



The Planning Inspectorate

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

Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) Project Definition

Date: 21 June 2023

Venue: MS Teams

Action Points

No	Party	Action	Deadline
1	Applicant	Following the announcement of a two-year rephasing of the proposed LTC development by the SoST on 9 March 2023 , please provide a tabulated addendum to the ES, setting out an appraisal of the effect of the revised construction timing and works duration changes flowing from that announcement, undertaken for each component of the Environmental Statement (ES) analysis. This should include consideration of the time sequence for and outcome of committed elements of Freeport development which it has been suggested will now be delivered concurrently with aspects of the rephased LTC project.	D2
2	Applicant	The Applicant is requested to provide a tabulated addendum to the ES, reviewing the construction effects changes consequent on the possible effect of changing from the use of 2 tunnel boring machines (TBMs) to 1 TBM. The duration of works and the effects experienced by receptors should be expressly considered. Effects and conclusion changes (if any) should be tabulated for each component of the Environmental Statement (ES) analysis. This request imports no judgement by the ExA on the question of whether this amounts to a change to the project as applied for. It is made in the interests of ensuring that any possible implications for the ES and the project Rochdale Envelope are identified.	D2

No	Party	Action	Deadline
3	Applicant	On 15 April 2023 , the UK government announced the cancellation of uncompleted elements of the Smart Motorway programme. IPs have made RRs and oral submissions to the extent that the LTC design is (in their view) equivalent to a Smart Motorway in design and operation, whereas the Applicant has made submissions that it has been designed and will be operated as an All-Purpose Trunk Road (AAPT). Please provide a summary document describing the design and operational distinction between a three lane per side AAPT and a Smart Motorway.	D1
4	Ports – Port of Tilbury London Ltd (PoTLL), and DP World London Gateway (Gateway)	Without disclosing any security-relevant detail, please provide information identifying those aspects of the Ports' emergency system management / evacuation strategies that rely upon or have implications for the surrounding road network feeding onto the proposed LTC and thus might have implications on the LTC itself.	D1
5	Applicant	Please explain the extent of the Nitrogen compensation area sought. Is it clear that no land outside order limits is being relied upon as compensation for the LTC project (and is it also clear that no land outside the order limits is being counted as providing such benefits)?	D1
6	Thurrock Council	Please provide copies of communications between Thurrock Council and the Applicant, requesting information relevant to the calculation of economic benefits and the outline business case and which it is alleged have not been responded to.	D1
7	Applicant	Please respond to Gravesham and Thurrock Councils' concerns that the 'value of travel time savings' assessment has not been undertaken in the sensitivity testing, in accordance with the guidance contained in DFT's document "TAG unit A1-3 user and provider impacts". Please explain whether this concern is correct and, if so, why that is the case?	D1
8	Applicant	Provide a summary of requests made to them by the following Councils (Thurrock, Essex, LB Havering, Gravesham, Medway and Kent CC) and Ports (PoTLL and Gateway) for localised traffic modelling data and specific intersection modelling around LTC, which ones they have	D1

No	Party	Action	Deadline
		assisted with and provided information, and which ones they have not and why not?	
9	Applicant	Please provide a summary list of local intersections for which localised traffic modelling has been completed. If there are any intersections for which modelling has been completed but has not been shared with the relevant local highway authority, what is the reason for that decision?	D1
10	Applicant	<p>The ExA was left with an impression that multiple local road stakeholders had been seeking objectively-based means to assess the traffic effects of LTC on key elements of the local road network, but that requests for local / micro modelling of key intersections had not necessarily been responded to positively by the Applicant and that the Applicant's reasons for its approach to such requests were not always clearly communicated and understood.</p> <p>The ExA accepts that the Applicant needs to make prioritised decisions about access to and the cost of its modelling resources. It will not be able to accede to all modelling requests. But equally there are likely to be requests that proceed from key local stakeholders on a reasonable basis (seeking to ensure that project design avoids/ minimises adverse effects on local road performance) where a publicly stated basis for and commitment to consideration of requests would assist.</p> <p>Further to actions 8 & 9, please provide a document describing the criteria that the Applicant will use going forward to determine whether and if so how to respond to requests for local / micro modelling of intersections. This relates to requests that have arisen from Thurrock Council (such as but not limited to the Dock Road/ Thurrock Park Asda roundabout (A1089) and Orsett Cock roundabout (A13/ Stanford Road)). However, in responding, the Applicant should take account of existing and possible future requests from other local authorities with local highway authority duties, from Gravesham Council as a main host local planning authority</p>	D1

No	Party	Action	Deadline
		and from PoTLL and Gateway as major users of the local road network proposed to link to LTC.	