

Lower Thames Crossing

9.53 Comments on WRs Appendix D – Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group

Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

DATE: August 2023
DEADLINE 2

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032
Examination Document Ref: TR010032/EXAM/9.53

VERSION: 1.0

Lower Thames Crossing

9.53 Comments on WRs

Appendix D – Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group and Safety Partners Steering Group

List of contents

Page number

REP1-338 Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group.....	1
---	---

REP1-338, REP1-339 and REP1-340 Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
REP1-338 REP1-339 REP1-340	Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group	<p>WR: WR summary: REP1-340 WR link: REP1-338 WR annexes: REP1-339</p> <p>WR Extract: 4. The overarching issue for the ESSP SG is the significant gap which currently exists between the 56 Recommendations made by the group, and what the Applicant has provided in the DCO submission. The ESSP SG considers that although some progress has been made on certain matters, overall these are significantly outweighed by the number of unresolved issues and failure of the Applicant to respond in a timely and substantive manner. 5. Annex A to this Written Representation comprises a track changed version of the current draft SoCG, which sets out the original ESSP SG Recommendations summarised and grouped into topics; together with the ESSP SG's further changes in response to the Applicant's position. Despite the 56 Recommendations having been made in September 2021, it was over a year before the Applicant's position on each matter was made clear. On most matters the Applicant's position has not changed significantly.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: The Applicant has engaged extensively with the ESSP SG, and this has led to an SoCG which is cross-referenced below to avoid duplication of matters in the examination documents, but this should not be seen as a lack of consideration of the Written Representation. The Applicant has been developing a "road map" which provides a comprehensive response, and where appropriate the future actions, with regard to the 56 "asks" from the ESSP SG, and this has been recently shared with the ESSP SG. In response to points 4 and 5 in the ESSP SG's written representation, in 2021 the Applicant provided initial responses to ESSP SG recommendations, which were included in a draft SoCG, developed with the group, prior</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>to DCO Application. This SoCG was not submitted at DCO Application at the request of the ESSP SG; however, the matters raised can be seen in the updated SoCG which has been submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-200].</p> <p>Prior to and since Application, the Applicant has attended regular, one-on-one, weekly meetings with the Consultant Representing the Group. The ESSP SG hold monthly steering group meetings, to which the Applicant is invited to attend the initial update segment.</p> <p>To aid discussion around matters important to the ESSP SG (such as, rendezvous points (RVPs), emergency hubs, provision of additional access, turnaround points, operational risk assessments, and funding for ongoing engagement during the pre-submission phase) and progress the drafting of the SoCG, the Applicant suggests that their attendance at the Steering Group Meeting should be extended to include the duration of the discourse. The Applicant would welcome the opportunity to engage with the group both as a whole, and as individual organisations - with related yet sometime distinct requirements and needs.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>6. The remainder of this section of this Written Representation identifies eight 'Key Concerns' for the ESSP SG, labelled A - H. For each Key Concern the text seeks to expand on the content of the SoCG to set out the ESSP SG position more fully.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>The Applicant has responded below by relevant paragraph number.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>7. Consultation is a very important issue for the ESSP SG. The Steering Group recognises that at this point in time not all details of the LTC are available for scrutiny, and that many items are intended to be the subject of subsequent development and approvals. However, running through many of the matters contained in the group SoCG is a concern that the proposals for further consultation and engagement with the ESSP SG are unsatisfactory, and/or are not secured. This concern relates to fundamental aspects of the LTC through its detailed design, construction and operational phases.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 7, the Applicant would note that many of the issues raised by ESSP SG and Tunnel Design and Safety Consultation Group (TDSCG) relate to levels of design or delivery detail that are beyond the current maturity of design development (preliminary scheme design). Whilst the Applicant has progressed key aspects of the design and delivery methodology, these are not at a level of detailed maturity.</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant’s Response
		<p>The Applicant stresses the importance of the detailed design, particularly related to the tunnel and associated systems, being completed as an integrated system, meaning that detailed design in its entirety should be developed in a holistic manner. Progressing specific aspects of the design to a greater level of detail or fixity ahead of the detailed design, would risk creating constraints on the design that lead to a sub-optimal outcome for all parties.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue consultation with the Emergency Services through the full lifecycle of the Project and into operation, and has sought to update aspects of the DCO to provide commitments to that effect. It is also worth noting that the Applicant’s licence¹ and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) requires consultation with the Emergency Services.</p> <p>In relation to progressing consultation on the detailed design, the Applicant proposes the use of a TDSCG, which has been used on numerous road tunnel projects over many years; the TDSCG is a requirement of DMRB CD 352².</p> <p>The Applicant is undertaking an exercise to review the proposals for further consultation and engagement with the ESSP SG in the draft DCO. As such, the matters which ESSP SG refers to are mostly “Matters Under Discussion” in the SoCG.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>8. Prior to early 2021, consultation on the emerging LTC proposals with the emergency services and safety partners was carried out by the Applicant using the Tunnel Design and Safety Consultation Group (TDSCG) model, as set out in guidance document CD352 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Member experience of this format was not complimentary for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That as time went on, previously discussed scheme elements were presented in amended form with little or no discussion in the interim; • Insufficient explanation and rationale was provided for the changes. Conversely, suggestions from ESSP SG member organisations or actions did not appear to have been comprehensively reflected in meeting notes, or acted on to develop the proposals. Examples include changes from a three lane road scheme to a two lane scheme without prior consultation; and inadequate development and sharing of emergency planning evolution. • Previous meeting notes were mainly not reviewed or actions progressed at subsequent meetings

¹ Department for Transport (2015). Highways England: Licence.

² Highways England (2020). Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), CD 352 Design of road tunnels.

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of meetings which took place between the Applicant and members is not considered to indicate productive engagement leading to progress, but often was considered by members more like an exercise in the Applicant going through the motions to satisfy internal, DMRB guidance requirements. • The membership of the TDSCG only reflected certain organisation north of the River Thames, it now has more local authority representation and the ESSP SG is considered more comprehensively representative of all parties. <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 8, the Applicant acknowledges the ESSP SG's concerns about the format of the TDSCG. Since commencement of the TDSCG (and prior to the ESSP SG being formed), the Applicant has held nine TDSCG meetings attended by various stakeholders, including all Emergency Services, local authorities and environmental bodies. Four further "sub-forum" meetings were held (three meetings with fire services and one meeting with the ambulance service). All meetings were minuted and sent to attendees for review, providing an opportunity to amend or add to the minutes.</p> <p>The ESSP SG considered that '<i>insufficient explanation and rational was provided for the changes</i>', noting the changes from a three-lane scheme to a two-lane scheme as an example. The Applicant provided an update on this particular change at a TDSCG meeting in December 2019 and attendees would have had the chance to feedback on this proposal (as well as other proposals) at the Supplementary Consultation in early 2020.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant maintains confidence that the TDSCG is the correct forum for future design consultation, the Applicant would welcome further discussion with the ESSP SG to address concerns about the use and form of TSDCG in future Project stages.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>9. Consequently, members therefore decided to move away from the TDSCG, and instead set up a Steering Group where members could take charge of their consideration of relevant issues; and, present a collective, coordinated response to the Applicant's proposals. The ESSP SG was formed in early 2021 and embarked on a programme of work to consider the main issues of concern to its members. This was based initially around the LTC scheme proposals which had been contained in the previous pre-submission draft of 2020, and moved on to consider the information published for the Community Impacts Consultation of September 2021. This work culminated in the ESSP SG response dated 8 September 2021, which included a total of 56 Recommendations.</p> <p>10. An initial summary RAG response to the Recommendations was received from the Applicant in November 2021, and some discussions on relevant topics continued through 2022. However, a detailed response on many of the issues was not forthcoming and progress on topics such as safety and security was slow. The ESSP SG</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>response to the Local Refinements Consultation dated 20 June 2022 (included as Annex C to this Written Representation) expresses the Steering Group's concerns over the lack of progress at that time.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 9 and 10, please refer to the Applicant's response to ESSP SG points 4, 5 and 7.</p> <p>WR Extract: 11. As mentioned above, the Applicant's position on many of the Steering Group's concerns only became clear over a year after the 56 Recommendations had been made, during initial drafting of the SoCG and shortly before the DCO was submitted in October 2022. Up until the pre-acceptance phase, the ESSP SG had not been offered sight of the Applicant's proposals to understand how its concerns and Recommendations might have been addressed.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 11, please refer to the Applicant's response to ESSP SG points 4, 5 and 7.</p> <p>WR Extract: 12. As set out in the Statement of Common Ground, the Applicant proposes to use the TDSCG to consult with the Emergency Services on nine matters in the SoCG, and these are set out in Table 1 on the following page (page 6 of the ESSP SG's written representation). These matters include the detailed tunnel and road design (and its component parts); but also the development of emergency planning measures which would apply during the operational phase of the LTC.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 12, the Applicant notes that Table 1 is not an exhaustive list of subject matters for the TDSCG.</p> <p>WR Extract: 13. In addition, although the DCO submissions offer a commitment to provide emergency services RVPs, there is no provision to secure satisfactory consultation with the Emergency Services on their detailed provision (SoCG item 2.1.25, ESSP SG Recommendations 6.1 – 6.4).</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 13, further to review, the Applicant notes in clauses S3.20 and S9.21 of the Design Principles [APP-516] that an Emergency Services Rendezvous Point (RVP) area shall be provided. The Design</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant’s Response
		<p>Principles will be updated to note that the area will be designed in consultation with the Emergency Services. This information has been shared in recent engagement with the ESSP SG.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>14. Given its previous experiences described above, the ESSP SG is not satisfied that the TDSCG model is the best way for its members to engage with the Applicant and be consulted on the scheme proposals moving forwards. DMRB CD352 is guidance only, published by the Applicant’s predecessor body Highways England, but is not part of the DCO submissions. The TDSCG does not appear to be referred to in any of the DCO documents; and, the draft DCO Order itself (AS-038) does not include provisions to secure comprehensive consultation with the Emergency Services on the matters set out in Table 1 on the next page, whether through the TDSCG or by any other means. The terms ‘emergency services’ or ‘safety partners’ is not legally defined in the draft DCO Order itself. Draft DCO (AS-038) Schedule 2 Requirement 3 states as follows: ‘3.—(1) The authorised development must be designed in detail and carried out in accordance with the design principles document and the preliminary scheme design shown on the engineering drawings and sections, and the general arrangement drawings, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation by the undertaker with the relevant planning authority on matters related to its functions, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments to those documents showing departures from the preliminary scheme design would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.’</p> <p>Applicant’s Response:</p> <p>In response to point 14, the TDSCG has been used on numerous road tunnel projects over many years; the TDSCG is described in the DMRB CD 352. The Applicant notes that CD 352 is requirements, and not “guidance” as stated by the ESSP SG in their representation. The Applicant is confident that the TDSCG is the correct forum for future design consultation, and is committed to working closely with the Emergency Services to ensure that the TDSCG works in a format that delivers value for all parties.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>15. Requirement 3 does not directly require consultation with the Emergency Services on the detailed design. Under this Requirement, the Applicant is only required to consult with the Emergency Services on the detailed design if the Design Principles document [APP-516] includes such a requirement. The only Design Principles that require consultation or engagement with the Emergency Services are at Clause S6.01 in respect of extending tunnel cross-passage spacing and on the specification for a Fixed Fire Fighting System.</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 15, in accordance with the requirements of DMRB CD 352 Section A2, the Applicant is required to consult the TDSCG, as a minimum, on the topics listed in Section A2.2.1. This includes, for example, 'safety and operational effectiveness of the overall systems proposed for the tunnel'.</p> <p>Seven existing Design Principles [APP-516] (clauses S3.20, S3.21, S3.22, S6.01, S9.21, S9.23 and 9.24) relate to areas in which ESSP SG have expressed specific interest in the design, being the Rendezvous Points, helicopter landing areas, emergency muster points and spacing of tunnel cross-passages. These seven Design Principles will be updated to include provision for consultation with the Emergency Services. This information has been shared in recent engagement with the ESSP SG. The Applicant acknowledges that there may be other specific design elements that the Emergency Services have an interest in, and will seek to clarify which elements ESSP SG wish to review.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>16. Draft DCO [AS-038] Schedule 2 Requirement 20 states as follows: '20.—(1) Where any paragraph in this Schedule requires the undertaker to consult with any authority or statutory body, the undertaker must—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. subject to sub-paragraph (2), provide that authority or statutory body with not less than b. 28 days from the provision of any documents being consulted upon for any response to the consultation; c. give due consideration to any representations made by that authority or statutory body about the proposed application; and d. include with its application to the Secretary of State copies of any representations made by that authority or statutory body about the proposed application, and a written account of how any such representations have been taken into account in the submitted application.' <p>17. The Applicant has confirmed in the draft Statement of Common Ground that it does not consider the Emergency Services to be a statutory body; but that it will consult with the Steering Group on the detailed design through the TDSCG.</p> <p>18. The ESSP SG objects to this approach. The ESSPSG's preference is for the Emergency Services to be named in the DCO as consultees on the development of the detailed design, and on operational matters such as Emergency Incident Management / Response Plans. The Emergency Services can then alert their Safety Partner colleagues when submissions are made; and ensure that a comprehensive, cross-agency response is</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>provided using the Steering Group meetings and other discussions. This would secure appropriate consultation. Currently, not even consultation through the TDSCG appears to be secured in the DCO submissions.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to points 16, 17 and 18, the Applicant considers a clear definition of Emergency Services in the context of the Project, is provided in Environmental Statement Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan (CoCP) [REP1-157]. The Applicant does not consider further definition within the draft DCO [REP1-042] to be necessary. Paragraph 2.3.2 of the CoCP defines Emergency Services as: '<i>blue-lights' services, being Kent Police, Kent Fire and Rescue, Essex Police, East of England Ambulance Service, Essex County Fire and Rescue, Southeast Coast Ambulance Service, Metropolitan Police, London Fire Brigade and London Ambulance Service</i>'. Design Principle clause S6.01 [APP-516] also defines Emergency Services as above. The Applicant acknowledges that the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [REP1-175] refers to 'Blue-Light Services' in Table 2.1 TMP Consultees, without a definition of the relevant bodies. The Applicant proposes to update the oTMPfC, the CoCP and Design Principles with a consistent definition of Emergency Services.</p> <p>WR Extract: 19. In its 56 Recommendations of September 2021, the ESSP SG also requested that satisfactory consultation and engagement arrangements are secured for matters which do not form part of the detailed design or other items identified in Table 1 (page 6 of the ESSP SG Written Representation). These matters are identified in Table 2 (page 7 of the ESSP SG Written Representation), and relate to both the construction phase and the operational phase of the project. 20. The ESSP SG acknowledges that the application submissions provide for some consultation with the Emergency Services on some of the above matters such as on the development of EMP2. However, as set out in the SoCG: a. for some issues it remains unclear to the ESSP SG how and by whom it will be consulted, and the scope of such consultation – see for instance SoCG item 2.1.1b; b. the Applicant refers to some documents which do not form part of the submissions and on which the ESSP SG has not been consulted. These include the project's Physical Security Execution Plan, which it is intended to use as the basis for contractors to develop their Security Management Plans. It is not clear to the ESSP SG how consultation with the Emergency Services is secured (see SoCG item 2.1.7).</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>21. In its current form, the ESSP SG objects to this approach. As set out in the SoCG, the ESSP SG seeks clarification of where and how satisfactory consultation is secured to address these issues.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to points 19 to 21, the Applicant refers the ESSP SG to responses to points 7, 15 and 31. In addition, the Applicant will update the CoCP paragraph 6.7.5 so that '<i>Contractors will consult with the relevant emergency services on the production of the Security Management Plan</i>'. This update has been communicated to the ESSP SG.</p> <p>WR Extract: 22. Overall, it is clear from the above that the ESSP SG is currently not satisfied that the current DCO submission would secure satisfactory consultation and engagement with the Emergency Services (and hence also the Safety Partners) on a range of issues covering the detailed design, construction and operation of the LTC Project. In turn, this risks the ESSP SG not being able to provide the coordinated, cross-agency input, which it considers is important to ensure this major development will deliver on relevant safety and security matters.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 22, the Applicant is undertaking an exercise to review the proposals for further consultation and engagement with the ESSP SG in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP1-042]. The Applicant has been developing a "road map" which provides a comprehensive response, and where appropriate the future actions, with regard to the 56 "asks" from the ESSP SG, and this has been recently shared. As such, the matters which ESSP SG refers to are mostly "Matters Under Discussion" in the SoCG.</p> <p>WR Extract: 23. The ESSP SG has requested that the Applicant provide the clarifications requested in the SoCG, in the form of a 'road map' showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how and by whom the Emergency Services will be consulted on each of the matters related to its Recommendations (identified in Tables 1 and 2 above); and • how that consultation is secured in the submissions (if that is the case). <p>24. The ESSP SG has also suggested to the Applicant that the 'road map' has the potential to help narrow the differences between the parties; and where these cannot be resolved, it could assist the ExA in their consideration of the proposals.</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>25. The ESSP SG welcomes the Applicant's agreement to provide such a 'road map and awaits receipt of the first draft of the document. In order to be fully effective, the "roadmap" (or some elements of it) would have to be secured as a commitment, either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. by becoming a Control Document or be secured through the DCO by some other means; or b. by including it in a side agreement by the Applicant with the ESSP SG. <p>Applicant's Response: In response to points 23, 24 and 25, the Applicant notes that the "road map" work is ongoing, as per the response to ESSP SG's point 22. A first draft of the "road map" has been shared with the ESSP SG.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>26. Discussions between ESSP SG and the Applicant during the first part of 2022. This resulted in the detailed advice provided to the Applicant dated 9 March 2022 which is included at Annex B to this Written Representation.</p> <p>27. RVPs are shown on the submitted General Arrangement Plans Volume B (APP-016, Sheet 13 and Sheet 20) and Works Plans Volume B (APP-019, Sheet 13 and Sheet 20) s at the north and south tunnel portals, and referred to in the Design Principles (APP-516).</p> <p>28. Emergency hubs are also shown on the scheme drawings. However, the following points are raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the ESSP SG objects to the location of the northern RVP – this location is considered unsuitable, being too close to the tunnel portal. RVP locations should allow resources to muster ahead of the project, to receive briefing and direction in a position which will not be affected by any ongoing incident. It is not clear to ESSP SG how its advice in Annex B has been taken into account. b. the ESSP SG has concerns regarding the size of the RVPs – these should be large enough to house a small building, lighting, power and parking facilities for approximately 30 - 40 vehicles. It is not clear that this will be the case, particularly for the southern RVP, which is much smaller. No further detail has been forthcoming since issuing the advice contained in Annex B (particularly paragraphs 30 and 31). c. considers that there are other potential locations which could be used as a contingency. The ESSP SG previous advice (see at 6 Annex B to this Written Representation, in particular paragraphs 18 - 22) was that an additional site should be provided in addition to the primary RVP close to the southern tunnel portal. One location, approximately 1-2 miles away from the southern tunnel portal, should be created for this purpose. d. the ESSP SG considers that the previously suggested secondary RVP alongside the A13 Westbound slip road on to the southbound LTC should be identified on the scheme drawings (see paragraph 17 of Annex B to this Written Representation).

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>e. although additional, temporary or “ad hoc” RVPs (beyond those mentioned above) need not necessarily be identified on the scheme drawings, the ESSP SG considers that provision for these should be addressed through emergency and operational plans (see paragraph 23 of Annex B to this Written Representation). These could take the form of temporary areas, brought into use when needed for RVP purposes; or small but more permanent but dual-use areas such as the location already identified in discussion with the Metropolitan Police at Junction 29 on the M25. This should be made a secured requirement of the response plans (see Concern G below).</p> <p>f. the ESSP is concerned at both the lack of detail for matters related to RVP provision (such as evacuation assembly areas, and emergency access roads) and the absence of consultation over the emergency hubs shown on the submission drawings, – it is unclear how these preliminary hub designs have been drawn up. This is important because it raises question marks about how a properly joined up approach will be delivered as the scheme design and operational plans progress (also see concern G of this Written Representation, below).</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 28(a), the Applicant has recently shared feedback and offered meetings with the ESSP SG, as to the selection process and rationale for the location of the RVP in the northern tunnel entrance area, including the key design and operational reasons for why the alternatives proposed by the ESSP SG were not able to be progressed.</p> <p>In relation to point 28(b), the sizing of the RVPs has been developed as a balance of the operational need and the associated impact of providing such a permanent facility.</p> <p>In particular, on the southern side of the crossing the Applicant has sought to minimise the size of the RVP to one that can fit 30 vehicles (10 from each service). Of particular significance is the feedback from Gravesham Borough Council that the southern RVP should be designed in cognisance of how it will sit in a Green Belt location.</p> <p>In relation to points 28(c), (d) and (e), a number of potential locations for secondary RVPs to the north of the tunnel (between the A13 and the tunnel) were proposed by the ESSP SG. The Applicant presented feedback to ESSP SG as to why these options had been discounted during a presentation in January 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to provide secondary RVPs facilities by using areas of carriageway that would be closed in the event of the Project tunnel being closed. These would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A13 to Lower Thames Crossing southbound link roads • A2 to Lower Thames Crossing northbound link roads

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>These links would be quickly closed using technology in the event of a tunnel closure.</p> <p>The requirement for using an RVP, and even more so a secondary RVP, is anticipated to be rare, and therefore the Applicant suggests that additional land-take for secondary RVP use would not be appropriate.</p> <p>In relation to point 28(f), the Applicant has engaged with the ESSP SG in relation to the requirements for RVPs. Details of the proposed facilities available at emergency hubs (and preliminary layout) were shared with the ESSP SG members at a meeting in January 2022. The Applicant has recently attempted to engage members of the ESSP SG for further detail in relation to the issues identified with the RVPs, and is currently awaiting further feedback.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>29. As set out under Key Concern A above, the ESSP SG also objects to the arrangements for engagement on the detailed scheme design (including the RVPs and emergency hubs) currently suggested by the Applicant, which uses the TDSCG approach and also does not secure a commitment to satisfactory consultation.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 29, please refer to the Applicant's response to ESSP SG points 12, 13 and 14.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>30. The ESSP SG welcomes, in general:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the Applicant's references in Section 6.7 of the CoCP (APP336-) to the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI) (now the NPSA) guidelines and to the Project's Security Management Plan (SMP) and Physical Security Execution Plan (PSEP (SoCG 2.1.2)). b. the Applicant's general statements regarding addressing safety and security through the construction phase, and in the detailed design of the project (SoCG 2.1.11). c. the Applicant's statements regarding best practice in relation to prevention of modern slavery, including for the design of the worker accommodation (SoCG 2.1.32) <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 30, the Applicant welcomes this feedback.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>31. However, some of the documents referred to by the Applicant, including the SMP and PSEP are not contained within the DCO submission and have not been made available to the ESSP SG, despite the expertise of the group members in this area. As set out in Annex C to this Written Representation, a Security Working</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>Group was proposed a considerable length of time ago, but has made very little progress towards satisfying the Steering Group that its recommendations will be adopted and acted on. These concerns are coupled with a lack of clarity regarding the Joint Operations Forum (JOF); and the ESSP SG's objections to concerns over the applicant's suggested reliance on the TDSCG to consult on detailed design issues (as set out under Key Concern A above).</p> <p>32. Consequently, the ESSP SG objects to the DCO as submitted, as it does not secure a safe and secure scheme during the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 31, the Applicant established a Security Working Group in September 2021, which has included Designing out Crime Officers from Kent and Essex Police, covering the Applicant's planned security approach and methodology. The Applicant has further meetings of the Security Working Group planned in the near future, at which the Physical Security Execution Plan (PSEP) will be presented and shared with the Police. The Applicant will expand the Security Working Group to include Contractors, resulting in more detailed engagement, particularly in relation to the Security Management Plan (SMP). The Applicant notes that the SMP and PSEP are not included in the DCO submission due to their confidential nature.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>33. Unfortunately, there has been relatively little progress on tunnel design since the ESSP SG made its Recommendations in September 2021. For instance, there has been very little discussion around the safety aspects of the tunnel design, Fixed Fire Fighting System, tunnel ventilation, fire fighting water supplies, evacuation proposals and the preparedness of contractors to provide emergency response should there be an incident in the tunnel during the construction phase. This does not bode well for consultation and engagement over the detailed scheme design, should the DCO be granted.</p> <p>34. Specifically, the ESSP SG currently maintains its objections to the proposals in Design Principle S6.01 in Table 5.4 (APP-516) which states that: "The distance between tunnel cross-passages will be in accordance with DMRB CD 352 Design of road tunnels (Highways England, 2020c), and supported by risk assessment, is currently proposed to be 150m maximum between passage centre line. If departures are applied from the standard and the cross-passages are more than 150m apart from each other, there shall be engagement with emergency services on their distance. To support cross-passage spacing of 150m between centre lines, a Fixed Fire-Fighting System (FFFS) will be deployed within the tunnel bore. There shall be engagement with the emergency services on the type and specification of the FFFS. Emergency services refers to the blue-lights'</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>services, being Kent Police, Kent Fire and Rescue, Essex Police, Essex Ambulance, Essex County Fire and Rescue, South East Coast”.</p> <p>35. The ESSP SG is concerned at this approach for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the spacing of cross passages should not be dictated solely by considerations of tunnel user survival. For instance, it is not clear that the full range of potential impacts on the health and well-being of emergency service personnel (including but not necessarily restricted to fire crews) arising from the proposed cross passage spacing has been taken into account through the Operational Risk Assessment. Personnel from Fire and Rescue, Ambulance and Police services entering the tunnels may have to carry significant equipment (such as breathing apparatus) and wear PPE, which could affect their ability to move between refuges / cross passages. b. it is not clear to the ESSP SG that the potential impacts of the proposed cross passage spacing on emergency response strategies, plans and their alternative options has been taken into account. c. there is an apparent reliance on a formula in the Operational Risk Assessment for the tunnel, which includes a parameter that may not be consistent with tunnel fire engineering. The ESSP SG is investigating this point further. <p>36. The Applicant has not, to date, responded to these concerns, some of which date from the TDSCG (i.e. pre-ESSP SG) discussions.</p> <p>37. As set out under Key Concern A above, the ESSP SG also objects to the arrangements for engagement on the detailed scheme design (including the detailed tunnel design and cross-passage spacing issues) currently suggested by the Applicant, which uses the TDSCG approach and does not secure a commitment to satisfactory consultation.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to points 33 to 37, the current tunnel design is progressed to a level of maturity consistent with a reference design stage. Whilst the Applicant has progressed key aspects of the tunnel (and associated systems) designs, these are not at a level of detailed design maturity. The Applicant stresses the importance of the detailed tunnel design being completed as an integrated system, meaning that detailed design of all aspects should be developed together in a holistic manner.</p> <p>The Applicant's reference design indicates 150m cross-passage spacing as a likely outcome based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The findings of the preliminary Operational Risk Assessment • Comparisons to other proposed, or currently in construction, road tunnels

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>Design Principles [APP-516] clause S6.01 requires cross-passages to be designed in accordance with DMRB CD 352. In particular, DMRB CD 352 paragraphs 3.24 to 3.27 provide requirements as to the determination of appropriate spacing between cross-passages, up to a maximum of 150m. The requirements for determining distance between cross-passages requires incident access proposals to be included, as well as user evacuation. During the detailed design process, a supporting Operational Risk Assessment (quantified risk assessment) will be produced and consulted upon with the Emergency Services. The conclusions of this process will determine the final cross-passage spacing.</p> <p>Design Principles clause S6.01 will be updated to provide greater clarity on this approach, including provision for consultation with the Emergency Services. This information has been shared in recent engagement with the ESSP SG.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken initial engagement, in particular with the Fire & Rescue Services (F&RS), as to access to incidents with cross-passage spacings in excess of 100m; the majority of this engagement took place during 2019. The Applicant also undertook several “desktop exercises” with TDSCG members relating to responses to key incident scenarios. This engagement led to a Fixed Fire Fighting System and closer spacings of fire hydrants being included within the preliminary scheme design. Specific details as to the type and detailed specification of these systems will be developed and consulted upon with the Emergency Services during the detailed design process.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to continue consultation with the Emergency Services on these issues, particularly in the development of detailed designs. The Applicant has also offered to facilitate meetings with the F&RS and a comparable tunnel project where cross-passage spacings of more than 100m are currently being delivered.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>38. The ESSP SG identified within its September 2021’s 56 Recommendations a number of areas where the Project could potentially have an adverse effect on the ability of members to carry out its duties and/or present an increased burden on resources. These fall into three main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. funding for additional emergency service staffing and vehicles to mitigate additional burdens during the construction phase. Essex Police have submitted a proposal and justification to the Applicant to support this funding request. The Applicant’s position is that they will not provide funding from one central government-funded source to another. b. reimbursement provisions for local authority and emergency service for the costs of dealing with major incidents on the LTC.

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>The Applicant's position is that they will not provide funding from one central government-funded source to another.</p> <p>c. funding for a co-ordination officer and in-house officer time to ensure the ESSP SG can respond to relevant consultation on the detailed design and construction phase documentation submitted for approval.</p> <p>Previously, the Applicant indicated that it would consider funding such posts as it was considered this work was not 'business as usual' for the ESSP SG members. However, the Applicant changed its position on this point, and now states that they will not provide funding from one central government-funded source to another.</p> <p>39. The ESSP SG notes from the responses of the Applicant as set out in the SoCG (items 2.1.17 and 2.1.20) that they do not rule out the possibility of there being impacts on the activities of the Steering Group members, which would place an additional burden on their resources, and which might justify mitigation. Impacts and burdens on the Emergency Services and Safety Partners during the design, construction, and initial operational phases (when further monitoring and mitigation measures are to be explored) does not represent a "business as usual" situation. The ESSP SG considers that the most important point here is not how its members and the Applicant are funded from central government. Rather, it is whether the developer and 'operator' of the LTC should bear the costs of justifiable mitigation which is required to make the scheme acceptable, also bearing in mind that the scheme is proposed as a toll road generating income.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to points 38 and 39, the Applicant refers the ESSP SG to the response provided in the SoCG [REP1-200] at item 2.1.17.</p> <p>The Applicant highlights that there would be a road user charge for using the tunnel, not a toll, with the important difference being that there is no direct link between the revenue raised by the road user charge and paying for the operation of the Project road. All revenue collected would go to central government and would not generate income for the Applicant. This is explained in further detail in the Road User Charging Statement [APP-517].</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>40. The ESSP SG intends to develop further costings for the mitigation items identified above and will submit them to the ExA in due course for discussion. Such funding could be provided via a side agreement(s).</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 40, the Applicant notes the ESSP SG's intention to particularise mitigation and their costings. The Applicant will consider whether this is necessary and proportionate once provided.</p> <p>WR Extract: 41. The ESSPSG members have been working with the Applicant on this issue to assess the potential impacts of the construction and operation of the road on the ability of the Emergency Services to achieve their targets for responding to incidents in the area around the Project. Such impacts might result from factors leading to increases in journey times, such as temporary road closures during construction or localised increases in traffic congestion during the operational phase. Response times might be adversely affected when attending incidents both on the proposed LTC itself, and incidents elsewhere within the area. 42. The ESSP SG recognises that the Project has been altered to provide emergency access roads to the tunnel portal areas and elsewhere on the route and this will assist in avoiding a deterioration in response times, particularly when attending incidents on the LTC itself. However, if nevertheless adverse impacts on Emergency Service response times are likely, then the ESSP SG will seek from the Applicant the provision of mitigation measures, though currently it is not known what form these might take. 43. The ESSP SG will provide an update to its position on this area of concern once it has received all the outputs of modelling being undertaken by the Applicant. However, this response time modelling will itself be derived from the strategic LTAM modelling used by the Applicants in their transport assessment work. Concerns have been expressed elsewhere - including by local authorities, some of whom are members of the ESSP SG - that such modelling may not be sufficiently fine-grained to fully identify impacts in the way that could be achieved if more local operational modelling for construction were used.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to points 41 to 43, the Applicant refers the ESSP SG to the response provided in the SoCG [REP1-200] at item 2.1.27. The Applicant adds that since the submission of the SoCG at Deadline 1, data has been received from one further Emergency Service and is now producing traffic modelling outputs on that data. The Applicant is still waiting for data from two (of six) Emergency Services in order to complete all traffic modelling outputs. The Applicant looks forward to feedback from the Emergency Services on the information provided to them so far. The Applicant notes the recent concerns raised by ESSP SG in regard to the use of the Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM) for modelling response times, and would welcome further engagement on this matter. The</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>Applicant considers that a strategic model is the correct methodology to achieve the outcomes of the response times modelling, as it highlights the benefits and disbenefits across the wider area that the Emergency Services respond to.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>44. The ESSP SG welcomes the inclusion of emergency access roads within the scheme. However, the Group has remaining concerns at the absence of detail for these roads; and almost none of the other planning for incident responses, both during the construction phase and the operational phase has been discussed with the ESSP SG. This is important because it raises question marks about how a properly joined up approach will be delivered. For instance, there is significant concern that evacuation assembly areas have not been identified; and it is not clear how the potential for conflicts between members of the public and emergency vehicles using proposed access roads to and from RVPs will be dealt with (see for example where this point was raised previously at paragraphs 9, 16 and 20 of Annex B to this Written Representation).</p> <p>45. Even at a strategy / framework level, this work appears to have been postponed by the Applicant; and is not clearly provided for in the DCO submission documentation. This is disappointing, as these issues were raised historically through the TDSCG and again in the 56 Recommendations of September 2021 and yet no clear strategy or framework seems to be in place.</p> <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 44 and 45, please refer to the Applicant's response to ESSP SG point 7 and the response in the SoCG [REP1-200] at item 2.1.22.</p> <p>The Applicant would further add that, while assembly areas/muster points are not identified in the draft DCO [REP1-042], Design Principles [APP-516] and clauses S3.22 and S9.24 relate to the identification and design of emergency muster points, including safe access routes. This is so that the detailed design has the ability to determine the optimal layout that best addresses their functionality, in coordination with other tunnel design aspects.</p> <p>The Applicant also wishes to note that hazard identification workshops and "desktop exercises" took place with the TDSCG between 2018 and 2021; these covered a range of hazards/incidents scenarios, including collisions, fires and evacuation, and the anticipated responses to these.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>46. There is a lack of clarity on what contractor emergency preparedness procedures should include for the construction phase; and no requirement relating to the enabling works. As set out under Key Concern A above,</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>the ESSP SG also objects to the arrangements for engagement on the detailed scheme design (including the emergency access roads and evacuation areas) currently suggested by the Applicant, which uses the TDSCG approach, and does not secure a commitment to satisfactory consultation. There is also a concern that other topics which should be covered in emergency response plans – such as smaller temporary/ad hoc RVPs – do not appear to have been secured in the application documents.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to point 46, the Applicant refers to the response provided in the SoCG [REP1-200] at item 2.1.3, as well as the response to points 7 and 14 in this document.</p> <p>WR Extract: 47. The ESSP SG concerns for this topic (mental Health, well-being and suicide prevention) cover impacts and risks both during the enabling and construction phases (including in relation to the workforce); and through the scheme design and into the operational phase. 48. The Applicant has responded to the ESSP SG Recommendations 11.1 and 11.2 regarding the previous omission of workforce mental wellbeing by now including it in the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA (APP-539) and Environmental Statement Chapter 13, with a reference (within the REAC ref No. PH002) in the CoCP (APP-336) Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC). The ESSP SG has made a number of further requests in the SoCG as to how these statements should be expanded and clarified, to more comprehensively cover the issues and ensure that they become secured commitments– see SoCG item 2.1.33 and 2.1.35.</p> <p>Applicant's Response: In response to points 47 and 48, the Applicant refers the ESSP SG to the response provided in the SoCG [REP1-200] at items 2.1.33 and 2.1.35. The Applicant will engage further with the ESSP SG in order to comprehensively cover any issues in relation to the impacts of mental health, wellbeing and suicide prevention.</p> <p>WR Extract: 49. In relation to Recommendations 11.3 and 11.4, the ESSP SG recognises that the Applicant has been working with bodies such as the Samaritans and the Transport Research Laboratory to develop tools examining the characteristics of structures to determine their level of risk. The Applicant has also stated (SoCG item 2.1.34)</p>

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>that their Suicide Prevention Strategy and Suicide Prevention Toolkit will be used on the project. However, it is noted that the Applicant's responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. appear to focus solely on final scheme design, and do not integrate across all of the project phases to ensure that contractors take appropriate steps to limit the risk of suicide involving structures and scheme features while under construction; b. in respect of final scheme design, do not provide a firm commitment in the application documents – for instance suicide prevention is not secured in a Design Principle with reference to the aforementioned prevention strategy and toolkit. <p>Applicant's Response:</p> <p>In response to point 49, the Applicant has been keen to develop the link between bodies, such as the Samaritans and the Transport Research Laboratory, to determine the levels of risks.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that suicide prevention is only considered in the final scheme design. A key factor in mitigating the risk of suicide threats involving the Project's assets during construction, is to establish a secure site. Construction sites, compounds and work areas will be secured at all times to prevent unauthorised access to restricted areas, as described in Section 6.7 of the CoCP. Contractors will be responsible for securing sites, compounds, and work areas with high perimeter fencing, secure gates, and security personnel. Other measures include CCTV, security lighting, immobilisation of plant equipment, and securing ladders and scaffolding to prevent unauthorised access.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Emergency Services and all partners as part of its Suicide Prevention Strategy. The Applicant will add an additional Design Principle requiring the adoption of the existing National Highways' Suicide Prevention Strategy³, in relation to assessing suicide risk and implementing proportionate interventions during detailed design for the operation of the Project.</p> <p>WR Extract:</p> <p>50. As set out under Key Concern A above, the ESSP SG also objects to the arrangements for engagement on the detailed scheme design (including design for suicide prevention) currently suggested by the Applicant, which uses the TDSCG approach and does not secure a commitment to satisfactory consultation.</p>

³ National Highways (2022). Suicide Prevention Strategy – Our Approach.

Rep ID	WR Submitter	WR/WR Extract/Applicant's Response
		<p>Response:</p> <p>In response to point 50, the Applicant refers to the response to points 7 and 14 in this document.</p> <p>The Applicant will follow all guidance set out in National Highways' Suicide Prevent Strategy, which sets out continuing engagement with Emergency Services, local authorities and partners throughout the life cycle of a project and into operation.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue consultation with the Emergency Services, through the full lifecycle of the Project and into operation, and has sought to update aspects of the DCO to provide commitments to that effect. It is also worth noting that that the Applicant's licence and DMRB requires consultation with the Emergency Services.</p> <p>The Applicant is undertaking an exercise to review the proposals for further consultation and engagement with the ESSP SG in the documents secured under the draft DCO [REP1-042], which will include design for suicide prevention. The Applicant would welcome further discussion with the ESSP SG to address concerns about the use of TSDCG.</p>

If you need help accessing this or any other National Highways information, please call **0300 123 5000** and we will help you.

© Crown copyright 2023.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

write to the **Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Mapping (where present): © Crown copyright and database rights 2023 OS 100030649. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

If you have any enquiries about this publication email info@nationalhighways.co.uk or call **0300 123 5000***.

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls.

These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources when issued directly by National Highways.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ

National Highways Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363