

Silvertown Tunnel Development Consent Order

London Borough of Hackney

Comments of TfL's Responses to Examining Authority's Second Written Questions and Deadline 4 Submissions

PINS Reference	TR010021	
Document Number	LBH 10	
Authors	LB Hackney, Project Centre, Phlorum, GVA	
Revision	Date	Description
0	March 2017	Deadline 5 Version

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S COMMENTS ON TFL'S RESPONSES TO THE EXA'S SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS.....	5
3. LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT'S DEADLINE 4 SUBMISSIONS.....	26

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Transport for London ("TfL") submitted the application for the Silvertown Tunnel Development Consent Order ("DCO") in April 2016. The DCO Examination began in October 2016. The London Borough of Hackney ("LB Hackney") is considered a 'neighbouring borough' for the purposes of the Silvertown Tunnel DCO.
- 1.2 LB Hackney has submitted written submissions throughout the examination process and attended a number of Issue Specific Hearings to make oral representations.
- 1.3 LB Hackney's concerns remain as per those set out in their written submissions including their Written Representation (document reference: REP1-019) and their Local Impact Report (document reference: REP1-020). LB Hackney also provided written submissions on the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written questions (document reference: REP1-021) and comments on TfL's responses to the ExA's first written questions (document reference: REP2-014).
- 1.4 The ExA published the second written questions and requests for information on 10 February 2017 and TfL submitted its responses to those questions on 6th March 2017. This document sets out LB Hackney's comments on the Applicant's responses to the relevant questions within the following sections of the questions;
- GA. General (Document ref: REP4-051)
 - DC. DCO wording (Document ref: REP4-052)
 - TT. Traffic and transportation (Document ref: REP4-055)
 - AQ. Air quality (Document ref: REP4-056)

- 1.5 This document also provides LB Hackney's comments on the 'Charging Policies and Procedures', Revision 2 (document ref: REP4-039) submitted by TfL at Deadline 4.
- 1.6 It should also be noted that LB Hackney has met with TfL on three occasions since Deadline 3 to discuss traffic and transport, air quality, and monitoring and mitigation. TfL subsequently provided the neighbouring boroughs with 'working drafts' of three documents (the draft DCO, the combined Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy, and the revised Bus Strategy) by email on 28 February 2017. LB Hackney referred to these documents and to discussions from meetings with TfL in its submissions at Deadline 4: *Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions and Requests for Information* (document ref: REP4-019), and *Update and Comments on the updated draft Development Consent Order* (document ref: REP4-020).
- 1.7 LB Hackney notes that the following documents submitted by TfL at Deadline 4 were broadly similar to the draft versions provided to the Borough by TfL on 28th February 2017:
- draft DCO Revision 4 (Document ref: REP4-025)
 - combined Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy (Document ref: REP4-046)
 - revised Bus Strategy (Document ref: REP4-044)
- 1.8 In light of the above, LB Hackney's comments made at Deadline 4 (within document refs: REP4-019 and REP4-020) on the above documents remain.

2. LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S COMMENTS ON TFL'S RESPONSES TO THE EXA'S SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
GA2	General		
GA2.1	Applicant	<p>Distribution of Benefits: Given that the further analysis provided in REP3-024 still shows that the imposition of user charges would have a detrimental impact on low income users of private vehicles needing to commute through the tunnels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide the DCO obligation or other means to give effect to the suggested waiving of the account registration fee for residents within the host boroughs or other defined local area and concessions for local users of the proposed new additional bus services to be provided through the tunnel. 2. Please also provide an update on the intended means for cyclists to cross the river economically at this point whether by a bus cycle shuttle and/or concessionary charges on the AirLine (or other means). The outcome of such a consideration would be another measure for inclusion in a DCO obligation. 	<p>It is noted that the Applicant proposes to waive the first year registration fee for scheme users within the host boroughs. LB Hackney also considers that this should be extended to apply to scheme users within the neighbouring boroughs, particularly those with high levels of deprivation.</p> <p>LB Hackney's comments on the proposed bus concessions were provided within the Borough's Deadline 4 submission (document ref: REP4-020) and are reiterated in Section 3 of this document.</p>
GA2.2	Applicant	<p>Distribution of Benefits: Given the indications that there would also be a negative impact for LGV users only made</p>	<p>It is noted from TfL's response to this question that the discount is aimed at small businesses (those with fewer</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>positive by addition of reliability benefits and that there would be a negative overall impact on HGV users, please comment on the proposal from the host boroughs that there should be a mitigation fund as a means to support or compensate small local businesses that may otherwise be adversely affected. Could such a fund be a further component of a DCO Obligation as referred to under GA1?</p>	<p>than 50 employees) with their main address within one of the host Boroughs.</p> <p>LB Hackney opposes user discounts for all LGVs and HGVs.</p>
GA2.4	Applicant	<p>Distribution of Benefits: In the further comment on the submissions of the Motorcycle Action Group [REP1-068], the Applicant points out that there is a higher level of motor cycle ownership among higher income groups. However, such ownership among higher income groups could be for recreational use and the analysis presented is not a direct answer to the argument that use of motorcycles is potentially the cheapest means of private motorised transport and therefore of importance for lower income groups. Given the acceptance that motorcycles create less congestion and less air quality issues than other forms of motorised transport, please provide a statement of the actual consequences in terms of revenue/funding for the scheme, traffic flows and environmental consequences were motorcycles to be exempt or otherwise not subject to user charges as elsewhere in or</p>	<p>LB Hackney remains opposed to discounts for motorcycles. It is noted from TfL's response to this question that a specific motorcycle discount is not proposed. LB Hackney welcomes this confirmation.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		adjacent to London where charges are levied.	
GA2.7	Applicant	<p>Package of river crossings: A number of Boroughs and other IPs have commented that the Silvertown Tunnel must be seen as part of a package of new river crossings in East London. To demonstrate this in addition to the references in the initial Update Documents (AS-021), a copy of the latest December 2016 TfL business Plan has been submitted (REP3-026). In this the Silvertown Tunnel is shown with a specific capital provision, but there are only qualified textual references to the proposed Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf pedestrian and cycle bridge and the proposed DLR connection between Gallions Reach and Thamesmead on page 17 with a still lesser degree of commitment indicated for a possible ferry between North Greenwich and Canary wharf. Please indicate the degree of commitment to these other components of a cross river package and the dates by which construction is expected to commence and the links be open for use in comparison with the proposed Silvertown Tunnel.</p>	<p>LB Hackney has already raised concern that the Silvertown Tunnel is being developed in isolation and not coming forward as part of a committed package of crossings. LB Hackney's written representation (document reference: REP1-019) summarises Hackney's concerns in paragraphs 3.37 to 3.39. LB Hackney's comments on TfL's responses to the First Written Questions (document reference: REP2-014) also sets out more detail in response to the FWQ PN1.</p> <p>LB Hackney considers that the Applicant's response to this question does not address its points on the package of river crossings nor does it provide sufficient, certainty of, or commitment to delivery.</p>
DC	DCO WORDING		
DC2.4	Applicant, host and neighbouring	Article 52: If possible bring forward any agreed changes to this article such that there is no doubt that it would require	LB Hackney as Hackney has concerns with Article 52 and the Charging Policies and Procedures Document. These concerns have already been raised in LB

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
	Boroughs	<p>adherence the revised Charging Policies and Procedures Document 7.11 (as further amended). Article 52(1) as currently drafted appears not to refer to this document as the determining policy document and is not explicit about the application of the UCAF procedure.</p> <p>A Revised copy of the Charging Policies and Procedures Document that would be certified under Schedule 14 should be supplied.</p>	<p>Hackney's previous submission documents including the written representation (document reference REP1-019) and LB Hackney's post hearing submissions on the dDCO (document reference: REP3-104). Please also see LB Hackney's Deadline 4 submission document Update and comments on the dDCO (document reference REP4-020).</p> <p>It is noted that TfL do not propose any amendments to Article 52 and as such LB Hackney is of the view that TfL's response to this question does not address its concerns. See LB Hackney's Update document submitted at Deadline 4 for further detail (document ref: REP4-020, paragraphs 4.5 – 4.8).</p> <p>LB Hackney has also reviewed the revised Charging Policies and Procedures submitted at Deadline 4 (document ref: REP4-039). LB Hackney notes that the document does state that TfL will keep user charges under review for the <i>'lifetime of the scheme'</i> (para. 5.1.1). However, this does not address LB Hackney's concern that it should be made clear either through the DCO or the Charging Policy that use charging will be required in perpetuity.</p>
DC2.5	Applicant	<p>Article 56: Although the Applicant has argued against making specific commitments to other river crossings, and while mitigation might be inferred as being covered under terms like 'operating', please explain why it would not be preferable to make mitigation a specific</p>	<p>LB Hackney has set out concerns with Article 56 within the written representation (document reference REP1-019) and LB Hackney's post hearing submissions on the dDCO and the Traffic and Transport ISHs (document reference: REP3-038). Oral representations were also made at the ISH on 17/01/2017.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>application for charges and, to the extent that additional cross river bus services are to be imposed as a requirement, why any funding requirements to guarantee such services should also not be explicitly referred to.</p>	<p>TfL has since suggested minor updates to Article 56 through the draft revised DCO provided to the neighbouring boroughs on 28 February 2017. Comments on the draft revised DCO were included in LB Hackney's Deadline 4 submission document 'Update and comments on the dDCO' (document reference REP4-020). Further comments are also provided in section 3 of this submission document.</p> <p>LB Hackney is disappointed with TfL's response to this question, and reiterates its view that the DCO should explicitly refer to charging revenue being used to fund cross-river bus services.</p>
DC2.6	Applicant	<p>Article 58: A number of Boroughs express concern over the possibility of transference of TfL/GLA/Mayoral statutory responsibilities under this Article. Please indicate whether such is intended, and if not, how would this be precluded?</p>	<p>LB Hackney notes that TfL's response to this question confirms that it is not the intention to transfer any functions in respect of user charging, the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy, or the operation of STIG. LB Hackney also welcomes confirmation from TfL that any third party would be subject to the same restrictions and responsibilities as the Applicant when it exercises the particular functions.</p>
DC2.7	Applicant, host and neighbouring Boroughs	<p>Article 65: If possible bring forward agreed changes to this article to address widespread concerns over the composition, operation and powers of the STIG. Does LBN have a view on whether they should represent LCY or whether the airport should have direct representation as is proposed for HE.</p>	<p>LB Hackney is opposed to private sector bodies having a permanent seat on STIG and believes that their views should be channelled through the relevant boroughs.</p> <p>As set out in the introduction to this document, LB Hackney has engaged in further discussions with TfL since Deadline 3, including discussions on a reworked STIG. TfL shared a working draft of an amended Article 65 at one of the meetings and shared the draft via email</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY’S RESPONSE
		<p>A copy of the revised combined Monitoring Strategy and Traffic Mitigation strategy should also be forwarded, again preferably in a form agreed with the Boroughs. It should include agreed monitoring thresholds relating to all roads that are of concern and direct monitoring of environmental effects as well as of traffic flows, so that there is local authority support for what will be a certified document under Schedule 14.</p>	<p>on 24 February 2017. TfL subsequently shared a further draft, suggesting further changes to Article 65 through the draft revised DCO provided to the neighbouring boroughs on 28 February 2017. LB Hackney shared initial comments on this draft with TfL prior to Deadline 4, but note that no changes (from the draft issued on 28th February 2017) have been made to the draft DCO (Revision 4) submitted at Deadline 4. .</p> <p>LB Hackney provided comments on STIG in Hackney’s Deadline 4 submission document ‘Update and comments on the dDCO’ (LB Hackney reference number REP4-020). These comments remain relevant.</p> <p>LB Hackney’s key comments on the Revised Article 65 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 65(5) sets out the matters on which TfL must consult members of STIG. It now removes what was Article 65(5)(e) on consulting STIG on proposals for cross-river bus services. This is concerning as the revised Bus Strategy seems to refer to consulting STIG and STIG being key to considering bus service provision, but yet this is no longer specified in the article on STIG. • There is still no requirement for STIG’s recommendations on user charges to be binding on TfL/the Mayor. • Although the reference under Article 65(2) to TfL acting as Chair of STIG has been removed, new article 65(7) states that TfL must ‘convene and

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY’S RESPONSE
			<p>chair’ STIG meetings. Article 65(7) includes the words ‘Unless agreed otherwise by STIG’ but it is not clear if this is referring to the frequency of meetings or TfL acting as chair. LB Hackney’s previous concerns over TfL acting as Chair remain – LB Hackney requires that there should be an independent chair of STIG. LB Hackney requests clarification on Article 65(7) accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB Hackney is concerned that the amendments dilute STIG and the lack of voting will lead to the borough’s views being marginalised. • LB Hackney welcomes the inclusion in Article 65(11) that TfL must publish agendas, reports, minutes, and other relevant documents relating to the operation of STIG.
DC2.9	Applicant, Host Boroughs (including London Borough (LB) Tower Hamlets), other Boroughs, HSE, Historic England, MMO and EA	<p>Schedule 2 Requirements: Requirement 1 – Are the Boroughs content with the approach of securing the bus services through the tunnel by means of a requirement relating to a separate certified document? Please provide an updated (and preferably agreed version of the Bus strategy Document that would be certified under Schedule 14.</p> <p>Requirement 3 – The Applicant has to date resisted suggestions for tying the design to the submitted DAS and General Arrangement drawings, yet at least one Borough has suggested that ‘have regard</p>	<p>TfL provided LB Hackney with working drafts of the dDCO (including an amended Article 65), the combined monitoring and mitigation strategy, and the revised bus strategy on 28 February 2017. LB Hackney provided initial comments to TfL at their deadline on 2 March 2017. It was understood that TfL would be making further amendments to these documents in advance of the Deadline 4 submissions, however it appears that no changes were made in response to LB Hackney’s initial comments and as such the comments made at Deadline 4 continue to stand.</p> <p><u>Bus services and cycle transport</u> Whilst LB Hackney notes that the Deadline 3 TfL dDCO (document reference REP3-003) includes an updated</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>to' would still be insufficient to ensure that the worked up scheme reflected what has been presented in the application and considered in the ES. Please give further consideration to the wording of Requirement 3(1) in the light of continuing concern both by the ExA and Boroughs.</p> <p>Requirement 4 – In the light of the discussions during the DCO Hearing held on the 19 January 2017, please give further consideration to the wording of Requirement 4(3) to ensure that the detailed design of all works that would normally be subject to planning control would be subject to the approval of the relevant planning authority (i.e. excluding only those works that would normally be Permitted Development for a local highway authority).</p> <p>Requirement 5 – In the light of the discussions during the DCO Hearing held on the 19 January 2017, please review and update the way that Requirement 5(2) is structured. Bearing in mind continuing concern from host boroughs and/or the PLA that more of the subsidiary plans should require their approval including the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Construction Site River Strategy, Lighting Management Plan and</p>	<p>requirement 13 on Cross-river bus services and required TfL to implement and act in accordance with the bus strategy, LB Hackney provided comments on the revised Bus Strategy to TfL on 3rd March as described above. LB Hackney has provided further comments on the bus strategy document submitted at deadline 4 in Section 3 of this written submission.</p> <p><u>Monitoring and mitigation strategy</u> LB Hackney has provided further comments on the combined monitoring and mitigation strategy document submitted at deadline 4 in Section 3 of this written submission.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>Site Waste Management Plan, please provide further justification as to why there should be any division between plans requiring approval and those only requiring consultation. It is noted that the pre-ambles to what are currently separate sub-requirements (2) and (3) refer to parts of the authorised development and this would seem to cover the possibility of seeking separate approvals from LBN and RBG. The simplest solution would be to combine sub-requirements (2) and (3) so that all components of the CoCP would require approval of the relevant LPA (or other body) after appropriate consultation.</p> <p>Please also provide further justification for the absence of a draft CEMP before the Examination when such documents have been provided to accompany many made DCOs and the CoCP is itself intended to be a certified document. While it may be referred to in the CoCP, why does Requirement 5 not specify that the CoCP must secure no lesser mitigation than assumed in the ES? The issue of ensuring that materially different or worse environmental effects do not arise under the provisions of the CoCP is raised in question CL2.6 under the heading of Construction on land. Amendment to Requirement 5 and to the CoCP may be</p>	

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY’S RESPONSE
		<p>required.</p> <p>Please provide an updated CoCP, preferably agreed with the relevant Boroughs and the PLA, in the form that would be certified.</p> <p>Requirement 6 – There has been discussion of whether there should be reference to the General Arrangement drawings in this requirement. Please provide appropriate wording or a justification for making no reference. Please could the host boroughs confirm whether they agree to the words, “in the opinion of the relevant planning authority” in R6(5) in respect of identifying which trees or shrubs have become seriously damaged or diseased? Is this a role that the host LPAs normally undertake? See also question TE2.3.</p> <p>Requirement 7 – Please amend wording in the light of the intended merger of the two subsidiary documents.</p> <p>Please provide a copy, preferably on an agreed basis with relevant Boroughs of the composite monitoring and mitigation strategy document. Roads subject to monitoring should include all those sought by host and adjoining Boroughs and/or</p>	

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>raised by other IPs.</p> <p>Requirement 12 – Please consider whether response to Question NV2.2 would require amendment to the wording of this requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 13 – Are the Boroughs content that securing the new additional bus services through the tunnel is achieved through this requirement and a separate Bus Strategy document? Please provide a copy of the updated Bus Strategy, preferably in a form agreed with relevant Boroughs, This should commit TfL to the provision of the assessed number of through Silvertown tunnel bus routes and services (as a minimum), as well as provision for the through-tunnel shuttle service for cyclists (or other means to facilitate economical cross-river transport for cyclists). See also SWQ GA2.1.</p> <p>Requirement 16 – Are the relevant Boroughs content with the revised wording of this requirement bearing in mind the representation of LBTH (REP3-034)?</p> <p>Possible Additional Requirements:</p> <p>It has been suggested by the Applicant that contaminated land issues would be</p>	

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>addressed by the CoCP rather than as often provided for by a separate requirement. Please explain how the CoCP would address this matter or provide an additional requirement.</p> <p>In REP3-017 it is suggested by the Applicant that it would be unlikely that the SoS would accept Grampian-style requirements to address the COMAH concerns of HSE. Please provide evidence for this assertion and also provide the text of a modified Grampian-style requirement to address the separate major hazard concerns over the storage of Hydro-fluoric Acid and other chemicals on the Brenntag site and the SGN gas-holder.</p> <p>Please either confirm that the issue of safeguarding, maintenance and enhancement of the river flood walls has been agreed within finalised Protective Provisions with the Environment Agency or provide agreed wording of an appropriate requirement.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the mandatory requirements of the Air Quality Directive, and the issue of uncertainty inherent in forecasting, please consider the desirability of including a requirement that would pick up elements of the M4 Requirement to</p>	

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>which the ExA drew attention that would not be covered by Requirement 7 and the related certified Document in order to provide certainty that Directive requirements would not be breached. See also question AQ2.2.</p> <p>Archaeology – Are all Boroughs, Historic England and the MMO content that the Written Scheme of Investigation is addressed under the CoCP rather than requiring a separate requirement (and dDML condition). See also question HT2.1</p>	
TT	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION		
TT2.1	The Applicant	<p>Regarding Action Point (AP) 1 from the Issue Specific Hearing held on the 17 January 2017, The Applicant was asked to provide <i>'a comprehensive note giving full borough distributions of car trips that are not suppressed but re-assigned for Deadline 3 (D3). This should include detailed estimates of the projected behaviour impacts'</i></p> <p>In relation to distribution of car trips that are not suppressed but reassigned, the information provided [REP3-025] does not address the issue of potential redistribution of trip origins and destinations. The Applicant notes that the assignment model does not have the capability of providing</p>	LB Hackney has no further comments to make on TfL's response to this question.

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>insights into this very important aspect of the spatial implications of the scheme for and the ability of selected population groups, in particular less well-off people, to avail of new opportunities. The Applicant is asked to revisit this request and exploit the capabilities of the overall model system including the demand model.</p>	
TT2.2	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 2, the Applicant was requested to supply 'a <i>comprehensive note showing the journey time and generalised cost impacts for those forecast to switch from car to bus for D3 (to include disaggregated data for population sub groups and also displayed in the form of maps</i>'. The information supplied [REP3-025] does not adequately address the question posed by the ExA; the Applicant is now asked to review the information supplied and fully address the request while acknowledging any limitations in the material supplied.</p>	<p>It can be seen that there are benefits to residents of, and visitors to, the Borough along the lines of the proposed new bus routes which is welcomed. However, LB Hackney is concerned that the Bus Strategy does not contain sufficient commitment to the level of service nor any proposed routes. As such these benefits cannot be guaranteed. LB Hackney's previous request for an express route from Hackney Wick to Greenwich would help to deliver benefits to the residents of the borough.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
TT2.3	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 7, the Applicant was asked to provide <i>'a comprehensive note on the uncertainty and associated level of confidence that can be afforded to the traffic forecasts that feed into the environmental assessments, whether numerically or in qualitative terms for D3'</i>.</p> <p>The response [REP3-027] is a comprehensive description of the matters of interest. However, the ExA requests that the Applicant quantifies the potential compounding effect of uncertainties in inputs, specification errors and parameter estimates for the scale of uncertainty in the transport model system. The Applicant is also asked to provide estimates of the implications of this effect for uncertainty in the inputs feeding into the environmental assessments.</p>	<p>In its response to the ExA's Second Written Questions [REP4-055], TfL has provided some explanation of traffic model uncertainty. However, no discussion or testing of how this uncertainty might increase the accuracy of air dispersion modelling outputs in the air quality assessment has been provided.</p> <p>LB Hackney remains concerned that there has been no sensitivity testing of air quality impacts, based on the uncertainty of the various model input parameters. As noted in LB Hackney's Deadline 4 submissions, the issue of uncertainty and transparency has the potential to undermine the entire air quality assessment.</p>
TT2.4	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 12, the Applicant was requested to supply <i>'a detailed analysis of projected Net Present Value (NPV) without implementation of bus strategy for D3'</i>.</p> <p>Can the Applicant expand on the material supplied [REP3-029], in particular taking account of the likely behavioural implications of such a scenario and the implications of those effects on the ultimate NPV.</p>	<p>It is clear that economic benefits are significantly reduced without the bus services. LB Hackney is concerned that the Bus Strategy does not contain sufficient commitment to the level of service nor any proposed routes. As such, benefits cannot be guaranteed and this brings the economic benefits of the scheme in to question.</p>
TT2.5	The Applicant	<p>Re. AP 13, the Applicant was asked to provide <i>'a BCR for the scheme assuming</i></p>	<p>LB Hackney has no further comments to make on TfL's response to this question.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p><i>without implementation of bus strategy and scheme funded publicly (not PPP) for D3'.</i></p> <p>The claim in the Applicant's response [REP3- 029] 'A BCR calculation is not appropriate for the Scheme as it has a negative cost...' needs further clarification given the question concerns alternative funding mechanisms and scope of measures. The matter of hypothecation of any revenue and economic benefits to users and non-users should be taken into consideration in addressing this request. Can the Applicant revisit its response to this question?</p>	
TT2.6	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 14, the Applicant was asked to provide economic assessments '<i>of any alternatives* that were taken through to comparative assessment for D3 to include monetary valuation of costs and benefits (*to include performance of preferred scheme at comparable stage of scheme development)</i>'</p> <p>The detailed response [REP3-030] is comprehensive in its description of alternatives considered/assessed. In line with the HMT's Five Case Model Guidelines, can the Applicant provide quantitative estimates of the economic impacts of these alternatives, encompassing both costs and benefits,</p>	LB Hackney has no further comments to make on TfL's response to this question.

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		including any estimates of wider economic benefits?	
TT2.7	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 16, the Applicant was requested to supply '<i>a comprehensive note explaining the intended local benefits/enhancements to offset the dis-benefits to some low income groups within the host or nearby boroughs for D3. This should include detailed figures by socio-economic group by borough and also displayed in map form</i>'.</p> <p>The material supplied is comprehensive [REP3-024]. The Applicant is however asked to enhance the quantitative information supplied to differentiate between lower income car users and existing public transport users in its description of impacts of the scheme. It is also noted that Figure 3-4 illustrates the trip origins of low income groups.</p> <p>Can the Applicant review this information and data for other scenarios in the light of its response to AP 1 (TT1).</p>	<p>It can be seen that there are disbenefits to low income highway users. The benefits to low income public transport users are only realised if the bus routes are implemented. LB Hackney is concerned that the Bus Strategy does not contain sufficient commitment to the level of service nor any proposed routes. As such these benefits cannot be guaranteed</p>
TT2.8	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 17, the Applicant was asked to provide '<i>a note to explain the modelling undertaken of categories proposed for exemption from charge for D3.</i>' The extent of exemptions is noted [REP3-015]. The Applicant is asked to comment on the potential implications of these exemptions</p>	<p>LB Hackney opposes offering user discounts to lower income groups as it is likely to undermine the travel demand element of the Silvertown scheme.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
		<p>for the efficient operation of the scheme.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide an assessment of the implications of permitting lower income groups in the host boroughs to avail of a discount scheme or exemption from the charge. See also questions GA2.1 and GA2.4.</p>	
TT2.9	The Applicant	<p>Regarding AP 18, the Applicant was requested to provide <i>'an update on progress towards securing a commitment to the enhanced bus routes strategy in the DCO (including procurement/tendering arrangements) for D3'</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant has outlined its commitment to the bus enhancements and its intentions to provide a commitment to securing its implementation [REP3-014] The Applicant is asked to provide more details on outline net costs of supplying the enhancement and the tendering and procurement arrangements for securing this goal. See also questions GA2.1 and DC2.9.</p>	<p>LB Hackney note there is no detail relating to costings of the proposed cross-river bus services. LB Hackney has requested that TfL commit to an express cross river bus service to serve Hackney linking Hackney Wick and Greenwich Town Centre through a provision in the dDCO and note that this is not included within the submitted Bus Strategy.</p>
AQ	AIR QUALITY		TfL post hearing submissions
AQ2.1	Applicant and host LPAs	<p>The Panel notes the Applicant's commitment to merge the Mitigation Strategy and the Traffic Impacts Mitigation Strategy (TIMS) documents for D4. The Panel urges the Applicant to ensure that the triggers for mitigation in the TIMS</p>	<p>The revised M&MS [REP4-046] rejects absolute air quality trigger metrics and places reliance on the opinions of an expert appointed by TfL, in consultation with STIG members.</p> <p>LB Hackney is concerned that this is not prescriptive</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY’S RESPONSE
		<p>document must reflect the levels of traffic that have been assessed in the ES chapters for noise and air quality, and clear environmental triggers (for air quality and noise) which indicate the point at which mitigation has to be implemented, must also be included in this document, and agree these with the host LPAs prior to D4.</p> <p>The Applicant’s written summary of Oral Case for the ISH on 17 January 2017, stated that <i>“consideration will be given to setting separate triggers for the Blackwall and Silvertown Tunnel”</i>, however the Panel considers that this is essential, so that effective and timely mitigation can be implemented should the traffic levels using the Silvertown Tunnel vary significantly from those assessed. In addition, the Panel urges the Applicant to review and remove the hurdles that are proposed in TIMS, so that there is certainty that essential mitigation would be implemented if the assessed traffic levels are exceeded. Also see question DC2.7.</p>	<p>enough. It potentially leaves too much uncertainty with regards to what might be considered an impact that could be significantly different to that assessed in the ES and for which mitigation might need to be applied.</p> <p>TfL also states in the M&MS that mitigation measures will only be proposed if there is shown by the expert to be a <i>“material worsening in air quality as a result of the scheme”</i>. Any proposed mitigation would then need to be approved by the Mayor. LB Hackney is concerned that TfL has not defined what a material worsening of air quality means and how this would be determined from the results of the assessed case. In their deadline 4 submission [REP4-019] LB Hackney requested that TfL explain how <i>“Not Materially Worse Than”</i> differs from <i>“Not Environmentally Worse Than”</i>.</p> <p>TfL also states in their M&MS that they engaged with the London boroughs, including Hackney, and took their views into account in preparing the document. LB Hackney does not feel that its views have been taken into account, particularly as monitoring has not been proposed in key areas where it has requested it.</p>
AQ2.2	Applicant and RBG, LBN, LBTH	<p>The Panel notes the Applicant’s intention to review the terms of reference and chairing of STIG. However, it wishes to make clear that if the Applicant remains the decision maker and STIG’s role is only advisory, the Panel has no comfort that, should the Order be made, essential</p>	<p>LB Hackney remains extremely disappointed that no air quality monitoring has been proposed in the borough and that there is therefore no mechanism for identifying any potential need for mitigation.</p> <p>In any case, LB Hackney remains concerned that little evidence has been provided to demonstrate that any of</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY’S RESPONSE
		<p>mitigation would be implemented in the manner assessed in the ES, or in a timely manner. Therefore, in this scenario a Requirement along the lines of R26 of the M4 DCO would be necessary on air quality matters, although the Panel also recognises that the application proposals, as currently drafted would include more monitoring locations than if the R26 M4 wording was to be used here. However, the Panel, in drawing attention to R26 of the M4 DCO, did not imply that any Silvertown Tunnel requirement for air quality would replicate the M4 requirement, merely that something “along the lines of” that requirement should be considered. It is not advocating less monitoring than that proposed in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant does not appear to have accepted this in the D3 DCO; the Panel now urges the Applicant and host authorities to consider drafting such a requirement, otherwise it is likely that the Panel will do so in its draft recommended DCO at D5, unless all matters related to STIG and TMS are resolved to the satisfaction of the Panel and the host authorities. In any event the Panel reserves its right to propose modifications and additions to the Applicant’s dDCO at D5. See also question DC2.9.</p>	<p>the proposed mitigation measures across the area of influence could effectively be delivered.</p>

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TO	QUESTION	LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S RESPONSE
AQ2.4	London Borough of Lewisham (LBL), London Borough of Southwark (LBS)	<p>Please can LBL and LBS provide their views on the additional modelling work recently undertaken by the Applicant, in relation to their concerns about the potential impacts on receptors along local roads in their boroughs that would be subjected to the highest levels of traffic changes arising from the scheme (this information is provided as [REP3-016], item 4.12, and [REP3-032], Appendix 8).</p> <p>Please can the neighbouring authorities also provide the Examination with an update on their views as to whether the proposed development would impact their ability to achieve EU limit values, on the basis of this new information?</p>	<p>LB Hackney's concerns, as laid out in their deadline 4 submissions [REP4-019], remain. In essence, these are that no robust assessment of Hackney has been carried out and that no air quality monitoring or mitigation in the borough has been proposed.</p>
AQ2.5	The Applicant and London Borough of Hackney (LBH)	<p>Please can the Applicant and LBH provide an update at D4 regarding whether there is agreement over the addition of the proposed monitoring sites in LBH's D3 representation [REP3-038], including Wick Road, Kenworthy Road, Cassland Road and Victoria Park Road in the monitoring strategy for air quality? How would this be secured?</p>	<p>LB Hackney is disappointed to see that while TfL has conceded to the other neighbouring boroughs of Lewisham and Southwark in proposing air quality monitoring there, it is not proposing any monitoring in Hackney.</p> <p>LB Hackney reiterates its requests for air quality monitoring on Wick Road, Kenworthy Road, Cassland Road and Victoria Park Road, as well as on the A12. This would complement the traffic monitoring now proposed on these roads.</p> <p>LB Hackney made clear in its deadline 4 submissions [REP4-019] its reasons for requiring such monitoring.</p>

3. LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY'S COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT'S DEADLINE 4 SUBMISSIONS

3.1 LB This section of the submission provides LB Hackney's comments on the following written submissions made by TfL at Deadline 4:

- draft DCO Revision 4 (Document ref: REP4-025)
- combined Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy (Document ref: REP4-046)
- revised Bus Strategy (Document ref: REP4-044)
- Charging Policies and Procedures (Revision 2) (Document Ref: REP4-039)

3.2 Draft versions of the above documents (with the exception of the Charging Policies) were provided by TfL to LB Hackney and the neighbouring boroughs on Tuesday 28 February 2017, requesting comments no later than Thursday 2 March 2017. Comments were provided to TfL on 2nd/ 3rd March 2017, and copies of these were appended to LB Hackney's written submissions at Deadline 4 (Document refs: REP4-019 and REP4-020).

3.3 LB Hackney's comments on these documents are set out below.

Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy.

3.4 LB Hackney welcomes a simplified merged document and the inclusion of traffic monitoring on four roads within LB Hackney, albeit there is more that can be done. LB Hackney requires air quality, road safety, and peak hour assessment on the roads within the borough, as described in the paragraphs below

Monitoring locations

- 3.5 Paragraph 3.11.2 sets out how any STIG members can request changes to the monitoring to enable the impacts of the scheme to be fully captured. Throughout the consultation LB Hackney have identified areas that require monitoring and whilst traffic monitoring on four roads in the borough have now been added, the full list of monitoring requests has not been included in the submitted document. This lack of willingness from TfL at this stage gives no confidence for future changes to the monitoring in future as suggested in the latest draft.
- 3.6 The traffic monitoring proposed within the borough now includes key routes identified by the Borough throughout the process as key links to the A12 which will be affected if additional traffic is drawn to the new tunnel. It is proposed to include traffic monitoring on, Wick Road, Kenworthy Road, Cassland Road and Victoria Park Road as well as the A12 in the borough. LB Hackney welcomes this but still requests that air quality monitoring is included on these routes and the traffic is assessed to understand the implications of the peak period rather than just the 24 hour flows.

Air Quality

- 3.7 With regard to air quality effects, LB Hackney makes the following comments:
- Appointment of any air quality expert to review and advise on mitigation measures must be transparent and impartial.
 - There is little faith that the mitigation measures proposed by TfL will be effectively deliverable.
 - It is not clear what difference there is between TfL's use of "*Not Materially Worse Than*" compared to "*Not Environmentally Worse Than*" with regard to actual impacts compared to those that have been predicted in the ES.

Mitigation Triggers

- 3.8 The M&MS states the triggers will cover the 'Area of Influence' (AOI). The coverage of the AOI was contested by LB Hackney as not extending far enough to the north. LB Hackney is concerned that as it is outside the AOI the monitoring / effect of the triggers does not include the borough.
- 3.9 LB Hackney has previously raised and reiterates the need for additional triggers for the following;
- journey time reliability needed on local roads
 - road safety needs to be monitored on all routes not just the tunnels;
 - impacts need to be assessed for peak hours and compressed peak effects
- 3.10 The need for Secretary of State approval of post-opening traffic mitigation measures seems onerous and LB Hackney is concerned that the process could lead to additional delay, cost and scrutiny of mitigation measures.

Draft DCO (Revision 4).

- 3.11 LB Hackney's most recent comments on the dDCO are set out in the 'Post-hearing submissions on the DCO', submitted at Deadline 3, and the Update document submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-020). LB Hackney note that many of their concerns are not addressed through the revised draft DCO (Revision 4) submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 4 and these concerns remain.

Article 52: The charging policy

- 3.12 TfL propose minor wording amendments to this article but these do not address LB Hackney's concerns. Concerns remain as per the post hearing submissions – that the Mayor should not have the final say on the Charging Policies and Procedures and user

charge, and that the user charging should be required in perpetuity. The proposed wording states that TfL must have "had regard to the response to consultation", but the decision on user charges remains with TfL and the Mayor.

Article 56: Application by TfL of charges levied

- 3.13 LB Hackney raised concerns with Article 56 at the ISHs and within its post hearing submissions on the dDCO and traffic modelling ISHs (document reference: REP3-038). Oral representations were also made at the ISH on 17/01/2017.
- 3.14 LB Hackney note the Applicant's draft DCO (Revision 4) includes a minor update to Article 56 to include "*paying the costs and expenses incurred...in relation to the implementation of necessary mitigation*" within Article 56(a).
- 3.15 Whilst this appears to be a slight improvement on the version of Article 56 included in the draft DCO (Revision 3) (Ref: REP3-003), this does still not address LB Hackney's concerns as set out in its post hearing submission. In summary, there should be a hierarchy for spending the charges levied and there should be an additional bullet point to make provision for payments to go into a dedicated fund for a package of crossings and sustainable transport measures.

Article 65: Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group

- 3.16 LB Hackney's comments on the revised Article 65 are set out in Section 2 of this submission in response to second written question DC2.7.

Requirement 7

- 3.17 Requirement 7 has been substantially revised in the dDCO Revision 4. The LB Hackney welcomes the additional detailed provisions within the requirement and the clear relationship to the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy. However, Hackney's concerns with the M&MS are also relevant to Requirement 7.
- 3.18 LB Hackney request that the requirement provides that TfL has to consult the members of STIG to identify the scope of the network to be assessed under R7(1). LB Hackney is concerned that the statement '*having regard to any consultation responses received from STIG members...*' in R7(2), will still allow TfL to take the final decision on the content of the mitigation strategy and LB Hackney reiterates its view that there should be an independent chair of STIG to minimise the risk that the views of the neighbouring boroughs are marginalised.
- 3.19 LB Hackney notes that under R7, the scheme of post-opening traffic mitigation measures will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport (SoS) for approval. LB Hackney is concerned that the SoS may not want to perform this function and requests clarification from TfL that the approval process set out in R7 has been discussed and agreed with the SoS. There is also concern that the SoS may not be entirely familiar with the local concerns of, and impacts on, the neighbouring boroughs and will not be able to identify if any of these concerns have been marginalised by TfL when it prepared the scheme of mitigation.

Requirement 13: Cross-river Bus Services

- 3.20 Requirement 13 relates to the provision of cross-river bus services. LB Hackney has provided comments on this in its comments on the Bus Strategy which are set out below.

Bus Strategy

- 3.21 It is welcomed that there is now a commitment to the level of peak hour buses, however, this is significantly lower than in the Assessed Case. There is general concern that the commitments in the strategy are not effective or binding and there is no commitment to a level of service or benefits that match those presented elsewhere in other examination materials. The Borough has made specific representation on these points and TfL has not adequately addressed these within the submitted document and as such it cannot be agreed by the Borough. It is disappointing that the proposed Bus Strategy emphasises the importance of bus services and the great opportunities that this scheme proposes to bus provision, but yet these benefits do not appear to be delivered.

Commitment 1 – residential concession. (comments also relevant to Requirement 13(2))

- 3.22 The £2m funding for concessionary bus travel is only available for the host boroughs and not for residents of LB Hackney. Given the proximity of Hackney to the scheme and the potential impact of additional trips on the borough network this is unacceptable. LB Hackney requests that residents of the borough are also eligible.

Commitment 5 – TfL must secure the provision of not less than 20 buses per hour during peak periods in each direction through the tunnel (comments also relevant to Requirement 13(1))

- 3.23 LB Hackney is pleased to see there is now a commitment to a level of service, however, the commitment of 20 buses per hour is too low, being only just over half the level modelled in the Assessed Case. As previously stated by the borough, a commitment to the level of bus services as within the Assessed Case is required as a minimum. This is what has been assessed with the ES and against which the benefits of the scheme have been assessed.

- 3.24 The proposed updated DCO Article 65 removes cross river bus services from one of the matters that STIG may consider. Therefore, it is unclear as to how STIG will actually be involved in the agreement of bus services where there appears to be no provision for their involvement within the DCO.

Commitment 8 – services for Growth Boroughs to access employment.

- 3.25 LB Hackney is a Growth Borough; however, there is no specific commitment to bus services in the borough. LB Hackney has directly requested a route between Hackney Wick and Greenwich Town Centre and this is not included.

Charging Policies and Procedures (Revision 2)

- 3.26 Policy 6 provides a 50% concession on the user charges for low income residents of the host boroughs, LB Hackney consider that this should not be provided as it will lead to additional traffic movements through the tunnel and the effect of these has not been assessed.