

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement

Lower Thames Crossing – TR010032

Gravesham Borough Council ([IP ref: 20035747](#))

Version ~~4-2~~ Submission ~~10-03~~ ~~March-August~~ 2023

Notes:

- This summary statement sets out in brief terms the main concerns and proposed remedies of Gravesham Borough Council. More detail will be provided in other documentation to be submitted in due course to the Examining Authority. 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 not agreed~~ document [APP-125](#) 5.4.4.6 Statement of Common Ground between National Highways and Gravesham and uses the same structure, and as updated by National Highways in their submission of 18 July 2023 REP1-100 (clean) and REP1-101 (tracked changes).
- Some additional points have been added as a result of the comments on the Gravesham Relevant Representation (pages 49-71 of REP1-180)
- The Council takes a holistic view of the impacts from the scheme on its residents and businesses regardless of where responsibility for particular matters may formally sit
- There are some additions arising from analysis the application ('DCO'), but more may be forthcoming from further exploration of the documents
- 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 should be possible in the near future
- 'Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination' has been assessed using best available information. Discussions with National Highways 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 to address the issue. The categories used are:

- Likely – 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
- Unlikely – issues where agreement is unlikely, or it is difficult to see what a solution could be

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------|---|--|--|
| Draft DCO and consents | | | | | |
| GBC001 | DfT not appropriate body for decision making on Requirements | 2.1.1 | SoS cannot continue to be judge and jury. The lack of an appeal mechanism for National Highways implies that consent will be given. | <p>Decision making should rest with the appropriate body (County, District etc.) depending on topic.</p> <p>Must be a clear protocol of consultation prior to any Requirements submissions and funding for the work involved by Gravesham Council.</p> <p>See REP1-236 ISH2 submission item 4 (d) page 6</p> | Unlikely on main point, likely on secondary |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC002 | National Highways | DCO | National Highways assume that other public bodies do not need additional funding to deal with the extra demands imposed on them by their scheme. Gravesham BC, Kent CC, health authorities and the emergency services are examples of agencies that will incur additional expenditure. There is no reason to treat NH in any different way to a private developer. | For GBC agreement under s.106 to fund costs of monitoring and dealing with Requirement applications, monitoring and other matters. Alternatively, a Fee Schedule could be included in the DCO. No discussions to date but hoped to be progressed in August | Likely |
| GBC003 | Scope of the DCO | DCO | The draft DCO fails to make provision for improvements at Blue Bell Hill (A229) which are necessary to allow the A122 to function. | Either include a scheme as associated development or commit to fully funding the scheme that KCC is developing. KCC LIR provides more information on issues at Blue Bell Hill | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| GBC004 | Design and construction detail issues | DCO & 2.1.22 | The draft DCO has to allow for some flexibility but at present contains too much ability to modify the scheme to the detriment of local residents and road users on the grounds of expediency. | Provide greater detail about specific design and construction details in either the DCO or supporting documents which there is a commitment to comply with, unless specifically justified otherwise. <u>Kent Roads contractor about to be appointed that may allow some progress on detailed issues</u> | To be discussed |
| <u>GBC108</u> | <u>Use of single TBM</u> | <u>New</u> | <u>Issue raised in National Highways Minor Refinements Consultation of possible use of a single TBM to construct Thames tunnels rather than two</u> | <u>Ensure that dDCO and control documents prevent spoil and other operations occurring on Kent side</u> | <u>To be discussed</u> |
| Need for Project | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| GBC005 | Project meeting its objectives | 2.1.2 | The application as submitted does not provide sufficient justification to meet the claimed seven objectives when set against negative impacts. | The scheme should not proceed in principle. | Unlikely |
| GBC006 | Local economic growth | 2.1.3 | Gravesham does not feel that the Borough will greatly benefit from the scheme, and in the short and long term there are major disbenefits. | Local community suffers significant negative impacts from construction and operation but without major economic gains that would justify it. | Unlikely |
| Planning Statement / Policy | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC007 | Green Belt | 2.1.4 & 2.1.5 | Green Belt 'special circumstances' justification is deficient, so the decision maker does not have the necessary information to make an informed decision. A robust and transparent assessment of the harm to the Green Belt in terms of its spatial and visual impacts and to the national and local Green Belt purposes is needed. | Revise 7.2 Planning Statement Appendix E needs to be revised to enable the ExA to reach a view on it. <u>No update from applicant – see LIR para 7.7 to 7.68 for full GBC case. Thurrock have similar issues</u> | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------------|-------|---|--|-----------------|
| GBC008 | Route alignment impact on Local Plan | 2.1.6 | Impact of scheme, including utility diversions, on potential development opportunities on the east side of Gravesend. The availability of highway capacity in the network as a result of the scheme to support development in North Kent. | Upgrading local road element of junctions along A2 (Pepper Hill / Tollgate etc). to ensure capacity for development and other appropriate measures where flows increase. Funding for the traffic modelling to establish what is required (as required by NH Spatial Planning Team) and where relevant commit to funding for LTC impact. <u>See KCC LIR Appendix B for junction issues from modelling using the Kent Model. Also newly released material from National Highways REP1-193</u> | To be discussed |
|--------|--------------------------------------|-------|---|--|-----------------|

Formatted: Not Highlight

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---|---|----------------|---|---|--|
| GBC009 | Alternatives schemes & design parameters | 2.1.7 & 2.1.8 | Alternative schemes at the Dartford Crossing have not been properly and comparatively reassessed since route choice in 2017 despite significant change in circumstances. The existing scheme could be designed for lower speeds to allow for a more compact footprint and therefore less environmental impact | Revised scheme focussed on Dartford Crossing. | Unlikely |
| GBC010 | Lack of non-car travel proposals in the application | 2.1.9 | The project (apart from PROW diversions) is entirely car based and so does not address the transport strategy for the area or national policy. | Positive support for local public transport and active travel modes (including Tilbury Ferry) and be part of a larger committed strategy. | Unlikely |
| Consultation and Engagement | | | | | |
| Covered by comments made in our Adequacy of Consultation response AoC-007 TR010032-001805-AoCR Gravesham Borough Council.pdf- Adequacy of Consultation Response – but some points relevant at this stage picked up under other headings | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--|--|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Land and Compulsory Acquisition | | | | | |
| GBC011 | Land acquisition at rear of Cascades Leisure Centre site | DCO & 2.1.73 | Loss of pitch and putt facility and need to agree replacement as well as compensation for impact on Cascades site operations | Agreement needs to be reached – studies, discussions and negotiations ongoing Awaiting response from National Highways to draft report | Likely |
| GBC012 | Viability of farm holdings impacted by scheme – in particular, the site at corner of Thong Lane and Rochester Road (A226). Includes the nitrogen compensation sites. | 2.1.13 & 2.1.42 | Question over land holdings impacted by scheme and in particular A226 corner site which becomes isolated from the farming unit | Answer the question posed in the SoCG items (references in third column). | Likely |
| GBC013 | Landscape maintenance | 2.1.14 | Reassurances that landscaping and planting will be maintained in the longer term. | REAC LV003 provides for 5 years for initial establishment – longer term required. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Design – Road Tunnel and utilities | | | | | |
| GBC014 | A2 junction | 2.1.12 | 3D model or cross sections (under AoC in SoCG) – see also GBC067. | Provide information to understand impact of junction in the landscape. | Likely |
| GBC015 | Chalk Park | 2.1.15 | Design purpose and function of the new open space. | Introduction of alien design features into the landscape of open fields. | Likely |
| GBC016 | Lighting | 2.1.16 | Landscape impact of lighting in areas where not currently found. | Assurances as to light spill – forms part of landscape issue. See Gravesham LIR Appendix 7b | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|--|----------------|--|--|--|
| GBC017 | Impact on Local Road network during: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction • operation | 2.1.17 | KCC work with their model shows issues with Henhurst Road and A2 junctions – in the context of point GBC038 on the amount of development in the modelling. | Further analysis of technical work and exploration and sensitivity testing of options for mitigation on LRN (which may require multiple funding sources including National Highways). Adequate monitoring required. <u>New technical work from KCC & Medway allows reassessment of the overall position</u> | Likely |
| GBC018 | Monitoring of road network in construction | DCO | Real time monitoring of actual flows on network (strategic and local) with appropriate set of mitigation measures in the event of significant congestion issues. | Commitment to appropriate monitoring and corrective action if required. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|---|----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC019 | A122/A2 junction and related local link roads | 2.1.19 & DCO | Analysis how A2/A122 junction will function similar to the analysis carried out at A13 Orsett Cock junction – in particular the impact of the 2 lane sections on the A2 to M2 mainline flow. | Micro-simulation or other appropriate method to ensure the junction functions correctly and does not have any knock-on effects on local road network. <u>Microsimulation (or other) work has been supplied but yet to be reviewed.</u> | Likely |
| GBC020 | Thong Lane Car Park | 2.1.20 | Objection to provision of facility as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and attracting traffic through Thong from urban area. | Site restored as landscaping after having been a works site. Overall car parking strategy for wider area (involves third parties). | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---|---|----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC021 | Width of Green Bridges | 2.1.21 | Further increase in width of green bridges to benefit landscape and increase biodiversity linkage. | Thong Lane south and Brewers Road. <u>Brewers Road space limited, Thong Lane south could be widened and could replace Park Pale bridge as a further option.</u> | To be discussed |
| <u>GBC109</u> | <u>Smart motorway design standard on A122</u> | <u>2.1.161</u> | <u>Design Standard proposed for A122 has raised concerns over safety. NB: not about formal road designation</u> | | <u>To be discussed</u> |
| Construction Impacts (CEMP/CTMP) | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|---|---|--|
| GBC022 | s.106 | DCO | Current s.106 proposal as outlined in document 7.3 inadequate to address the issues identified. | <p>The Council is making a more comprehensive statement of heads of terms to National Highways, attached for information. In this context s.106 is shorthand for combined effect of a s.106 agreement, DCO itself and the Control documents.</p> <p><u>No discussions to date but expected to start shortly</u></p> | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC023 | Construction programme | DCO | Insufficient detail to allow proper understanding of potential impacts in the 5 ½ year construction period. Understanding control of access to construction sites from a safety and anti-social behaviour point of view (downside is visual impact). | Clearer and more specific programme (appreciating the inherent uncertainties). This is fundamental to understanding impacts on local community. <u>Appointment of Kent Roads Contractor may assist in taking some issues forward</u> | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| GBC024 | Workforce accommodation | 2.1.24 & 2.1.38 | Council does not believe that there is sufficient capacity in the local housing market to accommodate additional demand from the construction workforce in a very constrained supply situation. Regular monitoring of workforce to see where they are living and how they are travelling so mitigation measures can be adjusted to suit. | The Council has set out a range of practical solutions to NH in our s.106 draft heads of agreement. Clarity about use of Inn on the Lake Motel which in the DCO application is mooted as an accommodation site as previously suggested by GBC. Monitoring strategy also relevant. 7.13 FCTP will need amendment. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| GBC025 | Effect on living conditions | 2.1.25, 2.1.28, 2.1.30 & 2.1.31 | Impact on all property adjoining the construction sites – in particular vulnerable housing at Polperro and caravans at Viewpoint Place on A226 plus along Thong Lane (including Thong itself). Clear strategy and mechanisms for consulting and informing local residents and businesses during construction of what is happening. To include a complaints procedure to deal with issues as soon as possible. | New site for caravans / rehousing should be offered and adequate measures and monitoring to reduce impacts. Set up appropriate mechanisms. NB: these must work seamlessly across the contract boundary along Thong Lane between Kent Roads and Tunnel contracts <u>Adjoining property issues not addressed</u> <u>CoCP agrees with complaints commissioner APP-336</u> <u>2.1.30 & 31 are about cumulative impacts on the community</u> | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|
| GBC026 | Use of the river and access thereto | 2.1.26 & 2.1.27 | Note proposed river use on Thurrock side and intention to keep spoil, apart from contaminated, on site. Also, the need to import significant amount of material for A122 to A2/M2 eastbound slip. | Undertaking to keep issue live as construction programme evolves but could require additional land to be included in the development boundary. Not using River Thames on Gravesham side – information on 1 TBM suggests pipeline for slurry from Kent to Thurrock | To be discussed |
| GBC027 | Hydrology impacts | 2.1.32 & 2.1.136 | Impacts on hydrology from construction (soil stripping) and spoil storage (surface runoff) on local watercourses, roads and property. | Clear strategy for avoiding any surface flooding or related matters. | To be discussed |
| GBC028 | Access to works compounds for workers | 2.1.33 | Travel to works sites by workforce, parking and related issues as unlike HGV's not constrained. | Fuller understanding of 7.14 oTMPfC given uncertainties in worker accommodation. See GBC024. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| GBC029 | Local Road Network access points | 2.1.34 | CA2 access via A2 Marling Cross junction and A226 in and out for CA3 – potential impacts on traffic, footway and cycle lanes. | Knock on impacts on LRN and maintenance of routes along A226. | To be discussed |
| GBC030 | Wider effects of construction access | 2.1.39 & 2.1.41, 2.1.42 | Overall impact from disruption on local roads (including Marling Cross junction from access sites CA2/3 and on A226) and A2 (including perception thereof) on local businesses and services – including implications from 24 hour working. Impacts on settlements Chalk, Lower Shorne, Higham and Thong as well as Thong Lane residents. | Monitoring and action plan if issues arise plus local liaison arrangements and speedy issue resolution. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC031 | Local effects | 2.1.40 & 2.1.35 | Noise and disturbance to local residents from construction process particularly in the Thong/Riverview Park/Thong Lane/Thong areas. | Minimise impacts on local residents – which includes perception of access issues which may harm businesses in the area. | To be discussed |
| GBC032 | Temporary diversions | 2.1.43 | Impact of closures – particularly Brewers Road. | Mitigation measures for impact on Local Road Network – including impact of poor access to Shorne Woods Country Park. | To be discussed |
| GBC033 | Impact of Milton (CA3b) construction site adjacent to Thames & Medway Canal | DCO | Concern over the possible implications for Thames & Medway Canal and stability of the North Kent railway. | Clarification and what might be done if issues arise from tunnelling operations or extraction of the Ground stabilisation tunnel boring machine (if needed). See GBC078 | Likely |
| Operations and Maintenance | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|----------------------------------|----------------|---|---|--|
| GBC034 | Access and incident access times | 2.1.45 | Emergency services access to tunnels in the event of a major incident within acceptable travel times noting the absence of a hard shoulder and the need to fund additional resources (as necessary) for them. | Needs input from Emergency Services as to whether project as currently designed meets their needs. <u>Emergency Services Group remains concerned over a number of issues – see their WR REP1-388</u> | Likely |
| GBC035 | Evacuation from tunnels | 2.1.46 | Handing of any drivers and passengers evacuated from tunnels in the event of a major incident. Southern portal is 28m below ground level. Emergency Services need to happy with cross passage spacing. | Clarification <u>for Local Authority role</u> and Emergency Services need to agree. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|------------------------------|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| GBC036 | Rendezvous point at Chalk | DCO | Function and location of RVP understood – clarity needed on what facilities it has (buildings, lighting, surface etc.) and maintenance thereof | Development in Green Belt – but as a facility that needs to be ready for use at any point <u>Emergency Services group wants greater clarity which leads onto the planning issues that may arise</u> | To be discussed |
| Charging | | | | | |
| GBC037 | Congestion charge on Lower Thames and Dartford crossings | 2.1.47 to 2.1.51 | Charge discount for local residents should apply to both crossings from start of construction | Agreement to proposal | Likely |
| Traffic and Economics | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| GBC038 | Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM) | 2.1.52 | Model does not adequately reflect the scale of development in the area and therefore cannot be relied upon as to traffic impacts. The reliability on Local Road Network not good enough to give confidence in the results. | Model run that reflects development includes a realistic set of likely development assumptions without TEMPRO constraint to ensure development in North Kent is not constrained. | Unlikely |
| GBC039 | DMRB & compliance with EIA regulations | 2.1.53, 2.1.54 & 2.1.63 | DMRB is only guidance and not to be relied upon in an Environmental Assessment. | Use appropriate guidance and wider interpretation in relation to traffic modelling assumptions | Unlikely |
| GBC040 | Tilbury Junction arrangement | 2.1.56 & 2.1.44 | Junction reintroduced into the scheme. | Opportunity to re-instate service area to replace that lost at Cobham – but a failure to account for the potential benefits and costs of the development it will facilitate. Modelling does not take account of the development or assess the impacts of traffic that may result. | Unlikely |
| Wider Network Impacts | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC041 | Effect on Dartford Crossing | 2.1.57 | The actual model results show that after 15 years congestion is more or less back to current levels. | Concede that Objective 4 of project is not being achieved by this scheme. | Unlikely |
| GBC042 | Impacts on wider road network | 2.1.58 | KCC concerned about impact on strategic network and local road network from the results of using their transport model with LTAM assumptions. | Further detailed analysis of the model results and use of more appropriate development levels as inputs. | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|---|---|--|
| GBC043 | Road asset maintenance | 2.1.59 | KCC concerned about impact of construction traffic on existing highways which may not be in good condition. | Ensure existing relevant highways are brought up to an acceptable standard to minimise potential impacts during or after construction period from additional traffic. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC044 | Monitoring | 2.1.60 | Continuous monitoring of traffic flows needed before start of construction, then very regular updates during construction period with appropriate remedial action if required. Monitoring at agreed years in the operation phase with a commitment to address any issues that arise as a result of the scheme on both strategic and local highway network. | Approach outlined in 7.12 WNIMMP needs expanding. With modern systems monitoring can be continuous and more widespread. | Likely |
| GBC045 | Cross river resilience | 2.1.3 | Claimed benefit of scheme is increased resilience on SRN but no analysis/modelling to show this is true in the event of major incidents. | Analysis requested. Disruptive events happen regularly – see DP World London Gateway WR REP1-331 | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|--|
| EIA General (including REAC) | | | | | |
| GBC046 | Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy | 2.1.61 | Overarching consideration raised in numerous detailed points within SoCG. | For every topic area, as appropriate, an appropriate monitoring strategy and potential remedial actions for both construction and operation phases. Overall reference document with specific commitments in DCO, control documents or s.106 as appropriate. | Likely |
| GBC047 | Comprehensive and interactive mitigation delivery strategy | 2.1.62 & 2.1.66 | Impact on AoNB and its setting from widening the A2. | National Highways agree and fund such a strategy. | Likely |
| GBC048 | Impacts on landscape during construction | 2.1.65 | Size of the construction sites on east side of Gravesend impacts for a long period on the setting of the AoNB. | No obvious mitigation possible, compensation may be the only route. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| GBC049 | Cumulative and in combination impacts on local communities | 2.1.67 | Impact taken in combination on Riverview and Westcourt Wards. | Enhanced mitigation and compensation. | To be discussed |
| GBC050 | Land reinstatement and vegetation | 2.1.68 | Speedy reinstatement and early planting where possible. | Commitment. | Likely |
| Socio-economic | | | | | |
| GBC051 | Use of local labour & implementation of SEE measures | 2.1.69 & 2.1.70 | Agreed skills and employment strategy with specific commitments and targets. | Clear implementation mechanisms. Subsequent discussions and announcement of a preferred bidder for the Kent roads contract may enable progress to be made on these issues | Likely |
| GBC052 | Southern Valley Golf Course | 2.1.71 | Loss of important leisure facility with no active recreation replacement. | Active leisure replacement. | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| GBC053 | Shorne Wood Country Park access | 2.1.72 | Impact of Brewers Road closure both on local highway network and operation of the facility and what it supports. | Possible revenue support (matter for KCC) – but principal applies wider. | To be discussed |
| GBC054 | Business disruption and effect on Cascades Leisure Centre | 2.1.73 | Road closures / restrictions / noise / dust impact on outdoor and indoor activities, and business disruption (including access) | Potential revenue support for impacted businesses. Clear understanding of the implications for Cascades of all the phases of the construction process. | To be discussed |
| GBC055 | Community Fund (principle) | 2.1.74 to 2.1.77 | Support the broad principle but size of funding pot, criteria for grant distribution and operating mechanisms need to be reviewed. | Need to review scheme as recently advertised. | To be discussed |
| Air Quality | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| GBC056 | PM _{2.5} | 2.1.79 | Need for monitoring of this pollutant that has no safe limit. | Further information sought on methodology used in ES and that new standard has been taken into account. May require additional monitoring solutions to be funded. | To be discussed |
| GBC057 | Air quality mitigation | 2.1.80 | Long term monitoring strategy and potential actions. Predictions are in the context of concerns over LTAM development quantities GBC038. | Monitoring Strategy supported by multiple potential actions and access to the information. | Likely |
| GBC058 | Local road network impact | DCO | Given concerns over LTAM development quantities etc, knock on impacts on LRN from greater traffic on SRN. | Fresh analysis taking the listed points into account. | To be discussed |
| GBC059 | Nature Conservation Impacts | DCO | Ammonia deposition and other pollutants impact on existing habitats and proposed planting. | Further information requested on ammonia model as there is no standard nationally. | To be discussed |
| Historic Environment | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC060 | Archaeological investigation | 2.1.81 | Ensure sufficient archaeological investigation of sites in advance of use. | KCC Archaeology satisfied with general approach, but Southern Valley Golf Course and nitrogen deposition mitigation sites need examination | Likely |
| GBC061 | Setting of Heritage Assets | 2.1.82 & 2.1.84 | Detail of landscaping and other mitigation around the Thong Conservation area and implications for Cobham Park | Suitable solution to be developed Applicant rests on assessment in ES Chap 6. REP1-232 Gravesham LIR App.6 provides more information | Likely |
| GBC062 | Cobham Estate (historic Darnley lands) | 2.1.83 | Failure to consider the wider heritage context of the proposal | Suitable solutions to be developed in heritage See above | Likely |
| GBC063 | Methodology used in ES assessment | DCO | Confused methodology not applied correctly | Rewrite using consistent methodology See above | Likely |
| Landscape and visual | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| GBC064 | Major compensation package required | 2.1.104 & 2.1.105 | Combination of Landscape, Historic and Natural Environment impacts on the Cobham Estate. | Substantial funding covering the former Cobham Estate lands (with flexibility) for delivery of an overall comprehensive plan that needs to be developed <u>Note study funded by Designated Funds by Kent Downs AoNB unit</u> | Likely |
| GBC065 | Kent Downs AoNB | 2.1.64 2.1.85, 2.1.87 & 2.1.89 | Impact on Kent Downs AoNB (and Green Belt) and its setting from dramatically increased severance and urbanisation from project. Creates 12 lanes (14 if Park Pale included) with no vegetated central reservation, plus the loss of woodland on the north side to create the utilities corridor and hard surface for cycleway to the south of HS1 in Cobham Park. | The scheme should not proceed in principle. | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|
| GBC066 | Retaining existing planting and loss of HS1 planting | 2.1.86 & 2.1.90 | Maximise the retention of the existing mature planting (e.g. in sandwich lands between A2 and HS1). | Objective of scheme | Likely |
| GBC067 | Visual intrusion of A2 junction | 2.1.88 | 3 level junction in the setting of AoNB and visual intrusion for local residents as can be seen by the renderings from various viewpoints. | Mitigation strategy and detailed design | To be discussed |
| GBC068 | Southern portal | 2.1.91 | Jarring landscape feature in view out over the Thames. | Mitigation strategy and detailed design. | To be discussed |
| GBC069 | Road / landscape integration | 2.1.92 | Scheme has developed piecemeal (e.g. adding nitrogen sites compensation) and needs a comprehensive overview. | Mitigation strategy and detailed design. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC070 | Woodland corridor north of A2 | 2.1.93 | Striking a balance in the area north of Park Pale between tree cover, a more parkland like landscape and long distance views. Drainage pond and area east of Harlex site need to be integrated into the scheme. | Detailed design. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| GBC071 | Setting of Thong | 2.1.94 & 2.1.95 | Landscape around Thong is going to change significantly to the west due to the A122 cutting and its screening and to the east by proposed planting. As a conservation area with a number of non-designated heritage buildings the setting needs to be preserved so far as possible the open setting backed by woodland to the west (Claylane Wood) and the east (Shorne Woods). | Detailed design. | To be discussed |
| GBC072 | Chalk Park | 2.1.96 | Design of Chalk Park, its function etc. Design Principles quoted include references to 'where reasonable practical' or similar which gives too much flexibility | Detailed design and recognition Chalk Park not delivered for many years. | To be discussed |
| GBC073 | Shorne lfield Road | 2.1.97 | Planting to south of Shorne lfield Road (was to north). | Detailed design. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|---|--|
| GBC074 | Tilbury Fields | 2.1.98 | Views across river to new higher landscaping (NB: Shornemead Fort just designated a Scheduled Ancient Monument). | Visual intrusion and whether changes are justified by the wider context. | To be discussed |
| GBC075 | New areas of planting | DCO & 2.1.37 | General issues over establishment, maintenance impact of climate change, and the long term management of new planting areas. | Long term maintenance plan and recognition that benefits only fully accrue when planting mature. | To be discussed |
| Terrestrial Biodiversity | | | | | |
| GBC076 | Environmental Impact of junction | 2.1.99 | More generally impact of loss of vegetation and time taken for new planting to establish. | Views after 15 years do not allow for fresh disturbance if the scheme is further developed over time. | To be discussed |
| GBC077 | Hedgerow reinstatement | 2.1.100 | Retain existing field patterns – significant losses but also proposed net gains. | LSP.13 needs strengthening. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|--|----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC078 | Marsh restoration | 2.1.101 | Impact on North Kent Marshes from ground stabilisation tunnel and enhancements to habitat. | Possible actions if stated objectives are not achieved Addressable by monitoring strategy | Likely |
| GBC079 | Effects on existing habitat replacement (CTRL) | 2.1.102 | Loss of HS1 landscaping in sandwich lands from M2 J1 to Marling Cross junction (including some from A2 widening). | Clear connection set out between what is lost and mitigation/compensation. | Likely |
| GBC080 | Utility corridor diversion impacts | 2.1.103 | Loss of ancient woodland even though reduced on what was originally proposed is still significant (Shorne Woods and Claylane Wood). | Compensation strategy clarity on replacement planting and ratios. | Likely |
| GBC081 | Incremental changes and EMP | 2.1.104 | General concern at the lack of integration between various mitigation and compensation measures. | Drift to the design objectives and related processes in detailed design. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| GBC082 | EMP | 2.1.105 | Need a wider management plan for Cobham Estate area including ammonia sites. | Funding for this over and above what is being committed via Designated Funds to look at the concept of a Special National Nature Reserve. See GBC064 update | To be discussed |
| GBC083 | Biodiversity net gain | DCO | Concern over loss of irreplaceable habitats (veteran trees and Ancient Woodland) and that south of the river biodiversity net gain is only 3% compared with 7% for project as a whole. | More biodiversity net gain south of the river. | Likely |
| Noise, Vibration and Light | | | | | |
| GBC084 | 24 Hour working | 2.1.106 | Ensure minimal disturbance to local residents. | Construction detail. | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|---|--|
| GBC085 | Noise barriers removed | DCO | Reliance on use of low noise surface whose effectiveness decays with time. Concerns in context of LTAM modelling – see GBC038. Landscape benefit from their removal. | Undertaking on maintenance/replacement and potential mitigating actions. Further technical discussions. | To be discussed |
| Population and Human Health | | | | | |
| GBC086 | Timing, form, and function of replacement open spaces | 2.1.107 | When they will become available for use, what physical form they will take and what needs they are supposed to cater for and how the community can engage. | Agreed programme and process for reaching agreement on each areas form, function(s) and objectives. No movement but longer explanation of Chalk Park | To be discussed |
| GBC087 | Construction impacts on PROW | 2.1.108 & 2.1.112 | PROW impacts information scattered but results in long term closures on the east side of Gravesend. | Access to Shorne Woods CP restricted and local dog walking forced into urban area. Impact assessed in para 13.62 - 108 Gravesham LIR | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC088 | Principle and design of PROW routes | 2.1.109 | Better understanding of routes in operational scheme but concerns over surfaces that may be used and the resulting urbanisation. | Need to ensure that surfaces are appropriate for a rural Green Belt setting. | To be discussed |
| GBC089 | Tilbury Ferry | 2.1.110 | Project provides an opportunity to enhance service during construction as a route between north and south of Thames construction sites and in the longer term to enhance sustainable transport. Ferry forms part of the construction travel plan. | Proposal for enhancing ferry service (hours of operation and Sundays). | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|--|----------------|---|--|--|
| GBC090 | Cyclists and walkers crossing the River Thames | 2.1.111 | Active measures of support for walkers and cyclists to cross the river where none is currently proposed. | National Highways to make proposals other than existing facilities at Dartford. <u>Applicant regards LA's as best placed to deliver – but will need funding</u> | Likely |
| GBC091 | Impact on NCN177 | 2.1.113 | The temporary route is more indirect and less commodious than the current and the operational version is shorter but still less commodious. Hard surface on temporary not acceptable due to impact on SSSI and historic park. | Major rethink of proposals in both construction and operational phases. | Unlikely |
| GBC092 | Assessment of cumulative effect on health | 2.1.115 | Many small impacts cumulate to be significant – and individuals have different susceptibilities (e.g. asthma suffers and dust). Need for monitoring. | Further information and agreement to monitoring strategy. | Likely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| GBC093 | Health Impacts Analysis – priorities and construction phasing | 2.1.114, 2.1.116 & 2.1.117 | Acceptance of the needs for overall monitoring of the impacts separately and in combination. The implications will depend on the vulnerability of individuals, which varies. Clearer construction timetable to understand length and severity of various operations. As a specific example, implications for access and operation of primary schools. | Further information and agreement to monitoring strategy. More information on mitigation required in GBC s.106 Heads of Terms document. | Likely |
| GBC094 | Health Impact Analysis detailed comment from independent review | 2.1.118 to 2.1.134 | Series of detailed comments about presentation, data used, actual severity etc. | Awaiting detailed response. New material in revised SoCG asking us to make 2.1.115 to 134 'matter agreed' | Likely |
| Road Drainage and Water Environment | | | | | |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---|---|--|
| GBC095 | AoNB perched water tables | 2.1.135 | Accept that seeking to avoid but need to understand what might be done if issues arise (e.g. Repton Ponds). | Part of the monitoring plan to explain how this is going to be considered and what action could be taken. | Likely |
| GBC096 | Drainage attenuation ponds | 2.1.137 | Introduction of unnatural features into landscape. | Fuller detail of the landscaping and visual impact in the landscape. Applicant refers to APP-156 | To be discussed |
| GBC097 | Flood risk assessment | DCO | FRA should be for 120 years as that is the design life of the tunnel. | Extended analysis. | To be discussed |
| Climate | | | | | |
| GBC098 | Scale of analysis | 2.1.138 | Request for analysis of carbon footprint to be done at Local Authority scale so implications for the Gravesham net zero target can be understood. | Analysis should be supplied. | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| GBC099 | Exemplar measures | 2.1.139 | Series of specific asks towards carbon neutrality. | Specific progress towards delivery asks noting that an exploration of using heat from the Thames Tunnel to heat the new Cascades Leisure Centre is being examined via a Designated Funds funded project. | Likely |
| GBC100 | Construction carbon objective | DCO | Ambitious targets that may not be deliverable. | Clearer understanding of the risk factors to delivery and potential implications. | To be discussed |
| GBC101 | Long term carbon footprint from operation | DCO | Compatibility with national carbon reduction targets and sustainable transport objectives not clear. | Taken with above are more realistic appraisal considering the role of transport in the overall national carbon budget and emerging government policy. | Unlikely |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Habitats Regulation Assessment | | | | | |
| GBC102 | HRA | 2.1.140 | Concern that the adverse effects have not been properly evaluated, especially if the modelled traffic flows do not cover reasonably expected development. | Further analysis of the implications on the basis of transport model run that fully considers reasonable levels of development in North Kent. | Likely |
| Nitrogen deposition | | | | | |
| GBC103 | Site acquisition and Management | 2.1.141 | As further significant extension of land to be acquired and used by the scheme need to understand how NH will ensure the sites are properly managed and maintained | Understand how these relate to the other proposed planting areas and the wider ecology, landscape, heritage and other relevant factors impacting on the wider area | To be discussed |
| GBC104 | Nitrogen mitigation planting sites | 2.1.143 | Ensure fit with landscape (inc. historic) and local SSSI ecology. Archaeological survey in advance of any works, existing biodiversity etc. | More detail to be clear how the sites fit with the adjoining habitats and those being compensated for | To be discussed |

| Number | Principal Issue in Question | SoCG reference | The brief concern held by Gravesham BC 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 |
|--------|---------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| GBC105 | Detail of proposed planting | 2.1.144 | How it relates to existing adjoining areas (often SSSI) but in a context of climate change and any specific functions for the site | More detail to be clear how the sites fit with the adjoining habitats and those being compensated for in terms of types of planting proposed | To be discussed |
| GBC106 | Site selection | 2.1.145 | Process whereby sites were selected | Understand the logic more clearly | To be discussed |
| GBC107 | Nitrogen deposition methodology | 2.1.146 | Clarity of the link between impacted sites and compensation sites | Understand the logic more clearly | |

~~10 March 2023~~ 03 August 2023