreed yet, but were technically acceptable. He added that although there had been progress on the Hatch report, this was mainly at a lower significance level.

The Chair asked for clarification regarding the purple measures. The Senior Consultant stated the purple measures were: smart speed limits as NH would only consider these on a regional level; revised proposals for the A13 junction; a fixed proportion of tolls for hypothecation (as this was the remit of the Department for Transport); the provision of legacy worker accommodation; and a low emissions target and financial penalties payable to Thurrock Council if these were missed, which would require Department for Transport approval. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery added that these purple measures were being discussed with both NH and would be raised directly with the Department of Transport. The Senior Consultant replied NH, including the Executive Director, had declined these purple measures, such as legacy worker accommodation. He stated that the team were concerned that 400 on-site worker units and 80 hyperbaric units would not be enough to accommodate all workers, and this would place additional stress on the local rental market or local road networks due to increased commuter numbers.

Councillor Muldowney questioned measure M4 relating to air quality sensors along the route during construction, and asked if these would remain during route operation. The Senior Consultant replied that NH were proposing to

install air quality monitors at certain agreed locations along the route, but Thurrock were pushing for these air quality monitors to remain during operation, as the Council would then be able to compare current baseline air quality data and could agree any exceedances with NH. He explained that NH did not want air quality monitoring during route operation, as their models told them that emissions would be negligible so there would be no need to monitor. He added that legislation had recently changed which meant mitigation for nitrogen dioxide needed to be accommodated, so Thurrock would be pushing for monitoring during this operation. Councillor Muldowney questioned the measure M5 and asked what the core hours of operation would be, and if any progress had been made on this measure. The Senior Consultant replied that the Code of Constriction Practice outlined core hours at 7am to 6pm with an hour before and after for mobilisation and demobilisation. He stated that Thurrock had been pushing for a reduction in using extended hours until 10pm during long summer months for earthworks where the route passed close to houses, and NH had undertaken GIS mapping to identify areas where properties came within 300 metres of the centre line of the route, and had agreed to only work during core hours in these areas. He stated that this would mostly benefit communities in Linford and Chadwell St Mary, but highlighted that some areas of the route construction, such as all tunnel works or utility works/bridge installation, would need to be 24 hours for safety reasons.

The Resident Representative stated that the majority of noise emissions would be from HGV movements, and NH were predicting approximately 400-500 HGV movements per day. He asked if these had been included in noise calculations, and asked if these HGV movements would be following pre-planned routes. The Senior Consultant responded that noise mitigation measures may not include HGV movements, but these would be limited to core working hours and would be outlined in the DCOv2 submission. He stated that the construction model revised HGV movement routes, but Thurrock Council were working to restrict HGV movements around the borough, which would necessitate NH increasing use of the river, ports and surrounding haul roads and the LTC 'trace'. The Chair asked why the measure regarding noise mitigation was red. The Senior Consultant replied it was because no noise data had been received yet, so Thurrock were unable to make comment or propose specific mitigation measures.

Councillor Muldowney highlighted measure M7 and queried what carbon neutral would mean in terms of the scheme. The Senior Consultant replied that it did not necessarily mean electric vehicles, but meant no petrol or diesel vehicles in certain circumstances. He explained that this could mean hydrogen vehicles, or the use of other new carbon neutral vehicle technology that was currently being developed. Councillor Muldowney questioned measure M13 and asked if low noise road surfacing would include the A1089. The Senior Consultant replied that the A1089 would not be included as it did not form part of the LTC scheme, and some parts of the local road network could not use low noise road surfacing due to safety issues, for example some roads which were curved required anti-skid road surfacing to reduce the number of accidents. Councillor Muldowney asked for officers to push for low

noise road surfacing on the A1089 as the LTC would increase traffic on this road due to the ports. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery stated that the team could push for this as part of RIS3 consultation, but it was outside the remit of the LTC scheme. He asked residents who wished for low noise road surfacing on the A1089 to lobby their local Councillors, MPs and the Department for Transport as this would have an impact when the Council came to make representations as part of RIS3.

Councillor Muldowney questioned the use of carbon hubs and measure L23 and asked how much money this would bring into the Council. The Interim Assistant Director Regeneration and Place Delivery stated that NH were currently looking at ways to establish local businesses to invest in low carbon technologies, which would form part of the carbon hubs. He stated that there was currently no clear definition for a carbon hub, but it recognised NH need to reduce the carbon impact of the route. He stated that Thurrock Council were currently in negotiation regarding L23 with NH, as NH would be saving money by using the local road network such as the A13 to connect to the LTC, rather than developing a whole new interchange. He stated that the Council were therefore asking for this saving by NH to be recognised and monies supplied to Thurrock for this. He stated that there was no estimated cost at this stage, and no clear response from NH or the Department for Transport had yet been received.

The Resident Representative asked for an update on measure L18. The Senior Consultant replied that Thurrock officers were currently preparing a technical paper on the East Tilbury landfill site, which would contain all the necessary information regarding ecology, history, contamination and ownership. He stated that the paper highlighted that invertebrates of national importance were likely to be located on the site, and Natural England maybe considering categorising the area as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). He added that the team were unsure of what was under the site as no boreholes had been carried out due to safety concerns. The Chair stated that a large area of the London Resort had been designated as an SSSI and asked how this had impacted that scheme. The Senior Consultant replied that not much work had been undertaken on the scheme since this designation.

#### **44. Work Programme**

The Senior Consultant asked for a verbal update on the Health Impact Assessment be added to every upcoming Task Force meeting. The Chair and the Task Force agreed.

**The meeting finished at 8.24 pm**

Approved as a true and correct record

**CHAIR**

**DATE**

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact  
Democratic Services at [Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk](mailto:Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank



**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force  
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>		
Highways England Attendance	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>20 September 2021</b>		
Thurrock Council Consultation Response	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

<b>18 October 2021 – this meeting was postponed until 15 November 2021</b>		
Skills and Employment Strategy	Colin Black	Members
Health Impact Assessment: Verbal Update	Colin Black	Members
Development Consent Order (DCO) Submission: Verbal Update	Colin Black	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>15 November 2021 – this meeting was adjourned and rescheduled for 13 December 2021</b>		
Transport Action Network Presentation	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>13 December 2021</b>		
Hatch Report Update	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>17 January 2022</b>		
Thames Freeport Verbal Update	Colin Black	Officers
Health Impact Assessment Verbal Update	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 February 2022</b>		
National Highways Compensation Policy	Colin Black	Members
Health Impact Assessment Verbal Update	Colin Black	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>14 March 2022</b>		
Orsett Cock/A13 Junction	Colin Black	Members

Health Impact Assessment Verbal Update	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
<b>11 April 2022</b>		
Health Impact Assessment Verbal Update	Colin Black	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

Clerk: Lucy Tricker  
Last updated: 6<sup>th</sup> January 2022

This page is intentionally left blank