



**Havering**  
LONDON BOROUGH

**Daniel Douglas**  
**Team Leader Transport Planning**  
**Planning**  
London Borough of Havering  
Mercury House  
Mercury Gardens  
Romford  
RM1 3SL

Mr Richard Allen  
Lead Member of the Examining Authority

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
18<sup>th</sup> February 2021

[www.havering.gov.uk](http://www.havering.gov.uk)

Dear Sir,

**London Borough of Havering (20025659) – Responses to Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Written Questions (REP2-011)**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Applicant’s response to the Examining Authority’s (ExA) first round of Written Questions (REP2-011). The Applicant’s response was submitted at Deadline 2. London Borough of Havering (LBH) has reviewed Document 9.26 and wish to make the following comments.

The Applicant’s response runs to some two hundred and nine pages and provides substantial technical details and statements which LBH believes should have been included in the original technical documentation.

The inclusion of such information would have guided LBH responses and potentially its Local Impact Report. Given the quantum of information that the Applicant has provided at Deadline 2 which includes associated Appendices (REP2-013), LBH is only in the position of providing key comments rather than detailed technical rebuttals to the points made.

LBH has instructed its technical advisors to carry out a detailed scrutiny of the technical matters raised by the Applicant and we would wish to submit these detailed remarks, if the Examining Authority (ExA) would choose accept them, at Deadline 3b.

The key comments that LBH would wish to raise at this point are set out below.

LBH welcomes the fact that the Applicant is preparing outline plans for air quality, noise and vibration, archaeology and tree protection that will form Appendix F of the outline CEMP to be submitted at Deadline 3a. LBH has recently received an Archaeological Management Plan and looks forward to discussing this further with the Applicant.

LBH would wish to be in a position to agree these outline plans and indeed the final version of these plans.

It is noted that additional plans are included in the updated Requirement 4 of the draft DCO but these are not cited in the Applicant’s responses to WQ1. LBH seeks clarity as to

**Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together**

whether the list of plans cited in the draft DCO will be prepared during the Examination timetable.

The key concern that LBH has regarding the REAC and the CEMP remains that the Principal Contractor will prepare these final documents outside of the Examination Process post consent of the DCO and the Council will only be a consultee in this process.

LBH is deeply concerned that the Applicant is not prepared to make provision for a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) or a Traffic Management Plan (TMP). We note that the design guidelines for Highways England Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 doesn't preclude a CoCP. A CoCP would allow for detailed consideration of the application and for clarity in any eventual DCO. We consider this is to be an essential document that should be produced. In addition, LBH maintains the view it expressed in response to WQ1 TA 1.1 (REP2-020) that it is not satisfactory for a TMP to be produced by the appointed contractor post scheme consent being granted.

It is of note that Highways England has regularly requested other Development Consent Order(DCO) schemes to provide a CoCP and TMPs namely Hinkley Point C New Nuclear Power Station, Hinkley Connection Project, West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange. We also note that as part of the Pre Application process for the proposed Lower Thames Crossing that Highways England has commenced development of a CoCP and a TMP which has already involved engagement with LBH on the content of both documents. LBH invites the ExA to consider this matter further in the Issue Specific Hearings (ISH).

LBH notes that the Applicant states that the Department for Transport (DfT) will discharge the Requirements. LBH believes that resources should not be the determining factor regarding the discharge of Requirements and that it should be the authority that is responsible for the matters that are required for discharge that should undertake this activity. LBH would wish to be fully involved in this process.

The language that is used in the Applicant's responses to the questions DCO 1.26 and DCO 1.28 does not give LBH the reassurance that it needs. We are concerned that there is an inferred need for flexibility in construction practices. This provides no certainty concerning the implementation of the documents that are examined.

The collision data that is referred to in the Applicant's response to the question TA 1.5 is dated (2013 -2017) more up to date data on this matter can be found in the LBH Local Impact Report (LIR) Figure 10 Overview of all the Collisions 2015 – 2019 (page 22).

LBH notes the position with regards to the provision of a proposed NMU route in the vicinity of M25 junction 28 by the Applicant which would be funded through their Designated Funds programme. This application for Designated Funds is separate to this DCO application and as such provides no certainty for improving the facilities for cyclists through Junction 28. LB Havering's LIR (REP1-031) provides commentary on the issues faced by pedestrians and cyclists who attempt to use the Brook Street Interchange (para 17.5.5, figures 22,23,24).

Thank you for the opportunity to respond on the Applicant's responses to the first round of Written Questions. LBH looks forward to exploring these matters further through the Examination process.

Yours faithfully,



Daniel Douglas  
**Team Leader Transport Planning**