

Lower Thames Crossing

Principal Areas of Disagreement (PADs) Summary Statement

Lower Thames Crossing – TR010032

Thurrock Council

Submission 4 May 2023

On behalf of **Thurrock Council**

 **thurrock.gov.uk**

Introduction and Notes

- This PADs Summary Statement sets out in brief terms the main concerns and proposed remedies of Thurrock Council. More detail will be provided in other documentation to be submitted in due course to the Examining Authority (ExA). This document states the current position of the Council, which may change, particularly once the application documents have been considered in more detail and as those documents change over time.
- It is derived from unsigned document (APP-130), the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between National Highways (NH) and Thurrock Council (previously Document 5.4.4.12) and uses the ExA's recommended structure for the PADs Template Tracker and also utilises the reference numbers from the unsigned SoCG, also it uses its main subdivision into 'Matters Not Agreed' and 'Matters under Discussion' (also refer to bullet below for further subdivision). For information, in the existing full draft SoCG there are '116 matters not agreed' and '124 matters under discussion', i.e. a total of 240 matters to be resolved and it is understood that NH will be adding some additional matters soon. These issues have been reduced substantially below to those matters considered by the Council to be 'Principal Areas of Disagreement', i.e. now '76 matters not agreed' and '74 matters under discussion', i.e. a total of 150 principal areas of disagreement, despite several years of 'engagement'.
- The Council is clear in its Relevant Representation (Sub Section XI) that the process by NH to develop the draft SoCG is significantly flawed – this is because it reads as a short precis of the issue by the Council followed by a detailed rebuttal either disputing the position taken by the Council or a dilution by citing an array of DCO documents, meetings /briefings held or bodies set up to address the issues, none of which has been discussed or agreed with the Council
- 'Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination' has been assessed using best available information. Previous discussions with NH have informed these assessments, but do not necessarily reflect their views. The Council has considered the ease with which an issue could be resolved, given a willingness by NH to address the issue. The categories used are based on those contained within the draft SoCG, which are themselves not considered to be sufficiently distinct. It is hoped that the following document offers more clarity for the ExA.
 - Matters Not Agreed/Very Unlikely or Unlikely to be Agreed – issues where agreement is unlikely or it is difficult to see what a solution could be. In fact there are many issues in this category where NH has indicated that there will be no further discussion.
 - Matters under Discussion
 - Very Unlikely or Unlikely to be Agreed – issues where agreement is unlikely or it is difficult to see what a solution could be.
 - Likely/Possible – issues where agreement should be reachable or a relatively simple change is required.
 - To be discussed – issues that are being or are about to be discussed and will be updated upon in due course. Unfortunately there are none in this category.
- The Council takes a holistic view of the impacts from the scheme on its residents and businesses.
- There will be some additions arising from analysis the application ('DCO') and the Council's response to NH's LTC Minor Refinement Consultation (16 May – 16 June 2023), plus any changes to the LTC DCOv2 documentation following NH's review of consultation responses, but more may be forthcoming from further exploration of the documents. In addition, the implications of the Minister's announced two year delay do need further consideration and additional matters may be added.
- For avoidance of doubt when considering environmental impacts that includes those arising from the substantial utility diversions proposed.
- Discussions with National Highways are ongoing so progress on some issues may be possible in the near future.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
Matters Not Agreed (75 Matters)					
1	Discharge of requirements	2.1.3	The Council consider that Schedule 2, requirements: Requirements 3 (detailed design), 4 (EMP), 5 (landscaping and ecology), 8 (surface and foul water drainage at a local level (with the Environment Agency responsible for those elements not at a local level), 10 (traffic management), 11 (construction travel plans), 12 (fencing), 17 (amendments to approved details) and a new Requirement regarding approval of a scheme for the removal of compounds should be discharged by the relevant local planning authority with an appeal to the Secretary of State. Whilst it is not unusual for the Secretary of State to be the discharging authority for highways DCOs, it is not universal. On the facts of this particular matter we consider that the Council, in relation to its area, is best placed to be the discharging authority. The reasons for this have been set out in more detail in correspondence with National Highways, however in summary, it is the Council's position that it will be quicker, cheaper and more efficient for the relevant local planning authority, who has the relevant experience to be the body discharging the requirements.	The draft DCO Order needs to be amended as recommended to allow local planning authorities to discharge the specified Requirements. Local planning authorities understand the impacts of the project on their areas better than anyone else. Whilst concern about coordination of requirement discharge is noted, in this case 70% of the scheme is within one Council's area. This will aid coordination of requirement discharge and will ultimately be quicker and more effective than discharge by the SoS.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
2	Deemed consent 12(8), 17(6), 19(8), 21(6), Sch 2 / Sch 14	2.1.6	<p>The Council is of the view that the principle of deemed consent is not in the public interest. National Highways states that it is required due to the need to deliver the project in an expeditious manner. From the Council's perspective it can only help the Project to be delivered in an expeditious way if either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the Council failed to respond and therefore a decision is made without proper scrutiny, or b. the pressure of the tight timeframes focuses the Counsel's resources on applications by NH. In relation to b) the same pressure could be exerted through use of deemed refusal provisions. The Council is of the opinion that there should be provision to agree a short extension in specific scenarios. For example, it could be that the Council requires some additional information and NH is not able to provide this within the 28 day period. With this information the Council might be able to provide consent within a 35- day period, but the current provisions mean that it would have to appeal to the Secretary of State. The Council cannot understand how that can be considered more efficient, or a better use of public funds. <p>The Council emphasises that it is suggesting the ability for both parties to agree a short extension - not an automatic right. If NH considered that it would be more efficient to go straight to appeal, then it could do so. However not allowing the parties the choice to agree a short extension appears to be counter-productive. To provide greater certainty there could be a limit to the grant of further extensions, for example, 3 months. The fact that the Council will have a better understanding of the Project aims compared to an approval unrelated to a DCO, does not justify the reduction in the time period from 3 month to 1 month (as would have been the case for a new Traffic Regulation Order). This is exacerbated by the fact that there is still significant uncertainty caused by wide powers, which make it impossible for the Council (of the public) to fully understand all the impacts of the project at this stage. For example, because of the wide ancillary works powers in schedule 1 of the dDCO and limits of deviation not being limited to the Order Limits.</p>	The draft DCO Order needs to be amended as recommended.	Unlikely
3	Modification of the permit scheme, Article 9	2.1.7	<p>The Council have raised comments in relation to Article 9 of the draft DCO which amends a number of provisions in the New Road and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA). The Council have commented on the disapplication of sections 56, 56A, 58, 58A and 74A of the NRSWA. The Council has found that when these provisions of the NRSWA have previously been disapplied, for example for Tilbury 2, it has significantly impacted the Council's ability to coordinate effectively. Previously granted permits were revoked, which led to delay for Statutory Undertakers for their programme works, which had been previously discussed and coordinated. It rendered not only the roads directly affected by the works as a 'sterile zone' for works, but also a larger area consisting of the diversion, which were set up on unsuitable roads, e.g. Gun Hill.</p> <p>This in addition caused unnecessary complaints, because the established processes were not followed, and mitigation measure could not be enforced. The Council, as Street Authority has a duty under the NRSWA to manage its street network and works within those streets such that delays are minimised and safe operation of the network is maintained. If the Council is not in a position to effectively co-ordinate all works on its network, the risk of conflicting street works is increased, and the Council will then not be fulfilling its duty. Having two determining Street Authorities operating on the same section of network risks conflicting street works being approved, resulting in significant traffic disruption (and potentially significant economic, environmental and social issues in the local area and restricting access to emergency vehicles).</p>	The draft DCO Order needs to be amended as recommended. It is the Council's position that the oTMPfC (APP-546) and any works must be dealt with via the permitting process.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			Although the Traffic Management Forum (TMF) could potentially help resolve issues once there is still uncertainty regarding its setup and terms of reference any reference to it is meaningless until these are clarified and agreed and therefore this modification is unwarranted.		
4	Article 6(3)	2.1.13	<p>The Council is of the view that article 6(2) causes uncertainty. The Council appreciates the need for flexibility and the use of limits of variation. It is the fact that the Project has not yet been designed in detail which necessitates the need for limits of deviation. The Council's concern is regarding the use of article 6(2) which creates additional significant uncertainty. This uncertainty arises because where there are no materially new or materially different environmental effects there is in essence no limit to the deviation. This means that issues such as visual impact and the impact on private rights might not be properly considered. It is possible that deviations could be so significant that individuals did not consider that they needed to make representations in relation to the currently proposed Project, but in fact are adversely affected by the Project which is constructed.</p> <p>This is significantly exacerbated by the fact that the use of limits of deviation are not limited to the Order Limits. NH states that 'it is not understood what the Council's concern with this approach is where, as is accepted, no land outside the Order land is proposed to be compulsorily acquired'. The Council's concern is not the use of compulsory purchase powers outside of the Order Limits (it is clear that this is not possible). However, there is nothing to stop NH purchasing land by agreement. This could still result in significant construction impacts outside of the Order Limits, which has not been properly considered at Examination.</p> <p>It is accepted that it is relatively unlikely that this scenario will occur. However, it is unclear why there should be this risk, or indeed what benefit NH achieves by not linking the limits of deviation to the Order Limits. The Council would like NH to include non-environmental effects and additional land requirements as constraints within the wording of the order relating to limits of deviation. The use of limits of variation should not negatively materially impact land or buildings which have not been identified as part of the application and examination process. It is important to allow all those possibly affected to make representations.</p>	The Council would like National Highways to include non-environmental effects and additional land requirements as constraints within the wording of the Order relating to limits of deviation. It is noted that there is new wording in the DCO, which limits powers in relation to highways other than a specific road or a trunk road. This will be reviewed further by the Council.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
5	Replacement 'special category' land, Article 40	2.1.18	<p>Special category land concerns land referred to as such in the special category land plans and includes land forming part of a common, open space or allotment.</p> <p>Article 40(1) requires NH to prepare a scheme for the provision of the replacement land including a timetable for the implementation of the scheme. That scheme must be approved by the Secretary of State prior to vesting of any special category land.</p> <p>Amendments have been agreed between the Council and NH. However, the Council still consider that the scheme of works for the replacement 'special land' should be completed and agreed prior to the vesting of the current 'special land' in National Highways.</p>	The Council still consider that the scheme of works for the replacement 'special land' should be completed and agreed prior to the vesting of the current 'special land' in National Highways.	Unlikely
6	Removal and restoration of compounds, Article 35(6)	2.1.22	We note the powers in Article 35(6). The Council is concerned about when the removal of the compounds will occur. It is noted that the same provisions are in the A14 Cambridge to Huntington Improvement Scheme Development Consent Order 2016 and yet a number of compounds remain unrestored over 2 years after works were completed.	The Council is of the view that a requirement for a site restoration scheme to be agreed with the relevant planning authority is needed in connection with the site compounds, with the aim to return the site to the condition it was in prior to construction, unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority.	Unlikely
7	Ability to review the Environmental Management Plan (Second Iteration), Schedule 2, paragraph 4	2.1.23	<p>Despite the mitigation measures in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) being based on a reasonable worst case scenario, it is the Council's opinion that in exceptional circumstances it can be updated. For example, if it was identified that significant environmental harm was being caused, the plan should be capable of adaptation to stop the harm being caused.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that the Secretary of State has previously authorised projects without this requirement, the last 3 years has seen exceptional domestic and international changes and challenges. There is a real risk that the current inflexible drafting for mean that the project is already unfit for purpose and/or represents poor value for money prior to being concluded.</p>	It is the Council's opinion that in exceptional circumstances it can be updated.	Unlikely
8	Consultation with the Council on the EMPs (Third Iteration), Schedule 2, requirement 4	2.1.25	<p>The Council consider that they should be consulted on the third iteration of the EMP. National Highways states that it is not appropriate for the Council to comment on operational aspects of the strategic road network. The Council considers that it needs to be consulted, due to the potential significant impact upon the local road network and the use of local roads by NH as an integral part of the LTC design.</p> <p>For example, the project proposes to disconnect the existing strategic road network (SRN) port link between the A13 west-bound and the A1089 south-bound and instead divert this traffic via local authority roads. Considering the limited engagement by National Highways with the</p>	Additional wording should be added to allow local planning authorities to be consulted.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			Council on the impact on the local road network, the Council has real concerns that National Highways is making decisions regarding the operation of the strategic road network without considering the impact on the local road network.		
9	Contaminated land - Schedule 2, requirements 4 and 6	2.1.26	<p>Regarding Requirement 6, Thurrock Council are concerned that historic contamination (including groundwater) is picked up too late. Requirement 6 only applies when carrying out the authorised development and the REAC does not currently capture historic contamination, especially if not captured within the ES.</p> <p>Requirement 4 must reflect the mitigation measures in the REAC and include plans for management of contaminated land. To compensate, we suggest a new Requirement: Ground conditions and ground stability 10.— (1) No part of the Works may commence until an investigation and assessment report to identify ground conditions and ground stability has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. (2) The report submitted pursuant to sub- paragraph (1) must identify the extent of any contamination and the remedial measures to be taken to render the land fit for its intended purpose, together with a management plan which sets out long-term measures with respect to any contaminants remaining on the site. (3) In the event that the report submitted pursuant to sub-paragraph (1) identifies necessary remedial measures, no part of the Works may commence until a remediation verification plan for that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. (4) The authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the approved report referred to at sub-paragraph (1) and, where necessary, the approved plan referred to at sub- paragraph (3). The Council considers that this proposed Requirement is necessary due to the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There remains uncertainty over site conditions, as the site investigations undertaken to date are limited in scope • The Outline Remediation Strategy identifies potential techniques, but does not set out which would be used • The current requirement GS002 is limited to pre-condition surveys on compound areas, and does not provide for more extensive site investigation 	Recommend the use of an amended Requirement instead of existing Requirement 4.	Unlikely
10	Traffic Monitoring to include and air quality monitoring, Schedule 2, requirement 14	2.1.28	The Council remains of the opinion that it should be clearly set out in the draft DCO or related control document that air quality and noise monitoring should take place to confirm that underlying assumptions are correct. If they are not then appropriate action needs to be taken. This is in the interests of both the wider environmental and local residents. The Council suggests that the dDCO should either set out that the monitoring must not impact upon the flow traffic unless NH has the consent of the Council.	The Council remains of the opinion that it should be clearly set out in the dDCO or related control document that air quality and noise monitoring should take place to confirm that underlying assumptions are correct.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
11	Updating of control documents including the CoCP, oTMPfC, FCTP and oMHP, Schedule 2	2.1.29	<p>The Council is of the view that there should be a mechanism to review the Transport Assessment if the Project does not start within a reasonable period of the examination. The Council's position is that just because documents are based on a 'reasonable worst-case scenario' does not mean that they cannot become unrepresentative. This is especially true given the effects of the pandemic and the drive to reach Net Zero.</p> <p>The Council does not accept that under no circumstances should the documents be capable of review, although it is anticipated that only in exceptional circumstances will they be reviewed.</p> <p>We note that the outline management plans will provide mechanisms for ongoing engagement and coordination, however, the Council does not consider this sufficient because the Council is only consulted, it does not provide the Council with either approval rights or for NH to take into account our comments.</p>	The Council is of the view that there should be a mechanism to review the Transport Assessment if the Project does not start within a reasonable period of the examination. This is very relevant now that the SoS for Transport has delayed the start of LTC construction for 2 years.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
12	Ability to review traffic assessment, Schedule 2	2.1.32	The Council is concerned that traffic assessments will become out of date due to significant changes on how the transport network is utilised. To continue working on a project without amendment, despite knowing major changes to the transport network will hinder the effective operation of the project, is not in the public interest. The Council understands the need for certainty in relation to the Project and the reasons why the environmental and traffic assessments are based on a reasonable worst-case scenario. However, the last two years has seen unprecedented change in how we live and work. This is combined with significant environmental concerns and the need to reduce carbon emissions. Accordingly, there needs to be the ability to review and amend the Project in exceptional circumstances. This is because the likelihood of there being exceptional circumstances, although low, is significantly higher than it might have been two years ago.	The Council is concerned that traffic assessments will become out of date due to significant changes on how the transport network is utilised. Accordingly, there needs to be the ability to review and amend the Project in exceptional circumstances.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
13	DCO Requirement for ecological and landscape mitigation	2.1.34	The Council seek the inclusion of a DCO Requirement for ecological and landscape mitigation proposals to be included in the draft DCO, and for the Council to approve the details.	Inclusion of a new Requirement. This is still requested although it is noted that Requirement 5 has now	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
				been added covering the oLEMP, although this does not cover the detailed landscaping scheme.	
14	2.3.1 to 2.3.4 (Traffic Management Plan (TMP) Consultation and Approval)	2.1.36	<p>The document now clearly commits the contractor to the preparation of TMP/TMPs for approval. It also includes a commitment to consultation with “the relevant authorities” (which should be defined) on the TMP/TMPs prior to submission to the SoS at 2.3.3. The Council has made representations to NH, however, to express that the Council should be the approving authority of the document rather than a consultee. The Council has no certainty that it will be listened to, or commitments actioned, and sanctions taken if it is not the approving body. National Highways refers to reporting to the SoS that consultation with Local Authorities has been undertaken, however, the evidence to the SoS must include a report as to what feedback was received and how it has been addressed.</p> <p>This is fundamental if the local authority is not to be the approving body. The local authority must have the right to respond to the report and a system of conflict resolution identified.</p>	Amendments to the Requirement.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
15	Requirement 17	2.1.49	As set out above, a number of the Requirements should be approved by the Council not the Secretary of State. Accordingly, amendments to the approved details will need to be by the Council where the Council is the discharging authority. Any amendments should only be approved if they do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.	Change each requirement to approval by the local planning authority.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
16	Certified Documents	2.1.51	The Council is concerned that the development is undertaken in accordance with the certified documents. Although some of the certified documents are referred to in conditions, such as the ‘general arrangement drawings’ others (for example the ‘structures plans’) are not. There needs to be a general requirement that works are undertaken in accordance with the certified documents.	Include missing documents as ‘certified’ and wider provisions of Requirement.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
17	Article 35(2) and Article 35(3)	2.1.54	<p>Notice period for temporary possession, Articles 35(3) and 36(3) - Article 35(3) and Article 36(3) requires National Highways to provide at least 28 days notice before entering and taking temporary possession of land. In our opinion both these time frames are far too short, especially if landowners need to make alternative arrangements for their business to continue to function. Accordingly, the period in articles 35(3) and 36(3) should be 3 months.</p> <p>We note that this has already been raised, however, it is an area that we feel we should be able to reach an agreement. It is unclear why National Highways is not able to give 3- months notice before potentially causing significant disruption to local residents by taking temporary possession of their land. As a public body it is important to be fair to local landowners in order to minimise the negative impacts on Council residents.</p> <p>The Council therefore considers that the December 2021 Response from NH to the Council asks the wrong question. It is not for the Council to evidence why a 3- month period is justified, but instead for National Highways to justify why it cannot in this case provide a longer period – if that is the case.</p> <p>It is of course important to landowners that they have a realistic timescale of how long their land will be taken for. This also allows them to better mitigate any losses. We therefore suggest that the Explanatory Memorandum makes a commitment to: (a) outlining estimated timescales as accurately as possible to landowners when notices are given; and (b) keeping them updated as to evolving timescales. The Council fully anticipates that National Highways will be doing this in practice as a responsible public body – but consider that there is value to this being specifically set out.</p>	Amend notice period to cover recommended longer period.	Unlikely
18	Planning Balance	2.1.61	<p>Thurrock Council have provided evidence of what they consider to be the adverse effects of the Project, yet these adverse effects and missing data and information remain outstanding. This includes key data on traffic modelling, AQ and noise assessments and health impacts and mitigation.</p> <p>Therefore, the Planning Statement included as part of the previously submitted application is considered to be incorrect to conclude that the planning balance weighs towards a positive outcome. As stated in NPSNN 4.4 the potential benefits and potential adverse impacts should be considered at a national, regional and local level.</p>	Update ‘planning balance’ to cover missing information and provide missing data.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
19	Cumulative Effects and effect on Local Plan	2.1.62	The Council has concerns of cumulative impacts from other large-scale developments in the local area, which would result in increased impacts of additional traffic movements on the Local Road Network (LRN), as well as on Junction 30 of the M25. NH has holding objections to two major planning applications at Purfleet and north of Lakeside but has so far failed to identify what mitigation or interventions are required at Junction 30, in order to allow the proposed development of these sites proceed. Until an agreed solution to the Junction 30 and the Project local connectivity issues is found, it will remain difficult for the Council to progress the new Local Plan.	Traffic modelling is not ‘fit for purpose’, will seriously undermine Local Plan growth and requires the LTAM and local junction modelling to be reworked and provided to the Council for review. Need to change LTC design to	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			<p>The Council acknowledges that NH is preparing modelling of the implications of local strategic growth (i.e. indicative Local Plan tests) on the operation of the LTC and the consequential effects on the local road network, to be shared directly with the Council. The Council is, however, unable to wholly comment on those effects until that testing has been received (it has now been over 1 year awaiting these results) and, therefore, currently remains concerned that the proposals do not recognise the importance of local sustainable growth and connectivity. It is also the Council's opinion that the current configuration of the route does not allow effective connectivity for new local bus services connecting Kent and Essex and does not respond to measures for strategic cycle connections.</p>	<p>reflect reworked modelling outcomes.</p>	
20	Lack of Public Transport Provision in Design	2.1.63	<p>The Project's design does not facilitate viable public transport services along the route, does not provide necessary connections in the Borough and does not provide adequate provision on key LTC crossings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Highways states "<i>there are currently no proposals to run local buses</i>" on LTC but does not explore why this is so, despite national and government policy advice (NPS NN & GD 300 – Requirements for new and upgraded all-purpose trunk roads (expressways)). 2. The design does not enable public transport connections (buses) to serve residential or employment growth locations. In the absence of the Tilbury Link Road there is no convenient access for local public transport to the tunnel on the north side thereby limiting access to potential growth areas and reducing the potential for further agglomeration benefits to be generated. 3. The current configuration of the route does not allow effective connectivity for new local bus services connecting Kent and Essex and does not respond to measures for strategic cycle connections. 4. The Council considers that the process for rejecting the potential use of public transport services to meet scheme objectives needs updating to reflect changes in policy and transport arrangements in the local area. 	<p>Provision for public transport must be provided for within the design of LTC crossings, efficient connectivity and access to the tunnel and facilitation of other public transport connections in accordance with national and local policy.</p>	<p>Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.</p>
21	Utility Relocations	2.1.64	<p>The Council understands that there are 4 or 5 additional Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) related to significant power and gas diversions. Specific concerns include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate reporting in respect of individual utility diversions, especially within the technical assessment chapters of the ES, and no information has been provided on impact assessment or effects. 2. Weak application of the undergrounding test. Neither the Planning Statement or the ES fully address the tests set out in NPS EN-5 and the commitments in the REAC does not adequately cover necessary commitments. Additionally, whilst the various justifications provided by National Highways as to why undergrounding in specific locations is not proposed present a binary choice between the proposed OHL diversion and a specific (discounted) under-grounding design, without reference to potential wider Overhead Line (OHL) route changes that may well extend the length of diversions but could offer the potential to then under-ground route sections in more feasible locations and thus reduce overall environmental impacts from the utility route. 3. The need for and design of individual utilities diversions has been considered as a necessary consequence of the preferred route, rather than a major design consideration at the outset. 4. Due to the above the Council cannot validate the NSIP screening conclusions. 5. Lack of clear identification and screening of proposed works to confirm whether each qualifies as a NSIP in its own right or requires to be treated as an Associated Development. 6. Lack of clarity regarding the identification of individual utilities. This also applies in terms of the ability to demonstrate 'compliance with reasonable alternatives requirements' within NPS EN- 5. 7. The extent of land-take required and likely impacts on communities and existing infrastructure, including in terms of disruption and safety. 8. Information gaps - Information requirements for EN-1, EN-4 and EN-5 are the same as those set out within NPSNN, need to be addressed directly for the proposed utilities NSIP diversions within the Project. <p>The Council consider that the above deficiencies significantly hinder the ability to clearly understand the types and levels of environmental impacts and mitigation requirements associated with each proposed utilities diversion</p>	<p>It is the Council's view that the DCO does not clearly establish the environmental acceptability of all proposed diversions, including the proposed utilities NSIP diversions in accordance with relevant requirements set out within EN-1, EN-4 and EN-5, including information requirements and requirement to assess all likely significant effects of the proposals.</p>	<p>Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.</p>
22	Appraisal of alternative configurations of the Project	2.1.66	<p>NH have not tested any alternative configurations for various elements of the Project such as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design of A13 junction 2. Potential TLR connection and connections with local junctions 3. Provision of local growth 4. Connections with active travel and public transport modes 	<p>National Highways have provided insufficient modelling evidence in support of the assessment of these alternative configurations. As a result, there is insufficient detail to understand the impacts (on the local road networks as well as residents, businesses,</p>	<p>Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.</p>

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			5. Consideration of the utility diversions in the route selection	open countryside and designated environmental areas) and to determine mitigation. NH have not explained their judgement on this matter and the Council cannot therefore subject it to any technical evaluation.	
23	Preferred Route Selection	2.1.67	The Council continues to take the view that the 2016 public consultation did not provide satisfactory comparative evidence for alternative route alignments A and C, and that the approach to deciding the preferred route was methodologically inadequate. No transport modelling evidence was presented at that time to substantiate the strategic choice made.	The Council would like additional information on the methodology of the sifting process, particularly how the options were weighted. The options were assessed against the Scheme Objectives, however, the Council does not agree with some of the major design elements (such as, A13 junction) or the detail of the layout of that route. Furthermore, the Council requires evidence of alternatives that would remove the traffic queues at Orsett Cock Roundabout through the consideration of an alternative configuration, including a junction at Tilbury.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
24	Future Proofing the LTC	2.1.69	<p>The Council query what future proofing of the road can be done to provide for sustainable transport solutions and support the Government's commitment to reduce carbon emissions by 78% by 2035. In the Council's opinion, it would not be in the public interest to have to retrofit at significant expense adjustments to the tunnel and associated works, which had only just been completed.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design excludes trains, trams, light rail, electric bikes, and scooters. Any future provision of these modes would require expensive retrofitting as the design is not future proof to accommodate the future changes in public transport demand and use. 2. There is no mention of safeguarding the Project for future upgrades such as autonomous vehicles. 3. There is no mention of bus routes or allowing for bus priority (in key areas such as the A1013) within the Design Principles and the design does not enable buses to serve efficiently existing centres and growth locations (residential or employment). 4. The Council note that the use of rail has been ruled out by DfT due to a poor business case, but no similar references were observed regarding bus routes, priority bus lanes or autonomous vehicles. <p>NH does not appear to consider it appropriate to work with the LAs in south Essex and north Kent, who would all support the use of LTC to facilitate an improved bus service. The Council recognises that the substitution of significant numbers of car users onto bus would erode further an already weak business case for LTC. It is likely therefore that concern to project the business case for LTC has taken precedence over the opportunity to use LTC to facilitate a more integrated transport system.</p>	The Council would welcome comments on how National Highways has engaged with the design requirements to accommodate the future change in public transport demand and use.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
25	Transport Modelling for resilience to future change	2.1.70	<p>The Project's design is for a life span of some 100 years, yet there is no modelling for resilience to future change, such as travel trends, mode shift and emerging technologies. The Council would require further testing to consider these scenarios.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that NH is preparing modelling of the implications of local strategic growth (i.e. indicative Local Plan tests) on the operation of the Project and the consequential effects on the local road network. The Council has also requested to see the modelling of the DfT Common Analytical Scenarios and modelling based on the assumption that a reduction in vehicle miles is needed to deliver on the Government's legally binding climate change targets. The Council is unable to wholly comment until that testing has been received, and, therefore, currently remains concerned that the proposals do not recognise the importance of local sustainable growth and connectivity.</p>	The Council would require further testing to consider these scenarios.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
26	Lack of progress of technical issues	2.1.75	Thurrock Council are not satisfied with the process of engagement undertaken by NH. While there have been extensive meetings and exchanges in correspondence, as evidenced by this PADs Summary document there remain many outstanding issues and there has been a lack of progress in resolving key technical discussions.	The Council believes that there are many critical, valid and acceptable points that could be	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
				built into the scheme that would greatly improve the scheme. Such changes, if accepted by National Highways, would offer the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) a greater chance of dealing with all such issues within the 6-months period of the Examination otherwise it will be challenging, as so many issues will be outstanding.	
27	Lack of updated traffic and environmental (including air quality, noise, updated Health and Equality Impacts Assessment) assessments	2.1.77	<p>Thurrock Council are concerned that the public consultations (particularly CIC and LRC) are based on earlier iterations of the traffic and environmental assessments, and that the information on impacts set out in the consultation may therefore not reflect the final outcomes of the assessments. Updated construction traffic modelling and other assessments have not been issued with consultation material and this is vital evidence that helps understand impacts on the road network and local communities and informs the development of appropriate design changes and mitigation measures.</p> <p>NH have not provided detailed technical information (traffic modelling, environmental assessments and utilities' construction assessments) in sufficient time for Thurrock Council to consider and respond, allowing National Highways to make needed changes in advance of freezing the proposals for the DCO submission. Thurrock Council are also concerned that some of the ongoing local modelling workstreams need linking to conclude activities such as the Strategic Traffic Modelling to confirm the robustness of those core assessments.</p>	National Highways have not provided detailed technical information (traffic modelling, environmental assessments and utilities' construction assessments) in sufficient time for Thurrock Council to consider and respond.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
28	Inadequate provision for compensation: Detailed comments on the 'Your Property and Compensation or Mitigation for the Effects of Our Road Proposals' document	2.1.80	<p>Thurrock Council consider that there is an inadequate provision for compensation to residents and businesses affected beyond that covered in statutory provision, particularly covering non- statutory compensation, respite stays, additional noise mitigation and off-line discretionary purchase. The policies provide limited comfort due to their discretionary nature and lack of specific details (including application process, response timeframe and support etc.).</p> <p>NH must include reference to this financial compensation as part of the HEqIA mitigation.</p>	Thurrock Council have made detailed comments and recommendations in respect of each policy contained within the 'Your Property and Compensation or Mitigation for the Effects of Our Road Proposals' Document published by National Highways.	Unlikely
29	A13 Junction; Consideration of alternatives	2.1.84	<p>The Council have concerns that the connectivity provided by the A13 junction results in a number of adverse impacts on regional traffic movements, local traffic flows, local communities and the environment. The proposed arrangement sterilises land within the Borough without assisting connections. The proposals are almost entirely about strategic benefit without supporting local growth, sustainable local access and connectivity, or the transport decarbonisation agenda.</p> <p>Further detail on specific concerns is set out in the following issues. The Council has presented a number of alternatives to test. Data and findings are just starting to be shared with the Council for review and further work will be needed in the coming months. NH has already stated that it has no intention that the scheme will be further amended as a result of the option testing currently underway – even if a more optimum scheme emerges from the work. This approach is inadequate.</p>	The Council do not consider that National Highways have presented enough information on alternative configurations to demonstrate that their proposed configuration is the optimal solution.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
30	A13 Junction; No consideration of the Tilbury Link Road as part of the alternative configurations	2.1.85	<p>The Council do not support the delivery of the Tilbury Link Road as a separate project to be appropriate. The Council consider that the Tilbury Link Road could provide connections that might enable a different configuration of the A13 junction, reducing the impacts associated with that junction. The Council view this as being an important element of the consideration of alternatives (as stated in paragraph 4.27 the NPSNN) and do not consider the work undertaken by National Highways to be sufficient to demonstrate that their proposals are the optimal scheme.</p> <p>Whilst the Council option is recognised by National Highways it is the Council's view that alternative options have not been adequately assessed.</p>	It is the Council's view that the crucial SRN links between LTC, A13 and A1089 could alternatively be made via a junction at Tilbury and the Tilbury Link Road (TLR). This could enable an alternative LTC / A13 / A1089 interchange configuration (potentially removing some A1089 links), reducing its complexity, scale, cost and local community impacts and making the interchange safer	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years
31	A13 Junction; Connectivity	2.1.86	The Council are concerned that the east-facing connections at the junction with the A13 lead to an increase in traffic in both directions along the A13 and the A130 to the east of the Lower Thames Crossing, removing capacity on the network which could support local growth. This	Amendments to the A13 junction design.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			also leads to local traffic moving off the A13 onto local roads, at Manorway roundabout and Five Bells roundabout, impacting on local communities.		
32	A13 Junction; Connectivity	2.1.87	The Council are concerned that the lack of west-facing connections at the junction with the A13 misses an opportunity to provide local connectivity, supporting local growth and sustainable local access. There is no proposal to manage the traffic induced on the local road network as a consequence of these absent connections.	Amendments to the A13 junction design.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
33	A13 Junction; Connectivity	2.1.88	The Council stated a concern that the proposals removed the connection between the Orsett Cock and the A1089 southbound. As a result, traffic from the A128 or from LTC travelling to the Port of Tilbury would need to travel along the A1013, as well as other local roads which are inappropriate for this traffic. The Council acknowledge that this link was reinstated at the Local Refinement consultation, by reconnecting the slip from the A13 westbound to A1089 to connect to Orsett Cock roundabout. However, the Council have concerns that this change increases the pressure on Orsett Cock roundabout, leading to additional traffic moving onto local roads, and increases the complexity of the interchange, impacting on driver understanding and causing safety concerns.	The Council are concerned that the traffic flows through Orsett Cock junction cannot be accommodated without additional works and that journey times are now slower.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
34	A13 Junction; Impacts on local roads	2.1.89	The Council are concerned that Project will result in additional traffic movements across the local road network, both from increased traffic using local roads to access the Lower Thames Crossing, and from vehicles diverting off the A13 to avoid congestion arising from the increased regional traffic. This will lead to adverse impacts on local communities, impacts on local bus services, and restrict local growth. Increased traffic flows across Orsett Cock roundabout will take up the additional capacity delivered by Thurrock Council through the A13 widening project. Delays resulting from the increased traffic will lead to increased flows along a number of roads around the A13 junction, and in addition the increase in traffic on the A13 east of the scheme will result in increased traffic on local roads through Orsett, Corringham and Stanford-le- Hope.	Amendments to the A13 junction design at Orsett Cock Roundabout.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
35	A13 Junction; Design Matters - Safe design of local road links	2.1.93	The Council has concerns that the elements of the road network have unsafe design aspects, including roads that are to be returned to Thurrock Council following completion of the works. The Council has provided information on these concerns to NH, but has not been provided with a justification, or been provided with information on any modifications to the design to address the concern. National Highways has effectively concluded that the safety matters raised by the Council are either not of concern or can be mitigated during detailed design. This response is unreasonably dismissive, and it is considered inappropriate to delay resolution for post DCO submission or grant. The Council does concur that, subject to confirmation of the boundary between local and trunk road network, some of the concerns that it has raised in the safety note could only directly affect the SRN. It may be that NH's designers have concluded that there are no concerns at these locations, but that point must be documented and not ignored.	Amendments to the A13 junction design at Orsett Cock Roundabout. Also, the economic appraisal report does not appropriately evaluate the social impacts of increased traffic on safety, severance, inactivity, etc and simply assumes that if on balance more traffic moves faster then this is a good thing. It is disingenuous to uphold a view that this approach improves the liveability of Thurrock.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
36	A13 Junction; Design Matters, Link Capacity	2.1.94	The Council are concerned that the capacity of the link between the LTC off slip to A13 eastbound and to Orsett Cock is insufficient, leading to a lack of resilience and impacting effective management on the network.	Amendments to the A13 junction design at Orsett Cock Roundabout and provision of evidence to substantiate the NH position on safety.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
37	Passive Provision at Tilbury and Provision of the Tilbury Operational Access, Options assessment	2.1.98	The provision of a new junction at Tilbury is supported in principle by the Council, if it is accompanied by a commitment to deliver the future Tilbury Link Road (TLR) that it is intended to facilitate. In the absence of this commitment, the junction is over-specified for an operational and emergency access only. It could, in the Council's view, facilitate regional growth with access to the Thames Freeport. Simply provided as an operational and emergency access it is an expensive and unnecessary luxury in the context of the Project as currently proposed. The Project should include provision of both a junction at Tilbury and the TLR to connect LTC to the A1089 and provide multi-modal access to the Tilbury, East Tilbury and potentially Chadwell St Mary Growth Areas. It is the Council's view that National Highways has to date not completed adequate option assessment, traffic modelling and design development work in relation to the Project overall, at the A13 Orsett Cock junction or at the proposed Tilbury junction to enable it to make fully informed judgements and comments on this latest proposal.	The Council expects National Highways to demonstrate that the proposed junction design will provide the vital capacity, connectivity, configuration and operational performance required to accommodate future traffic, public transport and walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH) movement demands arising as a result of the proposed project configuration with a TLR in place and with local growth aspirations for the area (e.g. Thames	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
				Freeport expansion and the Thurrock emerging Local Plan). Furthermore, NH must demonstrate why the TLR cannot be part of the LTC scheme.	
38	Tilbury Operational Access Design	2.1.99	<p>The Council has a number of concerns related to the half- clover leaf junction configuration and design as currently proposed which requires further evidence to be provided by National Highways covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction design options assessment; evidence of why this configuration has been proposed, and other alternatives discounted, • Junction design capacity and standards; National Highways should confirm the overall capacity constraints associated with this configuration (and associated National Highways design standards), especially the merge/diverge arrangements between slip roads, • Provision of a future east tilbury link; National Highways to demonstrate that this design can accommodate a future link eastward the east tilbury growth area, • The ability to accommodate future public transport and active travel i.e. National Highways should demonstrate sufficient width and space has been provided at the junction and on the new bridge structure to facilitate the creation of high quality public transport and active travel corridor. The added widths should allow for a minimum of 3.5m bus lane in each direction across the bridge and for a 5.0m segregated path pedestrian and cycle path, 	The Council has a number of concerns related to the half-clover leaf junction configuration and design as currently proposed and requires further evidence.	Unlikely
39	Design of Tilbury Viaduct	2.1.102	NH should classify the Tilbury Viaduct as a Project Enhanced Structure and provide a justification on this if is not the case. If the viaduct is not an 'enhanced design structure' it could worsen the environment for the population in this area. There are direct views from the West Tilbury Conservation Area onto Tilbury Viaduct.	Change Tilbury Viaduct to an 'Enhanced Structure' and amend design.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
40	Incentivisation, Reporting and Enforcement and the governance processes and dispute mechanisms	2.1.127	<p>The Council need further information on proposed incentivisation, monitoring, reporting and enforcement arrangements that will be put in place across all construction phases, particularly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the contractors be incentivised (e.g. In the fctp/omhp) to exceed targets and reduce impacts on travel network; 2. The key performance indicators (kpis) that will be regularly reported on; and 3. Effective enforcement mechanisms which will be used e.g. Consequences of non-compliance and consequence of targets not being met in the fctp. <p>The control documents must set out requirements for a defined management and governance process which encompasses the mechanisms by which the contractors' compliance is judged and measured. It must set out the corrective action procedures and timescales and the way in which dispute is resolved. The day-to-day governance process must be a system operated by the Client and the affected Local Authorities in collaboration with the Contractor. Only unresolved disputes should be referred to the Secretary of State.</p>	NH to provide further information on the proposed incentivisation, monitoring, reporting and enforcement arrangements for all construction phases.	Unlikely
41	A13 Junction; Construction	2.1.128	The Council are concerned that the complexity of the A13 interchange will lead to substantial disruption and delays due to the required temporary traffic management during the works.	Further traffic management measures are required.	Unlikely
42	Impacts on bus networks and lack of mitigation/ funding	2.1.132	<p>The Council believe impacts on the local bus network during construction should be assessed, and suitable monitoring and mitigation measures provided to reduce impacts on operators and bus passengers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More information is needed on the impacts on journey times. Mitigation is required for the adverse impact on journeys between Thurrock and Basildon (in particularly the Thurrock University Hospital located in Basildon and between Basildon and employment in Thurrock). Impacts on bus journeys to and from this site could have an adverse impact on health, reducing health enhancing behaviours (e.g. attending clinics/checks/screening) if accessibility is reduced. 2. Consideration should be given to relocation of a pair of bus stops at Heath Road (due to be relocated by 400 metres) and the potential impacts (re health and accessibility) on elderly residents of the area. 3. National Highways states that "longer-distance coaches" may transfer from the Dartford Crossing to LTC. This would not apply to London bound coaches which are not able to access A13 west of LTC and are therefore not able to open up to the market within Thurrock. 4. Funding should be made available to address the issues above, as necessary. In the Council's opinion, it would not be in the public interest to have to retrofit at significant expense adjustments to the tunnel and associated works, which had only just been completed. The Council would welcome comments on how National Highways has engaged with the design requirements to accommodate the future change in public transport demand and use. 	Assessment of impacts on local bus network is required.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
43	Limited progress on issues of concern and insufficient details for incident management	2.1.141	LTC has demonstrated limited progress on the ESSPSG's 56 specific recommendations as outlined in the CIC and supported by all local authorities including Thurrock Council. The Council is concerned about the lack of adequate provision for emergency services within the LTC scheme, especially around: 1. The timely safe and efficient access to and from incidents for the emergency and rescue services; 2. Management of traffic and people affected by those incidents; locations of rendezvous points (rvp) and emergency hubs 3. Management of the impacts on local routes as a consequence of those incidents including emergency service response times.	Positive responses required to ESSPSG's 56 recommendations .	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
44	Sharing of full LTAM operational model	2.1.145	Thurrock Council have requested issue of the full LTC Traffic Model (LTAM) to allow the Council to undertake its own review of the cause of changes in traffic flows within Thurrock for journeys that start and / or end outside Thurrock. NH have advised that they will not share the full traffic model.	Share full LTAM model	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years
45	Changes to A13/Orsett Cock Junction Arrangements Overall impacts of LTC project on local roads	2.1.153	The Council initial review of NH's latest strategic modelling (LTAM DCOv2) has determined that there are impacts of the LTC on Thurrock's LRN at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A13 Orsett Cock roundabout; significantly increased traffic flow (over +40% on some roundabout links in AM and PM peak) negatively impacting on the operational performance of the junction (increasing delays and queuing) and reducing capacity for future local plan growth. A128 Brentwood Road (and Chadwell Hill through Chadwell St Mary): – significantly increased traffic flow (+20% to 40% on some links in AM peak and over +40% on some links in Inter and PM peaks) with associated safety, noise and air quality impacts on local communities Marshfoot Road and Marshfoot Priority Junction- significantly increased traffic flow (over +40% on some links in AM and PM peak periods) negatively impacting on the operational performance of the junction (increasing delays and queuing). This has also been identified as an existing accident 'hotspot. Buckingham Hill Road (and East Tilbury Road/ Princes Margaret Road Corridor through Linford)- significantly increased traffic flow (over +40% on some links in AM, Inter and PM peaks) with associated safety, noise and air quality impacts on local communities - Muckingford Road (at Chadwell) - significantly increased traffic flow (+10% to +20% on some links in AM peak and +40% on some links in PM peak with associated safety, noise and air quality impacts on local communities; and Fort Road / Turnpike Lane / Station Road (including through West Tilbury) - increased traffic flow (+40% on some links in PM peak) with associated safety, noise and air quality impacts on local communities. 	Further detail will be provided within the LIR for consideration.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
46	Value for money	2.1.156	Thurrock Council are concerned that there has not been any provision of updated value for money information since the release of the first DCO submission. Increasing scheme costs over the past 4 years and scheme benefits decreasing mean that Thurrock Council are unclear on the benefits of the scheme and do not consider that it currently provides value for money. Modelling & Appraisal Report (ComMA) so far is now 2 years out-of-date and requests for updates of this document or provision of the OBC have been refused by NH (despite two Freedom of Information (Fol) formal requests) leading to inadequate conclusions. Consequently, the Council is undertaking further work on the economic costs of the proposed scheme.	Updates to OBC and ComMA reports with data from 2022 not 2020 or before, as the OBC issued to the Council is dated August or earlier 2020. Review of LTC value for money should be undertaken.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
47	Limited relief to the Dartford Crossing	2.1.157	Thurrock Council are concerned that the relief to the Dartford Crossing is limited and that there is marginal benefit by 2045. This matter is raised in more detail in the Council's Relevant Representation.	Not undertake the LTC scheme without further analysis.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
48	Consideration of Wider Network Impacts	2.1.158	The Council has concerns over the inadequate recognition of the likely impacts on the wider transport network in Thurrock and the lack of commitment to monitor and then mitigate effects on the wider network or junctions and local roads within Thurrock. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If improvements/ mitigation are required then National Highways should legally commit to securing these measures and providing the relevant funding (possibly through suitable agreements/ requirements). There is no commitment to mitigate the known impacts on the LRN. National Highways does not provide any reassurance to LAs and the community that LTC's impacts on the wider road network will be mitigated. National Highways should identify impacts, including those on the LRN, as part of the evidence base for the DCOv2 Examination and not defer this to a later date, at which stage the local authority may be little more than a consultee. 	NH to identify all impacts, including on LRN and identify adequate mitigation. Lack of mitigation of significant impacts to local road network and junction in the wider network.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
49	Roads and junctions of concern	2.1.159	<p>Thurrock Council have identified that there may be adverse impacts at a number of locations including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A13 interchange and Orsett Cock, 2. The Manorway roundabout, 3. ASDA roundabout, 4. Daneholes roundabout and 5. Marshfoot Road junction. 6. A1013 (Daneholes roundabout), B149, Marshfoot Road. 7. Marshfoot priority junction (with slips to A1089). 8. Brentwood Road and Chadwell Hill, Chadwell St Mary. 9. A1012/Lodge Lane/Long Lane Roundabout. 10. Stifford Clays Road. 11. A13/A126 eastbound off slip. 12. M25 J30 - Mardyke Interchange. 13. Devonshire Road/A1012/Hogg Lane. <p>Thurrock Council is of the view that locally validated junction modelling should be carried out at key pressure points on the network, using accurate baseline traffic data for validation. Where this work indicates further mitigation is required, this should be secured through the DCO or through a separate legal agreement. This should inform mitigation and the Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan, which the Council would seek to review prior to DCO submission. This type of modelling would be expected of any other applicant/developer.</p>	NH to identify all impacts through junction modelling, including on LRN and identify adequate mitigation. Lack of mitigation of significant impacts to local road network and junction in the wider network.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
50	Delivering Tilbury Link Road (TLR) as part of the LTC scheme	2.1.165	<p>The Council would like the TLR to be delivered as part of LTC and are opposed to its removal from the LTC proposals. Its inclusion would support the delivery of Thames Freeport, the planned growth of the Port of Tilbury, the expansion of DP World, the delivery of Thurrock's emerging Local Plan's employment and housing growth and avoiding unnecessary impacts of HGVs accessing LTC on local roads and communities.</p> <p>Recent correspondence with National Highways casts serious doubts over the eligibility of the TLR for funding via any future RIS3 programme, therefore the Council believes that the most efficient way of delivering the TLR is as part of the LTC scheme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council believe adding this to the scheme now would take approx. 12-18 months more than a LTC only DCO. National Highways have suggested that a combined LTC / TLR DCO would add 4 years to the delivery programme making it an unacceptable option. 2. If TLR cannot be added to the LTC DCO, it is essential to accelerate its delivery using alternative funding and delivery mechanisms (before RIS3, in line with the delivery of LTC). There must be a firm legal commitment from National Highways/DfT for its provision. 	It is the Council's view that the crucial SRN links between LTC, A13 and A1089 could alternatively be made via a junction at Tilbury and the Tilbury Link Road (TLR). This could enable an alternative LTC / A13 / A1089 interchange configuration (potentially removing some A1089 links), reducing its complexity, scale, cost and local community impacts and making the interchange safer.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
51	Potential route of the TLR and impacts	2.1.168	It is clear that access to the Port of Tilbury, once the LTC scheme is completed and operational, will be circuitous from the LTC north and southbound. The local A roads and unclassified roads/junctions are not designed to accommodate these increases in traffic and/or HGV traffic.	This matter means that there will be additional safety, air quality and noise concerns relating to increasing traffic and HGVs, particularly related to the schools, residential dwellings and local bus services along these routes, because of this circuitous route.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
52	Council- led local Labour and Business Team (LLBT)	2.1.170	Thurrock Council would like a dedicated council led labour and business team. This team would have responsibility for ensuring the residents and businesses of the borough secured economic benefits through working closely with NH, contractors and sub- contractors.	Agree to contribution via S106 Agreement.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
53	Alignment with Thurrock's Social Value Framework Ring fencing social value	2.1.175	Ensure LTC procurement meets with requirements of the Council commissioning, procurement and grant funding strategy and to include greater priority to be given to Thurrock council as a Level 2 Authority within the DLUHC Levelling Up White Paper beneficiary and recipient of greater disbenefits.	Priority needs to be given to Thurrock for procurement.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
54	Scale of the Community Fund (North)	2.1.177	The Council are of the opinion that the scale of the proposed LTC Community Fund remains very modest in comparison with all the available benchmark information for similar DCOs. Securing an appropriately sized community fund is of critical importance and the Council would like LTC to share the results of its benchmarking exercise and do further work to increase the quantum of the fund.	Change Community Fund to respond to multi-local authority comments.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
55	Need for a new Scoping Opinion	2.1.185	The Council are of the opinion that a new Scoping Opinion needs to be provided for the project. This is due to the significant changes since the original Scoping Opinion was issued, including a significant change in the size of the development boundary, which could have led to new, unassessed, environmental impacts. The significant changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of Tilbury Link Road; • A13 junction redesigned; • Pylons relocated; • Additional land take around East Tilbury; and • Growth in development boundary. The determination of the significance of the receptors was undertaken by NH, in the absence of input from local authorities like Thurrock Council, which should be corrected.	Provision of updated Scoping Opinion.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two-three years.
56	Comments on Air Quality methodology (LA105-Significance and Limit Values)	2.1.187	The Council disagree with the approach to methodology undertaken by LTC and the reliance on LA105. In the Council's opinion, the thresholds applied remain a limitation of the approach that only identifies significance where limit values are exceeded, which is not relevant when addressing health related impacts of non- threshold pollutants.	Change in methodology on air quality assessment.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two-three years.
57	Omission of PM2.5 in air quality assessment	2.1.188	PM2.5 is not currently assessed and reported as part of the DMRB HA207/07 and hence will not be included within the assessment for the project. The Council believes that this should also be included as part of the assessment, as it is PM2.5 which is potentially more prejudicial to health than PM10. The evaluation of significance of this pollutant should also be assessed, particularly as it is the very fine elements of particulate matter i.e. PM2.5, such as brake & tyre wear emissions and diesel exhaust emissions that contribute to the bulk of PM2.5 emissions and it is this element which is most prejudicial to health.	Specific Inclusion of PM2.5 within air quality assessment.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two-three years.
58	Actions in case of noise monitoring exceedance	2.1.207	Original text for NV015 - In the event that noise and vibration monitoring (as provided for in NV009) identifies that noise and vibration limits (as provided for in NV004) have been exceeded the Contractor shall, at the earliest practicable opportunity, investigate to confirm that works being undertaken as part of the scheme are the source of the noise. If this is confirmed, then the Contractor shall immediately undertake a further review of the best practicable means (as defined under the Control of Pollution Act, 1974) employed for the activity to minimise noise and agree additional or modified mitigation with the relevant local authority unless otherwise agreed with the Secretary of State. Alternative text sought by the Council for the (last sentence): If this is confirmed, then the contractor shall immediately stop those works causing the exceedance and undertake a further review of the best practicable means employed for the activity to minimise noise and agree additional or modified mitigation with the relevant local authority. These particular works will only re- commence when satisfactory and agreed (with the local authority) mitigation is provided.	The Council welcome the text in the NV015 (exceedance framework for noise); however seek immediate stoppage of works in case of an exceedance (after the works undertaken as part of the scheme are confirmed to be the source of the noise).	Unlikely
59	HIA Recommendations from Independent review - Severity and Likelihood of health outcomes	2.1.216	The assessment should provide information on the severity and likelihood of the health outcomes. At present it is just stated whether a health outcome is considered to be positive, negative or neutral, however the assessment would benefit from further information being provided on the severity of the effect (e.g. minor, moderate or major positive/ negative) to help provide a more balanced assessment and increase understand of the level of health outcomes anticipated.	Update HEqIA.	Unlikely
60	PRoW proposals sought within the LTC DCO: Potential Improvements around the northern side of Baker Street	2.1.242	Thurrock Council sent through proposals around how LTC can complete and improve the PRoW network. The PRoW proposals sought within the LTC DCO included potential improvements around the northern side of Baker Street.	Amend design of PRoW proposals to include additional mitigation and legacy provision.	Very unlikely, as recently discussed and rejected by NH.
61	Targets in the Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP)	2.1.243	The Council would like specific and stretch targets in the FCTP to be adopted by contractors. These targets should cover a certain percentage of car trips (preferably trips made via EV), cycle trips, trips by foot, trips via public transport. In addition, the targets should be monitored on a regular basis with a mechanism for modifying arrangements if targets are not met.	Add enhanced targets as recommended by the Council within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			For the Travel Plan to be effective there must be a robust and proactive commitment and governance from National Highways to be incorporated from Travel Plan Co-ordinators and Managers.		
62	FCTP Assumptions	2.1.244	The Council has the following suggestions for the FCTP assumptions: 1. FCTP assumes 60-minute travel time for workers based at compounds. This should account for the time taken to access the origin station or bus service and the period to travel from the destination hub or bus stop, which would reduce the catchment for the two hubs. 2. Compound shift arrangements should reflect availability and suitability of public transport services for worker commuting periods. Early and late tunnelling shift are not suited to public transport due to the early start or late finishes. How will these challenges be resolved without encouraging travel by private cars?	Implement suggested amended assumptions within the FCTP (APP-546). Further information is required to determine how these challenges will be resolved without using private cars.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
63	Use the construction phase as an opportunity to trial innovative forms of worker transport measures	2.1.248	The Council would like NH to commit to mobility hubs, enabling employees to travel in by rail, bus or car and switch to shuttle bus/DRT or e-bike to the construction compound or between construction compounds. Following a review of National Highways position, the Council welcome the commitment to shuttle buses. However, the Council seek more clarity around how this strategy will be realised, maintained and its ultimate effectiveness.	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
64	Use the construction phase as an opportunity to trial innovative forms of worker transport measures	2.1.249	The Council would like NH to adopt Travel Incentives – to cycle, use public transport, lift-share and use electric vehicles. Following a review of National Highways position, the Council's position is that the lack of specific targets before DCO submission and incentives for contractors will discourage the delivery of the commitments in the FCTP.	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
65	Use the construction phase as an opportunity to trial innovative forms of worker transport measures	2.1.250	The Council would like NH to adopt smart management of shift patterns and gangs to minimise travel in peak hours and maximum opportunity to lift share. Following a review of NH position, the Council's position is that travel spreading will flatten the profile but may not help to discourage car travel. The management of shift patterns therefore needs to be 'smart' and not solely driven by construction profiles.	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
66	Use the construction phase as an opportunity to trial innovative forms of worker transport measures	2.1.251	The Council would like NH to commit to Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) – partner with a provider to enable employees to book a service either from home (within a service area), hotel/temporary accommodation or public transport interchange. Following a review of NH position, the Council's position is that the wording in the FCTP is weak. National Highways should provide sufficient appropriate opportunities for workers to travel by non-car modes. Without these complementary measures National Highways is effectively proposing that car travel is the primary means of access. The contractors should be required to demonstrate why DRT would not form part of the package of measures.	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
67	Use the construction phase as an opportunity to trial innovative forms of worker transport measures	2.1.252	The Council would like NH to commit to new construction phase cycle infrastructure – providing a permanent scheme for community, when not accessing the LTC construction site/compounds. Following a review of NH position, the Council's position is that National Highways does not support the use of unlit access routes and routes with no footways (CoCP Para 6.3.5 (a)). Therefore, the FCTP and SSTPs will not support active travel without alterations to the existing network. The FCTP and SSTP are therefore entirely reliant on a strategy of shared transport (bus, van or car based sharing) to reduce the impact of workforce travel on the network.	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
68	Enable active travel to construction sites:	2.1.253	The Council request funding from NH to support the continued operation of the Hubs (cycle hubs at Stanford le Hope and Tilbury) will secure the infrastructure for the community for the future and provide the infrastructure for LTC construction workers to cycle from the hubs to the construction compounds. Following a review of the NH position, it is the Council's opinion that without this funding, National Highways is demonstrating a lack of commitment to these methods of travel.	Agree to additional funding through S106 Agreement.	Unlikely
69	Enable active travel to construction sites:	2.1.254	The Council would like NH to provide further capital works to facilitate convenient, well-lit cycle and pedestrian access to each of construction compounds from surrounding residential areas and transport hubs. Following a review of the NH position, it is the Council's opinion that National Highways is demonstrating a lack of commitment to these methods of travel.	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
70	Parking at Construction Compounds	2.1.255	<p>The Council would like compound parking provision to be based on accessibility of compound location not as a percentage of the number of workers. Poor accessibility should not be a justification for high numbers of parking spaces but should lead to improvements in environmentally sustainable options.</p> <p>What mechanisms will be put in place to ensure parking does not cascade to other compounds and result in movement between compounds along the trace or disguised as essential inter- compound travel?</p>	Implement recommended measures within the FCTP (APP-546).	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
71	Appropriate provision on LTC bridge crossings	2.1.256	<p>Ensuring that the proposed re- provision of bridges across the LTC, along existing corridors, deliver sufficient legacy provision to encourage active sustainable travel and support future growth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hoford Road - 4m WCH provision sought Farm Track and FP 79 - 3.5m WCH provision sought A1013 over A1089 - 5m WCH provision sought Rectory Road - 8m WCH provision sought Green Lane - 4m WCH provision sought Farm Track and FP 136 - 4m WCH provision sought North Road - 5m WCH provision sought 	NH need to agree to each of these measures and then implement recommended measures to required LTC crossings.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
72	Appropriate provision on LTC bridge crossings	2.1.257	<p>Ensuring that the proposed re- provision of bridges across the LTC, along existing corridors, deliver sufficient legacy provision to encourage active sustainable travel and support future growth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Muckingford Road – 5m Walkers, Cyclists and Horse-riders (WCH) provision sought along with a 7m bus lane Brentwood Road - separate provision for WCH sought on the bridge FP 252 over LTC - 5m provision sought on the bridge FP 252 over Railway - 5m provision sought on the bridge Stifford Clays - 7m provision sought on the bridge, with a separate equestrian route provided A1013 over LTC - 5m WCH provision sought 	NH need to agree to each of these measures and then implement recommended measures to required LTC crossings.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
73	Future changes in vehicle use due to electrification	2.1.266	<p>The Council notes that the 6th Carbon Budget Methodology report (published by the Climate Change Committee) identifies vehicle electrification, and the introduction of CAV technology will result in significant impact on road transportation (including increases), on the basis of assumptions made. The Council queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> These are not good outcomes for carbon reduction and community cohesion and need amending. The assumptions would need to be clarified to secure reductions in single vehicle use, and how might these apply to the road user charging regime for LTC. Explain how the operational regime be used to create positive outcomes from a carbon and community perspective. <p>The Council has seen no assessment of uncertainty as part of the development of this scheme, and no evidence of proposals that could suggest that LTC could become a transformational project.</p>	NH response to queries for further review.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
74	Nitrogen Deposition, DCO Requirement	2.1.273	It is essential that Thurrock Council are involved in development work to ensure that these schemes deliver appropriate new habitat and wider green infrastructure benefits that accord with the Council's emerging Local Plan. We therefore request an additional DCO Requirement to cover such controls and discussions.	Additional Requirement.	Unlikely
75	Bus access at the operational access (at Tilbury)	2.1.277	It is the Council's opinion that the operational access (at Tilbury) opens an opportunity for bus access which the LTC does not currently provide.	Provision for bus access.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
76	Low- emission vehicle usage targets	2.1.284	The Project should commit to low-emission vehicle usage targets for all construction vehicles with financial penalties payable to Thurrock in the event of exceedance.	Commit to low emission targets as recommended within appropriate control documents.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
Matters under Discussion (74 Matters)					
77	Requirement 3	2.1.48	This requirement must ensure that the Council approves the Outline Landscaping and Ecology Management Plan. The landscaping scheme must then be in accordance with the approved plans. Previous engagement with National Highways refers to 15% biodiversity net gain (BNG) gain – however, this percentage is no longer valid and a sub standard BNG has been achieved by NH. We suggest that this is set out in the Outline Landscaping and Ecology Management Plan (which will then be secured by the landscaping scheme).	Change Requirement to ensure Council approval of the oLEMP (APP-490) and update BNG to be achieved at a higher and acceptable level.	Unlikely
78	Accordance with National and Strategic Policy	2.1.58	The Council is concerned by the lack of an assessment of the Project's performance against national and National Highways strategic policies and its 7 scheme objectives (which have not been prioritised or weighted). Additionally, the national and strategic policies and scheme objectives that the Project does not satisfy relate to the following documents: 1. NPSNN (2015) – paragraph 2.13, 2.22, 4.3, 4.27 2. DFTs Road Investment Strategy 1 and 2 (RIS 1 and 2) - selected paragraphs 3. National Highway's 'The Road to Growth – Our Strategic Economic Growth Plan' (2017) - selected paragraphs 4. National Highway's Strategic Business Plan (2017) - selected paragraphs	Covered in every Council Consultation response and no response has been received from NH. Further information and evidence will be provided within the LIR.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for three-four years.
79	Green Belt Methodology	2.1.59	The Project is 'inappropriate development' and harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, the Council question if the compliance with NPS policy in relation to the Green Belt is adequately demonstrated and all other reasonable options have been examined. The Council has not yet had the opportunity to comment on a full LTC Green Belt assessment, despite 2 years having elapsed since DCOv1 was withdrawn. A Green Belt Assessment (GBA) should have been undertaken of all alternative routes, to help inform the preferred route of the scheme and National Highways should have consulted LPAs on the GBA methodology prior to the assessment and consultation on the GBA should have been undertaken prior to submission of the DCO application. The assessment is not considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and local planning policy including the Thurrock Strategic Green Belt Assessment. The Council has assumed that the assessment of harm to the Green Belt has not informed the alternatives process or the selection of the preferred route and junction designs for the Project.	Green Belt methodology is not in accordance with NPSNN requirements and requires significant amendments	Unlikely
80	Green Belt Assessment	2.1.60	The Council does not agree with identifying parts of the Project development as 'appropriate' or 'inappropriate' development in relation to assessing the impact to the Green Belt. The Green Belt assessment does not sufficiently assess the impact of the Project as a whole. Thurrock Council consider that the Project is without a correct assessment of the Green Belt which raises questions to whether the right option was selected to comply with Green Belt policy, preferred route and design, and whether the right mitigation has been selected to minimise the impact on the Green Belt.	A revised assessment of Green Belt, to include alternative/preferred route and design options (including A13 junction design). Also, Green Belt methodology is not in accordance with NPSNN requirements and requires significant amendments.	Unlikely
81	Testing scheme alternatives for Thurrock Council	2.1.68	The Council has suggested a number of alternatives for testing, including: 1. LTC with a Tilbury Link Road. 2. LTC with different configurations of the connections to the A13 and with a Tilbury Link Road. Some progress has been made on developing suitable models for testing these alternatives over the last 18 months, this work has not been completed. The Council consider that further modelling work is required to either justify the current configuration or propose an alternative for the A13 junction. NH approach to options analysis here is vague and unstructured and stakeholders would not support an option that delivers significant traffic congestion on opening and the Council's serious concerns have not been addressed by NH.	Additional alternatives testing required y NH, as NH has refused access to the LTAM model.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
82	Thurrock's Land Interests - likely impacts	2.1.81	The Statement of Reasons provides limited justification for the compulsory temporary possession powers being sought or the requirement for the permanent acquisition of Thurrock Council land to facilitate the Scheme. Due to positive engagement on the likely effects on Thurrock-owned land, there is a thorough assessment of likely impacts or compensation requirements on the 142 remaining land parcels in Thurrock ownership, through proposed permanent and temporary acquisition and rights. Discussions are still required as to how the assessment of land parcels information can be secured in a separate agreement. In relation to parcels required on a permanent basis, Thurrock Council have raised specific concerns and site specific queries on the following sites:	Joint working has established in detailed data on each Thurrock-owned land parcel and now requires securing through a side Agreement yet to be received from NH.	Possible, as requested from NH almost 6-9 months ago and promised but not yet received.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the West of Gammonfields Way Land at A13, Orsett Grays Public Highway, Footway and Verge (Baker Street, B118) <p>Site specific queries have also been raised in respects of land at Fort Road, Tilbury which is required on a temporary basis. Further work is required on the Statement of Reasons or a separate Agreement setting out adequate provisions. There are ongoing discussions regarding each land parcel owned by Thurrock Council to determine its usage, timescales and limitations on area required. Thurrock Council would request that these matters of detail are secured via a separate agreement.</p>		
83	Public Open Space	2.1.83	<p>Under s19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 an acquiring authority is in all but a limited number of cases that where the land to be acquired forms 'part of a common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment' that there will be provided as replacement land to fulfil the function of the land acquired and that other land will be of no lesser area and no less advantageous.</p> <p>We see no reasons why this requirement should not apply both in respect of land permanently acquired and that acquired temporarily. Failure in either circumstance would leave the residents of Thurrock with less of this particular land type.</p> <p>It is for NH to demonstrate, in each instance, the extent to which it meets these criteria.</p>	Amendments required to the draft DCO Order.	Possible
84	Impact of proposed new link on local roads;	2.1.90	<p>The latest LTAM traffic modelling presented by NH in the LR consultation material predicts that the proposed Orsett Cock / A1089 Junction Link Road will help to reduce the effects of LTC traffic on A1013 Stanford Road and Brentwood Road, which is welcomed albeit there continues to be an overall increase in traffic flow on A128 Brentwood Road which remains unmitigated. There is also an increase in Chadwell Hill through Chadwell St Mary. National Highways should amend the Project, such that traffic flow is not increased on Brentwood Road and if this is not viable, work closely with the council to design and fund traffic mitigation for this area. The effects of these measures need to be tested on A128 Brentwood Road and also on Buckingham Hill Road, Muckingford Road and Fort Road as all of these roads are predicted to see an increase in traffic as a result of the project. These traffic management mitigation measures may result in further traffic using Orsett Cock junction or other routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NH must also develop and test the mitigation measures at Marshfoot Road, particularly the priority junction on the east side of the A1089. The increased traffic also raises concerns related to the operational performance of the A1089 Asda Roundabout and micro- simulation should be undertaken. A negative impact of the proposed new link is to route more traffic through the A13 Orsett Cock junction itself and the consultation doesn't provide any specific information in this. National Highways haven't completed the assessment of this impact and is not presenting the public with this information. The effect of the new link in increasing traffic flows through Orsett village (Rectory Road / Conways Road) is concerning. Whilst it is noted that the overall predicted effect of the project will be to reduce flows through the village, the Council remains very concerned about the Project's traffic impacts on Orsett Village during construction and the ongoing risk of rat running through the area once the Project is operational due to potential congestion at the A13 Orsett Cock National Highways must work closely with the Council to design and fund traffic and environmental mitigation measures for this area and it is disappointing that little progress has been made on this issue. NH's response to a technical note shared in Jan summarising traffic survey data is outstanding. 	Further traffic model tests required for review by the Council to demonstrate no impact as technical meetings did not resolve this issue. NH need to provide these tests to the Council preceded by a programme for their provision.	Possible, as requested from NH almost 6-9 months ago, but not yet received.
85	A13 Junction; Ownership and management - Use of local roads to make strategic connections (Orsett Cock roundabout)	2.1.91	<p>The Council consider that the Project makes use of Orsett Cock roundabout, on the local road network, to provide strategic road connections, for example between the Lower Thames Crossing and the A1089. This places an obligation onto Thurrock Council to operate and maintain this junction while it accommodates SRN traffic and reduces the capacity of Orsett Cock roundabout to support future local growth.</p> <p>The Council is concerned that the LTC / A13 / A1089 interchange configuration is using Council roads at the A13 Orsett Cock junction, which is designated as part of the Major Road Network (MRN)) to provide critical SRN to SRN connections.</p> <p>This will be inappropriately reducing the cost of LTC by using this local highway road and junction increasing the future financial burden on the Council, by placing SRN traffic on the Major Road Network (MRN) junction. It will also mean LTC traffic will use up capacity delivered at this junction as part of the recent and expensive A13 highway upgrades to support local growth requirements and aspirations. The Council believes it should be compensated by DfT and a strategy derived by National Highways as to how that reserve capacity would be reintroduced to the network to allow the Council to realise its local growth requirements and aspirations.</p> <p>Changes to A13/Orsett Cock Junction Arrangements - Impacts at Orsett Cock Junction</p>	Amended designs required for the Orsett Cock Roundabout and adoption by NH of the A13 as an SRN and additional compensation to the Council.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			It is inappropriate to repeatedly consult on a scheme that NH do not know will operate effectively and has not been assessed fully. NH cannot rely on the designs currently considered by the Council to be of a conceptual nature, such that detail arrangements can be defined through detailed designs. This approach does not confirm the impacts of the project to sufficient detail for the Council to be confident of delivery of the project without significant unmitigated impact and does not effectively assess any 'worst case' through the EIA process.		
86	Orsett Cock Roundabout Mitigation	2.1.92	It is the view of the Council that additional mitigation is needed to negate the negative impact of the Project upon the junction, including the A128 approach to the junction, signalisation of the A128 arm and possible widening of existing lanes.	Amended designs required for the Orsett Cock Roundabout and adoption by NH of the A13 as an SRN and additional compensation to the Council.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
87	Spacing of non-emergency stopping areas	2.1.95	The Council request NH to confirm if they propose to adhere to the spacing of non-emergency stopping areas within its network, once the Project is constructed and if so, the Council would like confirmation of these spacings.	Amend design parameters for emergency stopping areas in Design Principles (APP-516).	Unlikely
88	Manorway Roundabout Mitigation	2.1.96	The Council requests additional lane capacity on the A1013 and A1013 approaches (including the Manorway roundabout) to ensure port and local traffic movements are not impaired by the Project.	Additional local junction modelling required and commitment from NH to share mitigation required.	Unlikely
89	Asda Roundabout Enhancement	2.1.97	The Council considers that the requirement for enhancements at the Asda roundabout should be actively examined alongside other delivery highway improvements.	Additional local junction modelling required and commitment from NH to share mitigation required.	Unlikely
90	Tilbury Fields Design Principles and Plan Additional information required for Tilbury Fields	2.1.101	<p>The final design of the public open space provision and facilities have yet to be prepared and will not form part of the DCO, however, the Council requires additional Design Principles and an 'Indicative Plan' to be prepared, so that the design of Tilbury Fields is both constrained, controlled and delivered as discussed to the appropriate standard and agreed with the Council. In particular these should include the layout, route of all the WCHs, surfacing palette and ecological finish and details of any structure/building. The Council requests the following additional information, which has not been provided to the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The alternatives options appraisal to demonstrate that the currently proposed site is appropriate and why the East Tilbury Landfill area was not included to lower landform levels - not yet provided but may be part of DCO application. 2. Sections and visualisations showing how the new earthworks will appear from Coalhouse Fort in context with intervening East Tilbury Landfill to better understand its visual effects on this sensitive heritage site – not yet provided but may be part of DCO application. 3. More details of the emerging design, including habitat features and their future management prior to DCO submission - not yet provided but may be part of DCO application. 4. A horse-riding route connecting the Two Forts Way to FP200 is included as part of the Project - not yet provided but may be part of DCO application. 5. The network of paths would improve recreational connectivity between the river and three Scheduled Monuments. However, the Council do require further details of the proposed designations of these WCH - not yet provided but may be part of DCO application. 6. Information on how would National Highways look to strategically link this new park to existing footpaths and other open spaces locally? 7. Updated noise and air quality impact assessments demonstrating how the proximity to the highway affects Tilbury Fields - not yet provided but may be part of DCO application. 	Additional Design Principles (APP-516) and Indicative Plan to secure broad design, plus provision of additional information by NH. Review of DCO application is needed by the Council.	Possible
91	Use of Port Facilities to transport construction materials	2.1.110	<p>NH should make firm commitments as to the type and amount of material that can be transported by marine transport including via Port of Tilbury and Tilbury2. At present whilst contractors are apparently encouraged to investigate this further as part of their MHPs and TMPs there is no firm commitment to do so and contractors will opt for the easiest and cheapest option. The oMHP must form a robust framework in which stretching targets around the movement and handling of materials which will bring about reductions in the environmental impacts of moving and handling that material. The targets should be minima which the contractors adopt within their developed Materials Handling Plans and that they are incentivised to exceed those targets.</p> <p>NH have offered a commitment and Thurrock Council have made formal comments summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NH should extend its commitments to moving materials, plant and equipment associated with the delivery of the project beyond the current commitment relating solely to 35% of bulk aggregates and revisit the wording such that it is specifically expressed that movement 	Joint comments from the Council and PLA in October 2022 have been rejected by NH in their response of February 2023. These joint comments should be reviewed, and NH should include further changes in its DCO commitments.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			<p>must be by non- road transport. Specifically, it is noted that concrete will be batched on site and also tunnel segments cast on site. How will concrete aggregate be delivered to the site for preparation/batching?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. NH should commit to move other materials, plant and equipment by marine and rail. 3. NH should set out the justification for exclusion of any material, plant or equipment that is dismissed by National Highways within the oMHP. 4. NH should indicate how road safety and reductions in transport-based carbon has been taken into account for road-based transport. 5. NH should establish a process within the oMHP by which contractors would apply for a derogation from the contracted commitments, if required. That process should allow suitable notification, review and approval between National Highways, the contractor and the Council. The process should be designed by National Highways to incentivise the contractor to pursue movements by non- road-based transport except in exceptional circumstances. 6. NH should confirm why the existing jetties are not available or appropriate to the project and how alternative marine and rail facilities would be used or created. 		
92	Number and type of vehicle movement	2.1.111	<p>No evidence has been provided to support the assessment of the number of on-line vehicle movements identified and the assessment appears to use different vehicle capacities for the waste removed from the North of the river to that removed from the South of the river with no justification for this difference.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no clarity as to the numbers and type of movements associated with materials handling and 2. There is no cap on movements from the project in total or from any defined compound, including the utilities logistics hubs. 	Previous requests for this information on construction vehicles from NH have not been provided.	Unlikely
93	Receiving wastes	2.1.112	<p>No information on the receiving sites has been identified to provide comfort that they will be able to accept the wastes generated at the point that they are exported from the site.</p> <p>There is a lack of detail on the sites receiving the wastes to provide confidence that they are suitably licensed or have sufficient capacity to receive the wastes generated at the point that they are produced. It is not possible to align the facilities identified within Appendix B the oMHP with those considered within the Excavated Materials Assessment (EMA) within the ES, making it impossible to assess the surrounding capacities and potential for the management of the material arising from the site.</p>	Previous requests for this information from NH have not been provided.	Unlikely
94	Excavated Material Assessment	2.1.113	The Excavated Material Assessment report provided states that waste classification of the soils (as either Hazardous or Non-Hazardous) will be undertaken once ground investigation is complete. Without this fundamental assessment we do not understand the origin of the quantities used in this oMHP.	Previous requests for this information from NH have not been provided.	Unlikely
95	Use of clean excavated material and associated impacts	2.1.114	<p>Clean excavated material is proposed to be re-used onsite to reduce the need for vehicles to transport the waste material offsite for disposal. All the clean material would be used to provide new landscaping features and could reduce truck movements on local roads. This would likely have a positive health, equalities and wellbeing effect to physical and environmental health through a reduction in congestion and resultant air and noise pollution. National Highways must, however, commit and incentivise its contractors to meet this proposal whilst also investigating how to further reduce the movement of all materials, plant and equipment – particularly by road.</p> <p>Furthermore, control measures are needed to ensure that if material is not deemed suitable for use within the Order Limits that the contractor must stick to committed limits of movement of material.</p> <p>During construction of the proposed landforms there is the potential for construction noise effects to local receptors, such as the residential areas of East and West Tilbury.</p> <p>However, although these would be temporary it would be experienced over a 6-8-year period - therefore, for people in later life the impacts could result in a permanent erosion of the quality of their remaining life.</p>	National Highways must, however, commit and incentivise its contractors to meet this proposal whilst also investigating how to further reduce the movement of all materials, plant and equipment – particularly by road.	Unlikely
96	Removal of tunnel materials	2.1.115	The Council would like confirmation of the route for the removal of the Tunnel Boring Machines (TBM); if these are to be brought back from the north portal, then there must be commitments to its removal using marine transport from PoT/PoT2.	Required information from NH. Particularly relevant now in view of the Minor Refinement Consultation proposal to change the TBM methodology.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
97	Asset Management and Maintenance	2.1.117	The Council has concerns around maintenance of its road network during construction works. National Highways need to outline and secure its proposals for preventing damage on local roads and how these will be rectified. A regime of regular inspections and intervention needs to be recognised and set out in the oTMPfC and the resources needed should be covered by a s106 or a suitable agreement.	Inclusion within the S106 Agreement or provision of a side Agreement required, and amendments are required to the oTMPfC (APP-547).	Unlikely
98	Designated Access Routes	2.1.118	Thurrock Council require further detail on how the designated construction access routes would be managed/ enforced and the consequences of non- compliance.	Amendments required to the oTMPfC (APP-547).	Possible
99	Construction of haul routes in alignment with emerging Tilbury Link Road (TLR) alignment	2.1.119	The Council would like National Highways to construct any elements of the proposed haul road that will fall within the general alignment of the TLR alignment to a standard to support the subsequent delivery of the TLR.	Awaiting further responses from NH.	Possible
100	Local construction traffic impacts	2.1.120	Thurrock Council have set out their concerns on the construction traffic impacts at 39 locations and have produced a comprehensive consideration of our concerns and requirements. NH have engaged collaboratively on a review of these concerns, and this work is ongoing. Thurrock Council expect these discussions to continue, and to see further outcomes committed to and secured within the control documents. NH should undertake detailed traffic assessments where there is significant impact on the Local Road Network (e.g. junction capacity assessments, shuttle working/contra flow/temporary signal assessments, swept path testing on unclassified roads to check the feasibility of HGV use and if any widening is needed, etc.) and outline what mitigation is proposed to accommodate additional traffic Some of these locations of concern relate to where haul roads either cross or enter onto the local road network. NH need to consider greater internal haul road connectivity to reduce construction traffic on local roads.	NH must positively respond to the Council's comments and required amendments.	Possible
101	Rat Running during Construction	2.1.121	The disruption on the road network resulting from the construction of the Project will lead to changes in the movements of local traffic unrelated to the construction work. Thurrock Council are concerned that this will lead to rat-running around construction sites, leading to adverse impacts on local communities. For example, traffic rat running via Marshfoot Road and by the two schools that will exist then, to avoid the congestion on the A1089.	Awaiting NH response and traffic model tests.	Unlikely
102	Monitoring during Construction	2.1.122	This Council expected to see monitoring during construction to form part of a much wider monitoring and evaluation plan for the Project to demonstrate the Project impacts in a much wider sense considering a range of socio, economic and environmental issues. This does not seem to be the case from the documents presented for consultation. It is unclear what road network impact monitoring is proposed before and during the construction period. Monitoring will be required to ensure impacts of the construction logistics.	Further discussions to agree a construction traffic monitoring framework are ongoing.	Possible
103	Production of the Traffic Management Plans (TMP)	2.1.123	The production of the TMP is required 'before commencing the relevant part of the Project'. This is vague. The oTMPfC should make a commitment to the production of a TMP by the contractor in advance of all works associated with the scheme (including enabling, site establishment and decommissioning phases. Enabling, site establishment and decommissioning works can be significant in terms of their impacts on the highway network. The undertaking within the oTMPfC must link to the stages of the works across the separate contracts. Due to the length of the works, it will be anticipated that the contractors will need to prepare a series of TMPs which are relevant to subsets of their contracted works. The framework must reflect this and ensure that the TMPs are kept current and relevant.	Change wording in oTMPfC.	Possible
104	Production of the Traffic Management Plans (TMP)	2.1.124	The oTMPfC should make clear the requirement for the contractor to undertake the following during development of the TMP: 1. Consider and assess a range of alternative Traffic Management options. 2. Undertake a safety assessment / audit.	Change wording in oTMPfC.	Possible
105	Post- consent traffic modelling requirements	2.1.126	The outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) must set out the project position on post consent traffic modelling requirements. The detailed models must use appropriate Transport Planning modelling software and reflect the stages of the construction. They must demonstrate how they affect the operations on the local roads and how those effects are mitigated. The strategic level analysis of the construction impacts using the LTAM Saturn model will give an indication of the strategic effects but will not inform the detailed management and mitigation of effects during the delivery of the scheme.	Change wording in oTMPfC	Possible

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			NH and its contractors must engage with the Council when preparing and analysing the effects of the work stages. This is essential to allow the Council to carry out its Network Management duties. This commitment must be covered by a Requirement within the DCO, including defined engagement periods and communication strategies.		
106	Impact of construction works on PROWs	2.1.130	During construction, NH have advised of their intent to close several PRow and WCH routes. For example, Footpath FP79, 82, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 104, 136, and BR 161, 2056, and 219 all face closures of between 8 months and 5 years. The Council has previously requested provision of temporary diversions to routes of suitable and similar standards for all closures to avoid severance and other community effects. National Highways need to present final proposals for all these closures and diversions before DCO submission. As such, a robust assessment of the potential effects to active travel for the construction phase cannot yet be made. National Highways are having ongoing discussions relating to the management of PRow closures. Thurrock Council expect to see the outcomes of these discussions secured within the appropriate control documents.	Change proposals for PRow closure and diversion to minimise impacts.	Unlikely
107	Impacts on public transport	2.1.133	NH have set out impacts on traffic and public transport links due to traffic management measures at a ward level. The Council question how these impacts fit into surrounding wards and the borough more widely in terms of supporting connectivity for local residents and reducing severance. Bus routes and roads are not situated in silo but rather interlink and support residents to access local amenities and social activity opportunities. A further understanding of how closures, diversions and other traffic management measures will impact on different wards throughout the duration of the construction phase is needed, in particular how this will be monitored and what mitigation measures will be taken to reduce impacts on bus operators and passengers.	Further explanation of bus route/timing impacts is needed.	Possible
108	Mitigating cumulative effects	2.1.138	There is no mention of commitments to mitigate/enhance the cumulative effects (either intra- related/interrelated) of the construction of the LTC. NH should ensure that cumulative effects during construction are included and sufficiently assessed and mitigated against as required. Such potential effects could have a significant negative impact on residents' health and wellbeing through increased noise, air pollution, particularly in areas where there are high levels of deprivation, and poor health, such as Tilbury.	Change wording in oTMPfC.	Possible
109	Model development Changes to A13/Orsett Cock Junction Arrangements - Impact of proposed new link on local roads	2.1.143	The Council does not think LTAM is a suitable tool to predict traffic effects on the local network and needs to be validated against observed traffic levels on the local roads and key junctions. Thurrock Council have a number of concerns relating to the methodology applied to development of the traffic model, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No local road traffic counts (except on the A13) have been used to calibrate or validate the model. The model is based upon the strategic road network peak in the morning, rather than the local network peak. A comparison of the model flows compared to observed flows undertaken by the Council which shows that, in general, the traffic flows output from the LTAM modelling are low on local roads in the base year model in comparison to the observed traffic flows, and in particular, low on: the A1013; links near Orsett Cock; on A1014 The Manorway; and A1089 near the ASDA roundabout. We would also expect analysis / sensitivity testing to have been completed by National Highways to demonstrate the validity of LTAM given significant events that have influenced travel patterns, such as the pandemic and associated working pattern changes. No evidence of this has been presented. Ongoing modelling work and gaps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated cordon models have been provided to the council for impacts on local roads and National Highways' strategic road network. Micro-simulation (VISSIM) models are now being developed by National Highways for the A13 Orsett Cock, A13 The Manorway and for an East-West Corridor through Thurrock (A13 Stifford Clays – A1013 Lodge Lane – A1013 Daneshole Roundabout – Old Dock Approach Road – Marshfoot Road / A1089) and this ongoing work is being discussed with the Council. However, future year forecast models including LTC traffic have not yet been developed to demonstrate that once LTC is operational that these can operate efficiently and with a good level of service. National Highways is also currently not proposing to develop a VISSIM model of the A1089 ASDA Roundabout which the Council believes is a critical gap in this work programme. A Local Model Validation report is outstanding. We would also expect analysis / sensitivity testing to have been completed by National Highways to demonstrate the validity of LTAM given significant events that have influenced travel patterns, such as the pandemic and associated working pattern changes. No evidence of this has been presented. 	Further modelling work as specified that may impact the design of the scheme.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
110	Operational model development	2.1.144	The traffic model presents a number of network restrictions, such as HGV bans. Thurrock Council have concerns around the practical implementation and operation of enforcement, and hence the realism of these modelling adjustments.	Further commitments on enforcement of HGV bans in appropriate control document.	Possible
111	Impacts on Local Plan	2.1.146	<p>The proposed LTC does not make provision for, and is inconsistent with, the housing and development potential as set out in Thurrock's emerging Local Plan and South Essex Joint Strategic Plan. Thurrock Council is planning for the delivery of an additional 1,169 - 1,381 homes per annum, which equates to a total housing requirement of up to 32,000 new homes in the period to 2038. Furthermore, ASELA is working to bring forward a joint spatial plan (JSP) for South Essex which must plan for 97,000 homes over the period to 2038 and has a longer-term vision which extends over the period to 2050 (152,000 homes).</p> <p>Thurrock is considered well placed to take more than its 25% share of new homes in South Essex.</p> <p>Thurrock Council consider that LTC would result in strategic issues for existing communities, employment areas and ports, as well as for future growth in Thurrock. This conflicts with the project's objective 'to support sustainable local development and regional economic growth in the medium to long term'</p> <p>The Government will be bringing some changes to the standard method in the short term, which are not expected to change Thurrock's requirement. In the longer term, the Government's 2020 Planning White Paper indicates that there could be wholesale changes made to the setting of housing requirements.</p> <p>Traffic growth forecast in LTAM has been based upon TEMPro 7.2 data, which unless the housing numbers have been adjusted to reflect the emerging housing requirements, will assume 34,254.6 new households to 2042 (or 29,071 new households to 2038). 5,458.59 jobs to 2038 and 6,423.2 jobs to 2042. These assumptions are low, and the growth locations will not reflect the Council's Issues and Option Part 2 of Thurrock's emerging Local Plan, where the majority of development will be on green field land, rather than intensifying the urban area.</p>	Further traffic modelling work that incorporates elements of Local Plan growth that may show different impacts on local roads.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
112	Impact on Orsett Cock	2.1.147	<p>Thurrock Council have concerns that the increased traffic flow through Orsett Cock roundabout means that the layout will no longer work. The Council has requested information from National Highways to address these concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking the validation of the model at this location using local traffic counts. • Addressing the difference in the peak hour, whereby the local traffic peak is 8:00 to 9:00 while the am peak is 07:00 to 08:00. • Consideration of the assignment of traffic associated with the freeport. <p>While Thurrock Council acknowledge that National Highways is undertaking a local junction modelling exercise and have worked collaboratively with the team, the Council has not yet received the results, and therefore is not satisfied that National Highways has demonstrated that this junction works.</p>	NH to address concerns raised for further technical discussions.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
113	Impact on Manorway	2.1.148	<p>Thurrock Council have concerns that the increased traffic flow through Manorway roundabout means that the layout will no longer work. The Council has requested information from NH to address these concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking the validation of the model at this location using local traffic counts. • Addressing the difference in the peak hour, whereby the local traffic peak is 8:00 to 9:00 while the am peak is 07:00 to 08:00. • Consideration of the assignment of traffic associated with the freeport, and the final consented scheme for Thames Enterprise Park. <p>While Thurrock Council acknowledge that NH is undertaking a modelling exercise and have worked collaboratively with the team, the Council has not yet received the results, and therefore is not satisfied that NH has demonstrated that this junction works.</p>	NH to address concerns raised for further technical discussions.	Possible
114	Operational impact on Asda Roundabout	2.1.149	Thurrock Council have concerns that traffic flow through Asda roundabout will increase, and expect National Highways to set out how these increased flows are to be mitigated. Thurrock Council consider that local junction modelling of ASDA roundabout is necessary in order to validate this claim.	NH to address concerns raised for further technical discussions.	Possible
115	Construction impact on Asda Roundabout	2.1.150	The Council has repeatedly raised the potential for the project to negatively affect the Asda roundabout and has been told that the worst case scenario modelling of the construction period has no negative impacts on that junction. Whilst the Council continues to refute that claim. NH must explain what the impact is of construction on Asda roundabout, and whether it that is deemed to be significant.	NH to address concerns raised for further technical discussions.	Possible

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
116	Sharing of construction modelling Construction model development	2.1.151	<p>The construction traffic modelling prepared by NH should be shared for analysis prior to the resubmission of the DCO application, allowing time for consideration of the impacts and potential mitigation. That analysis must reflect the effect of LGVs/vans as well as the movement of HGVs associated with the construction period.</p> <p>This should be followed by more detailed modelling and analysis of the construction stages, including but not limited to detailed analysis of the delivery of the A13 interchange and surrounding local roads.</p> <p>Thurrock Council have requested further clarity on the phased vehicles movements associated with the works. The information provided lacks detail regarding the timing/phasing of the works therefore it is not possible to identify the timing or quantum of vehicle movements to identify the potential impacts – this is despite the construction period apparently being divided into 11 phases.</p> <p>Information on the number of vehicle movements inbound and outbound should be provided on at least an averaged monthly projection to give an indication as to the impacts on the local road network.</p> <p>In addition, Thurrock Council consider that there needs to be more detailed work undertaken at selected locations including ASDA roundabout and the A13 junction's impacts. The modelling presented in the LRC consultation material indicates that the effect of the new link road between the Orsett Cock junction and the A1089 is that the scheme is no longer reliant on the A1013 for access to the Port of Tilbury and Grays, but further evidence is needed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if the main interchange design can accommodate the significant increases in traffic shown in Figures 4-27 to 4-32. Microsimulation modelling is needed. • Test the effects of implementing traffic. Microsimulation management measures, (assumed to be proposed as a mitigation measure) in Orsett Village. The further measures required to resolve the effects of the project on A128 Brentwood Road, Buckingham Hill Road, Muckingford Road and Fort Road, as this may result in further traffic using Orsett Cock junction or other routes. • Test the Marshfoot Road junction (particularly the priority junction on the east side of the A1089, which is an accident hot spot) Note: Table 1 states that "In the morning peak, eastbound traffic on Marshfoot Road east of the A1089 is predicted to increase by between 101 and 250 pcus. This would be a rise of between 20% and 40%." This is a significant concern and remains unmitigated by National Highways. • Test the ASDA junction, given that the junction is operating close to its capacity. <p>The modelling results presented do not provide any indication of the wider effects of the project and the new link road, the results are only shown as far as Orsett Cock junction on the A13 and Marshfoot Road on the A1089.</p> <p>The traffic flow and modelling information within the Local Refinements consultation materials does not extend to the limits of the Thurrock Borough and so it is not feasible for the Council to take a view on the current impacts of the project on areas such as the Five Bells junction and routes through Corringham, or the residual impacts on the A1014 / A13 The Manorway junction.</p>	Further modelling and information to address issues raised and identified impacts identified by the Council.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
117	Modelling Changes in Traffic	2.1.152	<p>The modelling presented in the LRC consultation material indicates that the effect of the new link road between the Orsett Cock junction and the A1089 is that the scheme is no longer reliant on the A1013 for access to the Port of Tilbury and Grays, but further evidence is needed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine if the main interchange design can accommodate the significant increases in traffic shown in Figures 4-27 to 4-32. Microsimulation modelling is needed. • Test the effects of implementing traffic. Microsimulation management measures, (assumed to be proposed as a mitigation measure) in Orsett Village. The further measures required to resolve the effects of the project on A128 Brentwood Road, Buckingham Hill Road, Muckingford Road and Fort Road, as this may result in further traffic using Orsett Cock junction or other routes. • Test the Marshfoot Road junction (particularly the priority junction on the east side of the A1089, which is an accident hot spot) Note: Table 1 states that "In the morning peak, eastbound traffic on Marshfoot Road east of the A1089 is predicted to increase by between 101 and 250 pcus. This would be a rise of between 20% and 40%." This is a significant concern and remains unmitigated by National Highways. • Test the ASDA junction, given that the junction is operating close to its capacity. <p>The modelling results presented do not provide any indication of the wider effects of the project and the new link road, the results are only shown as far as Orsett Cock junction on the A13 and Marshfoot Road on the A1089.</p>	Further modelling and information to address issues raised and identified impacts identified by the Council.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			The traffic flow and modelling information within the Local Refinements consultation materials does not extend to the limits of the Thurrock Borough and so it is not feasible for the Council to take a view on the current impacts of the project on areas such as the Five Bells junction and routes through Corringham, or the residual impacts on the A1014 / A13 The Manorway junction.		
118	Incident Modelling	2.1.154	<p>The effects of incidents on the LTC have not been tested and presented to the Council, to understand the local roads that will be at risk of impact. Mitigation measures should be incorporated to minimise the use of unsuitable routes.</p> <p>A COBALT analysis has been undertaken and the results provided to the Council. The Council understands that this assessment is being updated for the resubmission. Thurrock specific A Roads of the A13 and A1089 reported in the information shared states there is a 16.8% and 8.8% increase in the total number of accidents per vehicle kilometre driven as a result of the Project. This is a key concern with the SERP Vision Zero target. It is understood the scheme would have an impact on the number of incidents recorded in the future, however, mitigation is not proposed on the local roads, given the statement "Local accident rates were derived mainly for the SRN roads within the appraisal area for which local accident rate information could be derived.</p>	Further work required by NH as requested by the Council.	Unlikely
119	Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (ComMA)	2.1.155	<p>Thurrock Council have raised the following points further to a review of the ComMA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The justification of the scheme should be explained given its weak economic case. 2. Further details should be provided on how construction disbenefits are calculated and how these have been refined. 3. Further details should be provided on how economic appraisal outputs are consistent with the case for change, including whether the scheme objectives have been met. 4. The spatial distribution of the benefits attributed to Thurrock should be provided. 5. Further consideration should be made of the potential impacts on the scheme VfM of increased participation of activities via digital means. 6. Air quality impacts should be assessed for scenarios likely to have worse impacts than those of the core scenario such as the High Growth scenario, instead of assuming them to be equal to those of the core scenario as has been done. 	Review of ComMA to determine if it incorporates the Council concerns.	Unlikely
120	Impact on Orsett Village and Rat running	2.1.160	There is concern that the modelling demonstrates an increase in traffic through Orsett village and Rectory Road. Traffic levels and delays at Orsett Cock are also likely to be underestimated. Traffic management is also necessary in Orsett.	Impacts must be addressed.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
121	Impacts at Daneholes Roundabout and Daneholes Roundabout Enhancement	2.1.161	Rat-running should be monitored including Daneholes roundabout and routes via Chadwell St Mary. National Highways traffic modelling indicates there could be additional flows along the A1013 leading to this junction and this could impact upon congestion. This is an important route for buses leading into Grays and so it is proposed that a bus lane is added (as an outside lane) to the A1013 approach. The National Highways traffic modelling indicates there could be additional flows along the A1013 leading to this junction and this could impact upon congestion. This is an important route for buses leading into Grays and so it is proposed that a bus lane is added (as an outside lane) to the A1013 approach. However, review of latest LTAM model underway to determine if further work or an additional bus lane is required.	Impacts must be addressed.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
122	Traffic Management Measures in Orsett, Horndon and Chadwell	2.1.162	Mitigation for additional traffic movements on local roads through local settlements, including HGV movements, to avoid further diversion of traffic on other local routes.	Impacts must be addressed.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
123	Specific Comments on Wider Network Impact Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WNIMMP)	2.1.163	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The document should recognise interventions that may be required across a geographic area rather than at specific junctions only. 2. The timeframe for delivering interventions required to mitigate impacts would be 5 – 10 years following opening due to need to undertake traffic monitoring (one year and five year) and subsequent suitability assessments. The WNIMMP should include scope for fast-track scheme development and/or delivery of early interventions (after year one monitoring). 3. A commitment to funding the work required to identify, assess and develop business cases etc for interventions should also be provided. 4. WNIMMP in Table 2.1 should include local road network interventions in the Orsett Village, Rectory Road and Baker Street area and Chadwell St Mary area identified by the Council. 	Impacts must be addressed.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
124	Monitoring for the Traffic Monitoring Scheme	2.1.164	<p>Further work is required by National Highways to select and agree the locations to be assessed in the traffic impact monitoring scheme submitted for approval under the traffic monitoring requirement of Schedule 2 to the dDCO, in particular on local roads.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This includes along the A1013, B149, and at Daneholes Roundabout and on local roads through Chadwell St Mary and Orsett Village. 	Further work required by NH.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			<p>2. Junctions such as The Manorway roundabout, Orsett Cock junction, ASDA roundabout and Marshfoot priority junction should also be monitored.</p> <p>3. Reliability of journey times, congestion, incidents, noise and air quality are also important to monitor.</p> <p>The WNIMMP needs to state the exact level of change required for triggering of any additional mitigation.</p>		
125	Targets for local labour during construction	2.1.171	Thurrock Council want NH to establish clear targets for engaging local labour and apprentices during the construction of the LTC scheme.	Change the S106 Agreement to reflect enhanced targets.	Unlikely
126	Council- led Community and Public Health Team (CPHT):	2.1.172	Thurrock Council would like a resource to be given to support the Local Community and Public Health Team within Thurrock Council, who would have the responsibility to work with the local community and ensure local people experience positive social and economic benefits as a result of the LTC. This would encompass the management or oversight of delivering agreed community mitigations, such as a community-led programmes to build cohesion.	Change the S106 Agreement to reflect enhanced targets.	Unlikely
127	Transport Network Management and Development Resource (TNMDR)	2.1.173	Thurrock Council would like an additional resource provision to cover the requirements to manage and develop the transport network in response to the impacts of the LTC construction. It is understood that this item has been agreed to by NH, however, no evidence of this has yet been provided.	Change the S106 Agreement to reflect enhanced targets.	Possible
128	Fund Allocation Ring fencing the Community Fund by Local Authority Area	2.1.178	<p>The Council would like further information on how these funds will be allocated.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council support the ring- fencing/apportioning the Fund by local authority area. The Council's view is that the Community Fund must be designed from the outset to benefit those areas and communities most impacted by the LTC works and subsequent operation, especially giving priority to the Level 1 and Level 2 Authorities within the DLUHC Levelling Up White Paper beneficiaries.</p>	Change the S106 Agreement to reflect enhanced targets.	Possible
129	Grant amount, key themes and detailed funding criteria covered by the Community Fund	2.1.179	<p>The Council would like further clarification on the grant amount and key themes covered by the Community Fund.</p> <p>The Council would also like more detail on what activities are likely to be covered by each theme and how detailed criteria would be developed. The Council would want to be able to reassure local stakeholders that the themes will be broad in their remit and will not be overly restrictive in their reach, but yet target appropriate projects.</p>	Change the S106 Agreement to reflect enhanced targets.	Possible
130	Other Issues on Air quality methodology	2.1.189	<p>Thurrock Council requested a response to the following key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirm National Highways agree with the WHO and Coroner as to the adverse effects of traffic related air pollution on health (in particular PM2.5) at levels below the current AQOs? 2. Acknowledge that there will be an overall increased air pollution burden to the residents of Thurrock as a result of LTC or advise where in the DCOv2 submission they have or will demonstrate otherwise? 3. Confirm in relation to 'EIA significance' why these impacts do not require mitigation or monitoring during the operational phase? 4. Clarify how National Highways are proposing to deliver on their LAQM obligations (as a relevant public authority) under the Environment Act and that the requirements of the Act are compatible with the current DMRB LA105 approach? 5. Advise how they will improve the communication of the findings of the air quality assessment to enable members of the public to engage and be informed? 6. Confirm that they will share pertinent technical data used to undertake the air quality assessment to allow meaningful review, which would include the traffic data for the full network (flow, speed, % HDV) and modelled outputs both in georeferenced GIS format (including DM/DS traffic flows and speed bands for AADT and modelled periods) and results (DM/DS NO2 and PM concentrations) and webTAG appraisal worksheets (in full). 	Further information required from NH.	Unlikely
131	Consideration of sensitive receptors in air quality and noise assessments	2.1.190	The assessment of impacts from construction should consider other sensitive receptors beyond dwellings and include schools, hospitals and any traveller sites (Gammon Field traveller site along Long Lane) as these are particularly vulnerable to air quality and noise impacts.	Further information required from NH and confirmation of requests	Possible
132	Potential impact of proposed construction traffic	2.1.194	The potential impacts from the proposed construction traffic routes will need to be assessed within the EIA and HEqIA along with the long-term effects of road closures and how this impacts access to hospitals. The OTMPfC must set out either specific mitigations or a framework to mitigate the deleterious effects that the additional traffic would cause along the Councils routes to the contractor's compounds and works.	Additional mitigation required from NH	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
133	Air Quality impacts along the route	2.1.196	<p>Thurrock Council consider that there may be unacceptable air quality impacts at a number of locations arising from construction and operation. Subject to confirmation of the impacts set out in the Environment Statement, there are unacceptable impacts at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tilbury Fields • Buckingham Road (Linford) • The A1089 • Dock Road • Calcutta Road • Fort Road • The A13 • Tilbury • Chadwell St Mary • Grays • Stifford Clays, Chafford and North Stifford, and Belhus wards - A1013 - Brentwood Road - Orsett Cock Junction - The link between Orsett Cock Roundabout and the A1089. 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
134	Operational Air Quality and Noise Monitoring	2.1.198	<p>Thurrock Council would like LTC to install sensors to monitor operational air quality and noise, with required actions if target limits are exceeded:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NO2 Monitoring - The Council would also like LTC to supplementing the proposed particulate monitoring programme with monitoring of NO2 particularly in proximity to proposed heavily trafficked haul routes and construction compounds where there is currently limited monitoring undertaken by Councils and potential impacts are largely unquantified. 2. Operational Monitoring for air quality and noise - The Council require operational air quality and noise monitoring for up to 3 years following completion of the works and for the same Exceedance Framework to be applicable during this period. 	NH to agree to operational monitoring of air quality and noise and to agree actions if there are exceedances.	Unlikely
135	Comments on draft DCO Documents (draft oSWMP)	2.1.205	<p>The Council's concerns relate to the sufficiency of the level of detail provided for the scale, duration and waste generation potential of the proposed project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no clarity on if the contractor would comply with the 'anticipated management targets' or are they for guidance. Confirmation is needed that there is sufficient capacity at off-site recycling sites and landfill sites to take the predicted arisings. 2. The waste arisings are not described with regards to their phasing. 3. There is no evidence that the storage capacities within the compounds have been assessed for sufficiency. 4. The movements of large tonnages to/from excavation to stockpile/sorting/treatment locations before reuse (over an extended area) should be considered within assessments and control documents. Are these wastes likely to cross the river? Multi modal approach needs to be considered by various assessments. 5. There is no identified structure for monitoring, recording and reporting on the wastes generated by the scheme. 6. There are no proposed actions to ensure that the materials identified are captured for reuse, recycling or recovery, and in particular, how will material be separately collected? 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
136	Noise impacts along the route Noise mitigation along the route and design of acoustic barriers	2.1.206	<p>The Council consider that there may be unacceptable noise impacts at a number of locations arising from construction and operation. Subject to confirmation of the impacts set out in the Environment Statement, additional mitigation is required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stifford Clays • Chafford • North Stifford • Belhus Wards 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Unlikely

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edge of East Tilbury • Linford • North of Chadwell St. Mary • In and around the A13 junction and • To the North of South Ockendon and Ockendon • Tilbury • Little Thurrock Blackshots • Little Thurrock Rectory • Orsett Cock • Link between Orsett Cock roundabout and the A1089 • Some areas within Grays <p>The Council would like the following mitigation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional noise mitigation in Chadwell and East Tilbury during construction. 2. Build sufficient earth bunds and noise barriers along the route to reduce noise impact The acoustic barriers (where provided) need to be set out and secured, to ensure they are as naturalistic as possible and blended in with the landscape. Further details are required on the nature, composition and scale. 		
137	Independent review of HEQIA	2.1.208	<p>The Council are currently not satisfied that NH have addressed concerns with the methodology of the HEQIA and have not seen updates to the assessment that reflect the concerns.</p> <p>There was an Independent Review in June 2021 of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEQIA) (from DCOv1) on behalf of nine Local Authorities named in the report. NH responded, advising that the next iteration of the HEQIA will not be available to view until after the submission of the DCO application. This is inadequate, particularly given the potential changes to impacts as a result of the Local Refinement Consultation, the fundamental significance of those recommendations and given that National Highways state that the aim of the consultation is to improve the project for local people. Without sight of an updated assessment, the conclusions of the Independent Review above still stand, and we cannot comment on the health outcomes highlighted in the HEQIA in relation to the proposed Local Refinement Consultation.</p> <p>There are specific concerns on the methodology set out in the Independent Review – a total of 20 recommendations, some 13 on the HIA and 7 on the EqlA and these must all be addressed in the revised HEQIA within the DCO application.</p>	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if recommendations are implemented and impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
138	Consideration of travellers site	2.1.229	<p>The Council is of the opinion that the traveller community should be identified as a vulnerable group in the HEQIA and all impacts (from construction and operational) on them re air quality, noise, health accessibility be fully assessed to ensure the health of the community will not be adversely impacted.</p> <p>The Council seek assurances that the health of the community will not be adversely impacted and will not suffer worse health outcomes as a result of this relocation. For example, it must be ensured that, once the road is operational, noise levels and air quality are within permitted limits. There is also potential for OHL noise. Site specific baseline should be provided to the Council and included in the submission.</p>	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
139	HEQIA and Noise Impact on Whitecroft Care Home	2.1.231	The Council note some significant noise impacts on the Whitecroft care home and appropriate mitigation is needed. Measures like noise barriers might not be the most appropriate for dealing with noise in an outdoor environment, especially when windows need to be kept open for ventilation.	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
140	Assumptions made around LTC's worker accommodation strategy	2.1.233	<p>The Council have some concerns on the assumptions used by LTC in developing their worker accommodation strategy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LTC use the term 'bed spaces', which is distinctly different to 'bedrooms', which may account for additional bed spaces that could have been included in LTC's estimates. 2. How was the figure of 400 or 480 on page 6 derived for on- site demand? 3. What is the percentage figure for home-based workers in key assumptions. 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
			4. Potential reduction in emergency accommodation (BnBs etc.) available to homeless households needs to be assessed.		
141	Impact LTC's worker accommodation strategy on existing and proposed housing	2.1.234	New and existing housing supply in the Borough will be affected by the construction of the LTC. The Council estimates: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 20 homes will be lost to make way for the construction of the LTC. An additional 1,400 residential properties are estimated to be affected due to their proximity to LTC. 160 dwellings are located within 200m of the LTC scheme, and a further 1,240 homes located within 500m. Land with the potential for up to 3,500 new homes will either be lost or will see construction delayed due to the LTC, further affecting the ability of the Borough to meet its future housing needs. 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
142	Impact of construction worker numbers on private rental market	2.1.235	The Council would expect National Highways to fully assess the impact of its workers accommodation strategy on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rental market in Thurrock, with knock on impacts for housing affordability relating to the private rental market. Knock on negative impact on health and wellbeing. 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
143	Impact of construction workers on health and other services and Public Health mitigation during construction	2.1.236	The Council would like to understand the impacts on demand for healthcare and other services from construction workers residing in Thurrock: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is an existing and growing demand and capacity gap for Primary Care Services in Thurrock. Therefore, accommodating additional demand from construction workers could exacerbate the issue reducing the access to health services of the existing resident population. The Council would expect National Highways to monitor the impact of the construction workforce on demand and access to health and other services such as social care, education and community services. Additional impacts on feelings of safety, crime and mental health and well-being all need to be addressed. National Highways should also clarify what welfare facilities will be provided within the construction compounds and if there will be an on-site health facility. Given the scale of the proposal, the Council would expect welfare facilities to be provided on site and for adequate healthcare provision (that meets the needs of the workforce) to be in place prior to works taking place. Additionally, the mental health and wellbeing of the construction workers themselves needs consideration, particularly if the intention is for some of them to be sourced from our local populations. Mitigation could include funding for increased access to mental health support and services. <p>Public Health mitigation measures would include the enhancement of public transport to healthcare facilities and the reinforcement of local NHS provision during the construction phase, in addition to providing welfare facilities for construction workers.</p>	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Possible
144	Comments on draft HEqIA	2.1.239	The Council has submitted detailed comments on the draft HEqIA chapters (shared before DCOV1 submission, in Aug 2020) on the following matters. These will be revisited once the HEqIA documents are available as part of DCOV2: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise, waste and dust management Welfare facilities, healthcare and other services Accessibility Access to open space and nature Air quality Noise and vibration Work and training Housing and worker accommodation Mental health and wellbeing Baseline conditions 	Review of DCO documentation by Council to determine if impacts exist and/or are mitigated.	Unlikely
145	Responding to National Policy changes on	2.1.264	The Council would like LTC recognise the urgency of the climate emergency, and the scale of ambition required to meet net zero carbon by 2050 in the UK. The current focus on only relieving congestion at Dartford is considered too narrow, potentially at the cost to local communities and with unresolved impacts. LTC helps to resolve one historic problem but creating creates new ones for Thurrock. National Highways, in	Impacts must be addressed.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
	Climate Change and Decarbonisation		<p>doing so, is not observing the Governments own aspirations to decarbonise the transport network and LTC scheme objectives that also include supporting sustainable local development.</p> <p>LTC should assess the implications of the scheme to transport decarbonisation i.e. how the scheme might need to be adapted to respond to this challenge or to become an enabler of transport decarbonisation and green growth in the Thames Estuary using alternative modes and travel patterns. The proposals should clearly address how the scheme will support the 6 strategic priorities set out in the DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan and in particular, how the scheme will support and contribute to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accelerating modal shift to shift to public and active transport, 2. Decarbonise road transport/ reduce road user emissions, and 3. Decarbonise how we get our goods. <p>There are multiple benefits of taking action to reduce carbon (especially around reduction in cost of delivery & maintenance of infrastructure, active travel, lower congestion, better air quality, reduction in noise, improvements to health) and these should be priorities for the project.</p>		
146	Responding to National Highways' Net Zero Plan	2.1.265	<p>The LTC proposals need to be reviewed in light of National Highways' Net Zero Plan and its associated commitments.</p> <p>Thurrock Council consider there are important questions to consider about how freight movement on the strategic road network will develop and what consequences this might have for the operation of the SRN. For example, encouraging the development of a hydrogen network for freight and construction vehicles, developing locations for intermodal and last mile connections (including transfer to river transport), and delivering enabling roadside technology, (such as the development of HGV platooning technology) to support improved logistics functionality and operation should also be explored, thus enabling safety and environmental gains.</p>	Impacts must be addressed.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
147	Reduction of carbon during construction	2.1.268	<p>The Council seeks clarity on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How 'new standards for reducing carbon during construction' have been incorporated into the design of these local refinements and carbon reduction has been achieved through these design changes. The standards need to be enforceable by National Highways. 2. National Highways should include a Low Emissions Strategy for Construction in the DCO. 3. Since autumn 2021, National Highways have been in discussions about wider ambitions and innovation measures to address climate change and decarbonisation, including with the TEGB and supply chains. These discussions are welcomed by the Council, but there is still a lack of clarity in terms of commitments that will be incorporated within the DCOv2 application. The Council would expect to see details of what infrastructure will be included within the DCO to enable carbon neutral construction (for example power infrastructure scaled and sited for electrification of construction equipment, or spatial planning of new fuels, such as hydrogen). 	Impacts must be addressed. Information should be provided to the Council to assess.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
148	Nitrogen Deposition, Assessment and Methodology	2.1.272	<p>The Council seek the following details:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detail regarding the methodology for quantifying the predicted emissions or for determining what levels of mitigation would be required. As a result, it is not possible to assess the robustness of the assessment and proposed mitigation and compensation. 2. The mitigation hierarchy requires that avoidance and mitigation be fully considered before compensation measures are adopted as a final level. 3. No detail has been provided setting out the reasoning why measures such as lower speed limits could not be enforced along the route. <p>The Council wishes to see the detailed evidence justifying the proposed approach/ methodology.</p>	Information should be provided to the Council to assess.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.
149	Passive Provision at South Ockendon	2.1.278	<p>It is Thurrock Council's opinion that the LTC scheme either severs or impacts access to a number of potential housing and employment growth areas in Thurrock including at Ockendon. Therefore, LTC should confirm that 'passive provision' for an interchange on LTC between North and South Ockendon is acceptable and that the LTC would be configured not to preclude that aspiration.</p> <p>Therefore, Thurrock Council would like the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DCO to include provision for the non-preclusion zones within its Plans for Approval; and 2. This passive provision should be legally secured within a separate legal agreement that is finalised and signed prior to DCO re-submission. 	Amendments required to the DCO scheme.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.

Number	Principal Issue in Question	SoCG Reference	The brief concern held by Thurrock Council to be reported on in full in WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
150	Upgrading Medebridge Road	2.1.279	The Project should deliver the proposed construction haul road along Medebridge Road alignment from the A13 to Grangewater to a sufficient width and standard to enable it to be adopted by the council.	Amendments required to the DCO scheme.	Very unlikely, as been discussed with NH for two years.