

London Borough of Havering Relevant Representation for Registering as an Interested Party

LB Havering Scheme Position

The Council supports the Lower Thames Crossing scheme in principle. The Council recognises that the scheme will provide additional capacity to an important part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the added resilience a tunnel crossing will bring.

However, the Council remains deeply concerned about the schemes impacts, and continues to make the case for mitigation where the applicant has failed to provide sufficient surety to the authority that necessary mitigation will be provided.

Local Residents Discount Scheme

Havering notes that there are drafting inconsistencies between the Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and its supporting strategies, namely Road User Charging. Havering wishes for its residents to be eligible for a local residents discount and for the Road User Charging strategy to be in line with the contents of Schedule 12 Article 45 of the dDCO.

The Council would invite the Examining Authority (ExA) to consider exploring this matter further during Examination.

Policy Compliance

As referenced at the beginning of this document, the Council does not see the level of appropriate mitigation being provided that would mean that the proposed scheme is fully policy compliant. It is noted that the applicant cites the overarching need for the scheme outweighs policy compliance. Havering does not consider that this is an appropriate approach where severe permanent effects are sustained, for example nitrogen deposition.

Traffic Modelling

The applicant has undertaken significant strategic analysis of the traffic and transport movements (construction and operation). The Council agrees with the strategic approach that has been undertaken but is deeply concerned that granularity at a local level has not been presented and no mitigation for local impacts is proposed through the Environmental Statement (ES). Only a monitor and manage approach is advocated.

Wider Network Impacts

The Council is very disappointed with the proposed Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan. The document acknowledges that there will be increases in traffic flows on some sections of the wider road network, and yet offers no firm commitment to mitigate against these impacts. The document provides no

surety that future traffic issues arising from the proposed Lower Thames Crossing will be addressed with no direct funding being made available to local highway authorities.

Non-Motorised User Routes

Havering notes the proposed additions and amendments to the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in the borough. The connectivity and viability of the new routes remain a key issue for Havering as the applicant has not designed suitable onward routes for new crossings. For example, a new route is proposed across the A127 between Folkes Lane and Moor Lane. Whilst this new crossing is welcome, there is no assurance at this stage that the approaches to this crossing will be made suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders to use.

On this basis, Havering cannot fully support the statement that the Applicant states that the proposed scheme is compliant with the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) on this matter.

Impact of construction works on community facilities

The construction impacts are severe for Havering residents. The Council is very concerned that a section of Ockendon Road will experience up to a 19-month closure.

The Council considers this length of closure unacceptable and will lead to significant disruption to Upminster Cemetery and South Essex Crematorium (SEC) as well as nearby businesses that support the SEC. This has social as well as economic impacts which have not been mitigated.

There is a lack of surety in the Control Documents that the diversion routes proposed are appropriate for the type of vehicles that will be using them.

There are 11 schools that are directly affected by the construction of the proposed scheme. Effective physical mitigation for these impacts has not been secured through either the ES or the Section 106.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

The Section 106 Heads of Terms document does not give the Council surety that the Applicant can satisfactorily manage the impacts of the scheme.

The Skills and Employment Strategy that is included in S106 is not supported by Havering as it fails to provide surety that a targeted proportion of the proposed 20,000 jobs created by the scheme will be secured for the Borough.

Draft Development Consent Order – Protective Provisions

LB Havering has a number of concerns regarding the current drafting of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). The document lacks any Protective Provisions for Havering in terms of maintenance of new structures (Part 3 Streets, Article 10 subsection 5) or for drainage. Havering also would wish to see Protective

Provisions drawn up for the protection of the Local Highway Authority regarding vehicular and non-vehicular highways.

The current side agreement drafted by the applicant does not provide the surety that local highways will be protected. It is noted that the applicant does not wish to see this side agreement scrutinised by the ExA. The Council believes that this is an inappropriate approach.

Draft DCO Articles and Requirements

The Council has concerns regarding the drafting of the current Articles and Requirements in the dDCO, namely the use and timescales of “deemed consent”, the use of the phrases “reasonable endeavours” and “best endeavours” for the revisions of control documents. The Council would wish to see these revised in line with the approach taken on both matters in the consented DCO for M25 Junction 28 Improvement scheme.

Control Documents

The Applicant has stated that no application documents will be updated following further discussions with stakeholders during the pre-examination phase. This makes it extremely difficult for amendments to be agreed and recorded. The Council would welcome a change to this approach.

The Council continues to work with the Applicant to resolve other outstanding matters including seeking suitable assurances that environmental impacts are appropriately minimised.