



Peter Robottom
The Planning Inspectorate
3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN
Via Email: Silvertowntunnel@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Deirdra Armsby
Director of Regeneration & Planning

1st Floor, West Wing
Newham Dockside
1000 Dockside Road
London
E16 2QU

PINS Ref: TR010021
LBN Ref: 16/02991/DCO

Date 20 March 2017

**Planning Act 2008 (as amended)
Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended)**

**Application by Transport for London (TfL) for an Order Granting Development Consent
for the proposed Silvertown Tunnel ('the Scheme')**

I write in response to your letter dated 18th October 2016, which set out the examination timetable, procedure and notification of hearings and requested information from the London Borough of Newham ('the Council') as an interested party.

In accordance with Item 21 of the Timetable for Examination of the application (Deadline 5) for 20th of March 2017, please find attached with this correspondence the following documents:

- Silvertown Tunnel Deadline 5: Statement of the London Borough of Newham
- London Borough of Newham – Silvertown Tunnel Issue Tracker (V3)

The views of the Council as presented within this correspondence are considered to be both "important" and "relevant" pursuant to the determination of the Secretary of State under the Planning Act 2008 (as amended).

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Deirdra Armsby.

Deirdra Armsby
Director of Regeneration & Planning

Encl.



Silvertown Tunnel

Deadline 5:

Statement of the London Borough of Newham

20th March 2017

Introduction

The purpose of this statement is to reaffirm the position of the London Borough of Newham (“the Council”) in light of new and updated documents submitted throughout the examination to date. It should be noted that while discussions continue with the applicant on many detailed matters, the focus of this statement is on key matters where agreement is not expected to be reached, and a determination will need be made by the Examining Authority and Secretary of State in due course. These matters, in no particular order, are as follows;

1. The Legality of User Charging
2. Uncertainties and the Planning Process
3. Bus Strategy
4. Emirates Air Line
5. Air Quality Mitigation (Hoola Building)

The matters above should not be taken to comprise an exhaustive list of the Council’s concerns, and should be read in conjunction with the *London Borough of Newham – Silvertown Tunnel Issue Tracker (V3)*. The Council would wish to make further representations to the Examination, should the ongoing discussion on other matters fail to reach satisfactory resolution.

The matters of concern outlined within this statement are considered to be matter(s), that are both “important” and “relevant” pursuant to the determination of the Secretary of State under the Planning Act 2008.

Legality of User Charging

The Council’s position regarding the powers of the Planning Act 2008 to authorise the User Charging proposed by the Applicant remains largely as set it out in the Legal Position Statement prepared by Thomas Hill QC and Christiaan Zwaart of 39 Essex Chambers (Appendix 1). Subsequently it remains that a judgement will be required with regard to the appropriateness and lawfulness of the proposals for User Charging of the Blackwall Tunnel, and whether this provision can be considered “ancillary”, or “incidental or consequential” pursuant to section 120(3) or (5) of the Planning Act 2008.

Uncertainties and the Planning Process

It is accepted by the Council that there are uncertainties associated with the Scheme which are outside of the control of the Applicant. Primarily, these uncertainties are linked to the forecast opening date in 2023, and are often compounded by the significant growth which is occurring, and expected to continue in the sub-region. The proposal itself is also inherently complex, proposing not only the construction of a new river crossing, but also to harmonise flows with an existing river crossing (Blackwall Tunnel) through the imposition of road user charging. Given the complexity of the Scheme and its context, it has been and remains a concern to the Council, that the current application is not supported by best-case modelling and a robust evidence base. Indeed, the Council has made clear throughout the Examination process that there are a number of areas where the modelling presented by the applicant is considered to be deficient, reliant on inappropriate inputs, or contrary to guidance. As a result, the Council can not be satisfied that it has been appropriately demonstrated that the 'Assessed Case' promoted by the Applicant is the most likely outcome, should consent be granted.

Cognisant of the time constraints associated within an Application for Development Consent pursuant to the Planning Act 2008, the Council does not expect to reach agreement on the Assessed Case prior to the conclusion of the Examination Process. Accordingly, the Council's focus has shifted from an examination of the Assessed Case Scheme, to working with the Applicant in developing strategies and requirements that could result in timely and targeted mitigations of impacts of the Scheme.

It is particularly noteworthy that the primary mitigation vehicle proposed by TfL, the *Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy*, proposes a "refreshed" assessment which will update and re-run the assessed case prior to Scheme opening. While this later process is supported by the Council, given its current position as an interest party, it falls to both the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State, to be satisfied that deficiencies within the TfL application (the Assessed Case) can appropriately and satisfactorily be resolved after the grant of consent. It is the view of the Council that this particular point must also be considered in the context of the Scheme's Environmental Impact Assessment which is based on Assessed Case traffic scenarios, and will define mitigation points for many Scheme impacts, including impacts on air quality.

Bus Strategy

The Council maintains that the level of bus services assumed in the Assessed Case must be secured in order for net benefits of the Scheme to be realised in the London Borough of Newham. Although the provision of a Bus Strategy is welcomed, the commitment to a minimum of 20 bus movements per hour is clearly somewhat behind the 37.5 bus movements assumed in the Assessed Case. Noting there is merit in phased delivery, and the later determination of exact frequencies and routings, the Council's position is that the Scheme should include a commitment to fund a quantum of services equal to the Assessed Case for a fixed period after Scheme opening.

Given that TfL's business case and equalities impact assessment for the scheme are fundamentally reliant on bus provision, this level of commitment is proportionate, and in the view of the Council, necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

The relative poor provision of cross river bus service in East London compared with West London is well documented in TfL's application documents. Indeed, the Bus Strategy itself makes repeated reference to the Convergence Agenda, that being the aim of the 2012 Olympic host boroughs to achieve equal social and economic chances as their across-London neighbours. In the view of the Council, the Convergence Agenda only serves to support the view that funding commitment to the assessed case bus provision should be secured in the DCO. Without this commitment, it is clear that funding would otherwise be sought from developments through Planning Contributions (Section 106) or CIL. Mindful of the relative tests that must be applied to determine the acceptability and necessity of such obligations, it is clear that this funding would only come from local developments. Taking account of scheme viability, contributions to bus services will have knock on implications for other obligations such as affordable housing, or, if secured through CIL, would reduce the funding available for other community infrastructure projects. In the context of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure project, which relies on a "step-change" in bus provision to support its Economic Case and embraces the principles of the Convergence Agenda, the Council considers that it is fundamental to the success of the Scheme that busses are committed, and funded by all of London, and not to the detriment of development and economic opportunities in the East.

Emirates Air Line

With regard to a pedestrian and cycle link within the Silvertown Tunnel, TfL sets out within its *Case for the Scheme* that the length of the tunnel means that a poor and potentially intimidating ambience would be inevitable, and that there would be safety and security implications. This would likely prove unattractive, TfL states, “in the context of the existing Emirates Air Line which follows broadly the same alignment but ties more directly into the local centres of activity”. Accordingly, the case for the Scheme states that there would be more cost-effective ways of improving connections for pedestrians and cyclists in the area, and sets out TfL’s intention to produce a fare strategy document developed in consultation with local boroughs, which would be published ahead of the opening of the Silvertown Tunnel.

It is clear from ongoing discussions with TfL, that there is no intention to committing to this proposal through a DCO Requirement or obligation. Indeed, TfL’s response to Second Written Question GA2.1 is clear in its reference back to the *Case to the Scheme*, but is silent on any commitment through a DCO obligation. Instead, the response to this question indicates that TfL is continuing to investigate a trial cycle shuttle service which would be secured “by means of the proposed legal agreements with Host Boroughs”. The Council understands that these discussions are now focussed on a service through the Blackwall Tunnel only, as it has not been party to these on-going discussions, despite its status as a Host Borough. Given that the Emirates Air Line infrastructure is already in place, this is not a significant concern for the Council, if there is a level of commitment to the retention of the Emirates Airline, and the production of a fares strategy document to increase its attractiveness as a crossing and effectiveness as a tool for modal shift from local vehicle trips which may otherwise be suppressed through the imposition of user charging.

In light of the above, the financial and political situation of the Emirates Air Line must be taken into account. It is noted in the Commissioner’s Report to the TfL Board in November 2015 that a £1 million surplus was created in the time since opening (cumulatively between 2012/13 to 2014/15), and that, at that time, TfL was aiming for the cumulative operating surplus to pay back the build costs within the scheme’s first 10 years (2021). It is understood though, that the operating costs of the infrastructure are propped up by the £36million sponsorship of Emirates, which is due to expire in 2021, two years prior to the Silvertown Tunnel opening. Cognisant of comments made by the Mayor of London during his electoral campaign regarding the ongoing provision of public funding for the Emirates Airline, the Council has a level of concern that, contrary to the assessed case, the Emirates Airline may

never be operational in conjunction with the Scheme. Indeed, a spokesman of Mr Khan's campaign was quoted during the election campaign as stating that the likeliest option is its closure in 2021¹. Should the Emirates Airline no longer exist as a transport link in the context of the Monitoring & Mitigation Strategy's "refreshed case", it's unclear how such an eventually would be dealt with post-consent. Clearly this would have implications for the Scheme and may result in a level of mitigation which could not be known at the time of the consent. This would suggest to the Council that the viability of this transport link is a material consideration in the assessment of this application, and that clarity on these issues should be provided to inform the decision making process.

Given that the Scheme would provide TfL with a new revenue stream in perpetuity, the Council considers that it would be entirely appropriate that the revenue generated by road traffic to be used to offset the running costs of the Emirates Airline, and to provide security for the active transport link at this part of the network. Indeed there is clear support for this principle within the National Networks NPS, Mayors Transport Strategy, Local Development Plan and the Project Objectives. The Council remains open to discussing a suitably worded requirement with TfL to ensure that the obligation is of a scale which meets the relevant planning tests. That the Council has been unable to open such discussions on this matter with TfL to date, only lends greater weight to the concern that the future of the Emirates Airline is unsecure, and that a failure to secure cross river enhancements for sustainable transport will lead to Newham residents and businesses being disproportionately affected as a result of the Scheme.

¹ Broadbent, Giles (2016, Jan 8), *Labour's Sadiq Khan backs away from cable car closure pledge*, The Wharf

Air Quality Mitigation (Hoola Building)

Given the Mayor of London's clear strategic priority to improve London's Air Quality, it appears extraordinary to the Council that TfL continues to rebut that the Scheme should require site specific mitigation of a considerable local impact, such as that predicted at the Hoola Building.

TfL's Updated Air Quality and Health Assessment (REP2-041), within Table 2-4, shows expected concentrations of nitrogen dioxide at various floor heights on the West Tower of the Hoola Development. These figures update those found within Table 6-18 of Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (Air Quality), on the basis of the increase in number of over height vehicles, revised DEFRA guidance, and the commitment to Euro VI (or equivalent) Busses through the Silvertown Tunnel. In its most recent submission on the matter (Technical Note Air Quality at the Hoola Development REP3-031), additional detail is provided in relation to the relative heights and position of residential flats in the Hoola West Tower, the building which is subjected to the greatest expected impact.

It is clear from review of these documents that there are dwellings within the Hoola which are predicted to have a large (>4 Magnitude of change in NO₂ (µg/m³)) worsening of air quality in the assessed case year 2021. The worsening in Air Quality also moves the Hoola building from below air quality objectives to above, which in itself would trigger the requirement for the Council to revise its Air Quality Management Area.

While it is noted that the Updated Air Quality and Health Assessment indicates improvements in Air Quality from the Environmental Statement predictions for the first floor and above (the residential units), this is caused by modelling the first floor at 5m in height rather than at the standard 3m. It is worth noting that the Updated Air Quality and Health Assessment does actually produce some higher concentrations of nitrogen dioxide than stated in the Environmental Statement, with changes at the ground floor rising from 45.0µg/m³ to 45.4 µg/m³ Annual Mean NO₂.

The Applicant's argument for not providing further mitigation for the Hoola is based on a prediction that 2023 is a more likely date for the opening of the Silvertown Tunnel, by which time the air quality at the Hoola would not be expected to exceed the objective value of 40 µg/m³. Mindful that the Scheme is based on an assessed case year of 2021, and that the dDCO as currently drafted does not include Grampian Requirements regarding Air Quality, this view is not accepted by the Council.

The Interim Advice Note (IAN) *174/13 Updated advice for evaluating significant local air quality effects for users of DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 'Air Quality (HA207/07)*, provides a broad framework for the assessment of significance of local air quality effects. It is clear though that this document is guidance, and not a policy which provides for a conclusive qualification of significance absent professional judgement. It would appear to the Council that Scheme-wide benefits for air quality are masking the recognition of the significance of a large local worsening of air quality, thereby justifying a failure to mitigate.

Recognising that TfL has undertaken a desk-top review of the Hoola's ventilation system, the Council notes that this system was fitted primarily for the purpose noise mitigation, in light of an assessment which did not include the impact of Silvertown Tunnel. Further, the Council notes that there is nothing intrinsic about mechanical ventilation that would improve air quality. In order for the mechanical ventilation system to provide an improvement it would need to include an NO₂ filtration system or air intake from a less polluted area. The Council maintains that the potential to retrofit such measures and seek necessary agreements with land-owners should be investigated as a priority.

LONDON BOROUGH OF NEWHAM - SILVERTOWN TUNNEL ISSUE TRACKER (V3)



LBN Issue	Action Required by TfL	Action required by LBN	Progress - live
Commitments to financial benefits should be provided for local residents, to address socioeconomic implications of local trips which would be suppressed by the imposition of a user charge. The Council maintains that local discounts and/or a Community Fund could address this issue.	TfL to consider how discounts or subsidies could be provided and administered.	LBN to provide input to TfL into the scheme, review proposals and seek to agree outcomes.	The Council welcomes TfL's intention, as reported in the Host Borough meeting on the 23rd of February, to prepare a discount scheme which would mitigate the impact of the Scheme on lower income users. It is noted that the particulars of such a scheme are not yet known, but the Council maintains that a resource should be provided to ensure that important socio-economic trips of lower income groups are not suppressed. This position is directly supported by Project Objective PO3 - To support economic and population growth, in particular in east and southeast London by providing improved cross-river transport links. This is also fundamental, from the perspective of LBN to Project Objection P06 - To ensure where possible that any proposals are acceptable in principle to key stakeholders, including affected boroughs. TfL's proposition arrived late before deadline 4 and was presented in high level outline only, so there has been limited time to make progress towards a package of targeted discounts. Council officers are now identifying appropriate qualification thresholds for any discount scheme and cross-checking against household car ownership data to determine the number of Newham residents likely to benefit from any discount scheme. While this work is ongoing, it is already evident that a 50% discount for those in lower income tiers would remain a significant cost and a tiered discount scheme, depending on income is preferable and would be more targeted. Lowest incomes would receive a greater discount (say 90%). A means of readily identifying these potential income tiers from benefit and other information held by the Council is ongoing. While the principle of a discount scheme is now agreed, the detail is unlikely to be fully resolved by the end of the Examination.
Commitment to price reduction in the Emirates Air Line should be secured.	TfL to consider how discounts or subsidies could be provided and administered.	LBN to review and agree	The Council's position on this matter is set out within its Deadline 5 Statement under the heading Emirates Air Line.
Pedestrian & Cycle Scheme improvements outside of order limits need a legal agreement.	TfL to draft	LBN to review and agree	This is agreed in principle, subject to detailed design proposals and legal agreement. The Council has no update at this time.
Public transport commitment should be known and should be not less than assumed in the Assessed Case. A Requirement is necessary for inclusion in the DCO.	TfL to provide further commitment	LBN to review and agree	While the Council welcomes the emerging commitment to run a minimum service pattern of 20 buses per hour, this still falls far short of the 37.5 buses per hour as coded in the Assessed Case. As stated elsewhere, the Council remains concerned over the reluctance to make any commitment to the level of public transport on which the demonstrated scheme benefits depend. This is of particular concern to Newham, as the only significant benefit to Newham residents is delivered by the new public transport services. Without a guarantee to the provision of such a service pattern, any benefits of the scheme to Newham residents cannot be secured. The Council is therefore unwilling to accept this commitment to a reduced service provision and insists on the full bus service frequency modelled in the Assessed Case. The Council fully understands that defining the exact route and frequencies of these services at this stage is impractical, and that such an exercise would more usefully be undertaken in the pre-Scheme modelling phase, to which the Applicant has made a firm commitment. However, by similar means to existing S.106 planning agreements negotiated by TfL from developers, it is entirely feasible for the Applicant to commit to underwrite a prescribed bus frequency through the new tunnel using Scheme user charge revenue for a fixed period after Scheme opening. The Council will continue to press for this commitment.
Lack of evidence from the strategic model to validate local traffic, economic, socio and environmental impacts.	No further action	No further action	There is unlikely to be any agreement forthcoming on these issues, as the Applicant will not be able to demonstrate sufficient modelling information at this stage in the DCO process. However, the Applicant has subsequently given a full commitment to undertake detailed local modelling, using iterative processes as per guidance, during the pre-scheme modelling stage. As traffic, environmental and other impacts will be mitigated once identified by the application of the M&MS, the Council is content that this document could provide a mechanism to ease the Council's concerns. A suitable prescribed M&MS which can deal with socio-economic impacts and then deliver effective targeted mitigations will result in the agreement of the existing modelling outputs becoming less of a concern for LBN. Further, if the Applicant can undertake to improve the local validation of socio-economic characteristics within the model with specific local data (eg revised OD surveys, stated preference surveys and value of time validation) during the pre-Scheme modelling, then this will go some way further to addressing these issues.
COCP Matters - Including FORS Gold, High Visibility Cabs, Lorry Routes, Receptor Site	Discussions continuing offline	Discussions continuing offline	See response to SWQ CL2.6. The Council has no further update at this time, as discussions are continuing with TfL on these matters.
Monitoring strategy to be revised to include triggers and included as a Requirement in the DCO. Need environmental related triggers.	Agreed changes to be submitted formally	LBN to review and agree	The Council broadly supports the decision to combine the Monitoring Strategy and TIMS into one document known as the "The Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy", a draft of which has been sited by the Council. This document is currently under review, and the Council anticipates to be in the position to provide an assessment of this document after Deadline 5. Considerable progress is being made on the traffic and environmental trigger mechanisms and their likely means of mitigation, but the monitoring of socio-economic data, appropriate triggers and what mitigations could be applied to address these remain not well developed. It is hoped that progress can be made with the Applicant on developing this aspect of the M&MS further prior to the end of the Examination period.
Lack of air quality and noise mitigation measures within the dDCO (Hoola and Western Beach in particular).	Agreed changes to be submitted formally	LBN to review and agree	The Council broadly supports the decision to combine the Monitoring Strategy and TIMS into one document known as the "The Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy". It is understood that at Deadline 5, TfL intends on submitting a schedule of feedback, with agreed changes to be made to the document. The Council's position regarding this matter is further expanded within its Deadline 5 Statement under the heading Air Quality Mitigation (Hoola Building)
London Borough of Newham is seeking further commitment to local employment	TfL to clarify	LBN to review and agree	Discussions are ongoing between LBN and TfL regarding obligations to local employment which would could be secured via a legal agreement. The Council anticipates updating the ExA once an agreement is reached in-principle.
Landholdings - Agreement (in principle) to be reached regarding Waterfront studios, car parking issue.	TfL to clarify	LBN to review and agree	The Council met with TfL and its advisors on the 1st March 2017. TfL agreed to provide more detailed plans relating to the location and layout of the temporary and existing car parks together with specifications of the car parks. The Settlement of the terms of the related agreement is also still ongoing. The Council is not in a position to accept the proposals without clarity on these issues.
Lack of mitigation for the Woolwich Ferry impacts	TfL to clarify	LBN to review and agree	While the Applicant has suggested some trigger metrics which will indicate when there is a defined adverse impact on the Woolwich Ferry, the means by which this could be mitigated remains unclear. It is understood that the Applicant will investigate the process of changing the existing Woolwich Ferry Act and report in due course - although it is not clear what may be included in a revised DCO as a result.
A Construction Method Statement incorporating a piling statement and strategy should be a Requirement and included in the DCO.	TfL to clarify	LBN to review and agree	The Council understands that TfL proposes to ensure control of piling impacts through the CoCP. The Council has concerns over the noise chapter of the CoCP and reserves its judgement on the suitability of TfL's suggested control method. Discussions on this matter are continuing and the Council anticipates providing a further update on this matter at upcoming Deadlines

Further clarification is required from the applicant as to how a land contamination remediation strategy is secured within the DCO.	TfL to clarify	LBN to review and agree	The Council's position remains as set out within SWQ DC2.9i
Article 12 – Agreements with street authorities	TfL to review and confirm.	LBN to review and provide comment to TfL	The Council welcomes the principle of the addition of Protection Provisions within Part 6 of Schedule 13. Subject to further discussion on minor wording amendments, these provisions would resolve the Council's objection to the current wording of Article 12.
Part 4 and Part 5, Operational Provisions and User Charging	TfL to review and confirm.	No further action	Legal matters relating to user charging of the Blackwall Tunnel were outlined by Thomas Hill QC at the ISH on the wording of the DCO on the 19th of January 2017. A summary of this statement was submitted at Deadline 3.
Article 58 - Transfer of benefit of Order, etc	Discussed with TfL in meeting 1st March 2017 - TfL to update.	LBN to review and agree	The Council maintains a high level of concern with regard to the extent of the provisions of this Article. TfL, through the Charging Policies and Procedures Document (7.11) sets out its statutory duties to apply policies to promote and encourage safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services to, from and within London. TfL also has statutory responsibilities to make sure road networks are managed effectively to minimise congestion and disruption to vehicles and pedestrians. These functions provide a level of security to the Council as to how the decisions of the TfL board can be made in respect to the user charge. It is a substantial concern then, that this Article allows TfL to transfer its role in setting the charge to a private entity. The Council is not convinced that there is adequate transparency and security within the user charging assessment framework to protect the public interest. The Council has sought further clarification from the Applicant on this matter, these discussions have not yet been resolved.
Requirement 4 - Scope of works attributed to this requirement is deficient.	TfL to propose revised wording	LBN to review and agree	The alterations made for Deadline 4 are welcomed in principle, however this requirement is still lacking a "catch-all" provision for permanent above ground buildings and structures within "other works and development" of Schedule 1. The Council is in agreement with TfL about the wording of this provision, and once included in within the DCO this matter will be resolved.
Article 68 – Deemed consent provisions	TfL to review and confirm.	LBN to review and provide comment to TfL	The Council welcomes the principle of the addition of Protection Provisions within Part 6 of Schedule 13. Subject to further discussion on minor wording amendments, these provisions would resolve the Council's objection to the current wording of Article 12.
Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 5	Wording to be provided by TfL	LBN to review and agree	The Council's position remains as per its response to SWQ DC2.9d
Resolved / No further action required			
Limits of Deviation (horizontal) to be specified and included in the DCO	No further action	No further action	Resolved DC 35.9 or FWQ 8.19 Wording of DCO
The Emergency Plan is required to be submitted to the LPA for approval. This should be included as a Requirement in the DCO.	No further action	No further action	Now included in Sch 2. part 5
The NVMP will need to be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to any works commencing on site. A Requirement on this matter should be included in the DCO.	No further action	No further action	Now included
Proposed construction hours not acceptable.	No further action	No further action	Amended and accepted
Compliance with the the Arboricultural Survey (ES Appendix 9.D) should be expressly demonstrated in any applications seeking LPA approval pursuant to Requirement 6 (Landscaping)	No further action	No further action	The requirement to submit a statement of compliance with obligations, as set out in Requirement 16 (3), resolves this concern.
Requirements 4(1) and 6(1) should clarify that the details to be submitted are those that are to be designed in accordance with the design principles as required under Requirement 3(1). This should also include specific reference to details of materials	No further action	No further action	The requirement to submit a statement of compliance with obligations, as set out in Requirement 16 (3), resolves this concern.
Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 13, Enforceability of Euro VI busses.	No further action	No further action	TfL has provided additional information to the Council in relation to how this Requirement would be enforced. This has been accepted by the Council as appropriate.
Schedule 2, Part 2, Article 16 - Consultation of requirements with LBTH	No further action	No further action	The consultation process, as set out in Requirement 16 (5) now makes the clear the responsibilities of the Council
Schedule 2, Part 2, Article 17 - Business days	No further action	No further action	It is understood that this has been resolved in the Deadline 4 dDCO.
Requirement 12 - Low Noise Surfacing wording	No further action	No further action	The Council is satisfied with the wording of Requirement 12, with regard to low noise road surfacing. [12.(2)(b)]
Displacement and management of existing uses on the portal sites should be known. Relocation could cause more vehicle movements, reduce river usage.	No further action	No further action	It is now acknowledged that the Applicant has limited responsibility on this issue, given the nature of the lease arrangements and planning consents of the northern work-site occupiers and their dates of expiry. It is hoped that GLA can find suitable alternative locations for these operations that will ensure continued use of the river in preference to additional lorry movements. However, acknowledging this, the Applicant cannot also express lorry movements associated with the construction of the Scheme in terms of relative change, where the base figures include these existing lorry movements to and from these operational sites, where the consent for these sites expires prior to the commencement of scheme construction. All existing lorry movements associated with the current operational sites to be relocated by the Scheme worksite must not be included in any base traffic levels from which construction highway impacts of the Scheme are derived.
Schedule 2, Part 2, Article 17 - should be Business days	No further action	No further action	Resolved within Deadline 4 dDCO
Article 65 – Functions of the Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group	No further action	No further action	The Council is generally satisfied with the drafting of this Article, and the revised role of STIG.
Article 29 (1) – Temporary use of land for carrying out the development. Could provide for ongoing operations and re-siting of northern portal uses during construction which result in effects greater than	No further action	No further action	Resolved by amendments to this Article within Deadline 4 dDCO