

## Application by National Highways for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Lower Thames Crossing

### Draft Agenda<sup>1</sup> for Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH 1): Project Definition

Hearing	Date and Time	Location
Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) on Project Definition	<b>Wednesday 21 June 2023</b> <b>Hearing Starts at 10am</b> Virtual Registration Process from 9:15am	By virtual means using Microsoft Teams

#### Agenda

- 1. Welcome, introductions, arrangements for the Hearing**
- 2. Purpose of the Issue Specific Hearing**
- 3. The Applicant's Proposed Development**

The Applicant is requested to frame the purpose and definition of the proposed development, to introduce the minor refinements consultation process and changes arising from it and to identify whether any further substantial changes to project definition or design are anticipated during the Examination period?

#### **4. ExA Questions on Project Definition**

The ExA will ask questions of the Applicant relating to the definition of the project and seek observations from IPs present. Noting that this hearing is in the earliest stages of the Examination, the primary purpose of this Agenda item will be for the ExA to raise its own initial questions. Other IPs will be welcome to participate but will not be expected to frame their own detailed positions until the submission of their Written Representations, Local Impact Reports, and participation in a further ISHs commencing in September 2023.

The Applicant will be provided with a right of reply.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a draft Agenda, issued before the commencement of the Examination. If decisions to vary Examination process are taken, this Agenda may be amended. If a decision is taken not to commence the Examination until after the date appointed for this hearing, this Agenda will be withdrawn.

a)	<b>The need case</b>
i	Can the Applicant demonstrate that the proposed development will meet anticipated need?
ii	Is it anticipated and if so, how swiftly is it anticipated that the proposed LTC alignment might become capacity constrained by traffic demand?
b)	<b>Transport demand, traffic modelling and the role of the road in the National and regional transport system</b>
i	How will the proposed LTC affect the operation of the existing M25/ A282 Dartford crossing?
ii	How will the proposed LTC address traffic demand arising from the M20 corridor (and possible demand for trips between the LTC alignment and the M20 alignment in Kent)?
iii	Are there elements of demand for the LTC alignment that can be met by existing or new heavy rail, or light rail/ tram services (such as KenEx/ Thames Gateway Tramlink) and to what extent has the contribution of such modes and options been explored?
c)	<b>Effects of the two-year rephasing in capital funding</b>
i	Is there sufficient scope within the Rochdale Envelope for the proposed development (affects as assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES)) to take account of the two-year rephasing in capital funding that has occurred in the period between the acceptance of the application and the commencement of the Examination?
ii	What is the effect on construction duration and environmental effects of the proposed use of a single tunnel boring machine (TBM)?
d)	<b>Road design approach</b>
i	Having regard to anticipated traffic levels and user safety, is there a case for a different road design approach, including consideration of a special road/ motorway, provision of a continuous hard shoulder or any other particular safety measures?
e)	<b>Routing and intersection design</b>
i	What consideration has been given to possible alternative routes and/ or alignment design mitigations at route 'pinch points', specifically in open land between North and South Ockendon, at Baker Street and between the hamlet of Thong and Riverview Park?

ii	<p>What consideration has been given to land take at intersections and whether alternatives to the 'all directional slip' model for the main intersections at Baker Street and Shorne /A2 /M2 have been considered?</p> <p>Are all directions to all directions outcomes needed at these intersections? If not, could some slips be deleted to reduce land take?</p> <p>If so could it be feasible to incorporate roundabouts into elements of intersection designs to reduce land take?</p>
iii	<p>Has adequate provision been made in the proposed LTC design for port access (referring specifically to Tilbury, Tilbury 2, DP World London Gateway Port and extension) and for access to other proposed and emerging business, industrial and employment uses of land?</p>
iv	<p>Has adequate provision been made for the provision/ restoration of community connections across the LTC alignment?</p>
	<p>Has adequate provision been made for the provision/ restoration of connectivity across the LTC alignment for non-motorised users (NMUs)?</p>
f)	<p><b>Mitigation design and delivery</b></p>
i	<p>There appears to be some element of double counting of the benefits of some elements of mitigation design and delivery. Examples arising from site inspections include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The observation that land at Hole Farm near Great Warley is identified as already having been purchased and drawn into the creation of community woodland that has been publicly described as serving some general purposes not directly linked to the effects of LTC.</li> <li>• The observation that land proposed for nitrogen management at Bluebell Hill and Burham was added to the land requirement for the project between the first application and the second application, but that elements of this land are identified in the minor refinements consultation as potentially surplus to need and to be reduced in extent. The possible inclusion of some of this land in Stewardship is given as a basis for some of the exclusion, but again there does not appear to be a direct link between the management of land under Stewardship and the management of the effects of LTC?</li> </ul>
ii	<p>Can the extent of land take and acquisition for mitigation be fully justified as addressing need arising from LTC?</p>
g)	<p><b>Utilities and transmission diversions</b></p>

i	These works are currently characterised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) in their own right. The statutory basis for this approach will be explored in ISH2.
ii	What design approach has been taken to the siting and design of replacement utilities and transmission alignments?
h)	<b>Economic benefits</b>
i	Are the economic benefits (BCR) of the proposed LTC robust and measurable?
ii	Do costs figures adequately address current positions in relation to labour and materials availability and costs? Has inflation been taken into sufficient account?
iii	Is any adjustment to economic benefits necessary, given submissions from Ports to the effect that the lack of local highway connectivity to the waterfront could reduce local journey time reliability and have negative economic impacts on port operations?

## 5. Next Steps

## 6. Closing

### Purpose of this ISH

The purpose of this ISH is to inquire into definition of the project that comprises the proposed development, providing the Applicant with an initial opportunity to explain the key elements of the project and its design approach (Agenda Item 3) and for the ExA to explore initial questions about the definition of the project and the design approach taken with the Applicant and Interested Parties (Agenda Item 4).

The intention is to identify and discuss issues that have emerged for the ExA during its preparatory work. This hearing will not limit the remit of issues to be identified in Written Representations at Deadline 1 or examined in later written or oral processes.

### Attendees

The ExA would find it helpful if the following parties could attend this Hearing.

- The Applicant
- Any host local authority
- Any other public authority affected by the proposed development
- Any utility service provider or statutory undertaker with land, infrastructure, alignments or apparatus affected by the proposed development
- Any port authority or port operator affected by the proposed development

However, this does not indicate that other parties will not be able to contribute. All Interested Parties (IP) are invited to attend and make oral representations on the matters set out in the Agenda, subject to the ExA's ability to control the Hearing.

The ExA has sought to provide sufficient detail to assist the parties to prepare for the Hearing. The details set out above are indicative and the ExA may find it necessary to include additional Agenda items or to amend the order in which the items are dealt with.

The event will be livestreamed and a link for watching the livestream will be posted on the [project webpage of the National Infrastructure Planning website](#) closer to the Hearing date. IPs and members of the public who wish to observe the Hearing can therefore view and listen to the Hearing using the livestream, or view and listen to the recording, after it has concluded.

### **Registration Process**

Parties who have registered to speak will receive a Joining Instruction email the day before the Hearing which will include a link to the virtual event on Microsoft Teams, and a telephone number should they need to participate by telephone. To enable the Hearing to start on time at **10am** please join promptly at **9:15am** to ensure that all attendees can complete the virtual registration process in good time.

### **Procedure at an ISH**

Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 provides that it is for the ExA to probe, test and assess the evidence through direct questions of persons making oral representations at Hearings. Questioning at the Hearing will be led by the ExA. Cross questioning of a person giving evidence by another person will only be permitted if the ExA decides it is necessary to ensure representations are adequately tested or that an IP has had a fair chance to put its case.