



PLANNING INSPECTORATE ISSUE-SPECIFIC HEARING 3

on

5 SEPTEMBER 2023

Ubiquis (Acolad UK Ltd)
291-299 Borough High Street, London, SE1 1JG
Tel: 0207 269 0370

PRESENT

PLANNING INSPECTORATE

RYND SMITH
JANINE LAVER
KEN PRATT
KEN TAYLOR
DOMINIC YOUNG

CASE TEAM

BART BARTKOWIAK
TED BLACKMORE
SPENCER BARROWMAN
RYAN SEDGMAN
JESSICA WEATHERBY

LOWER THAMES CROSSING

ANDREW TAIT KC
ISABELLA TAFUR
GARY HODGE
STEVE ROBERTS
CLARE DONNELLY
DR TIM WRIGHT
ANDREW KAY
BARNEY FORREST

LOCAL AUTHORITIES

DANIEL DOUGLAS (London Borough of Havering)
[LEE WHITE?] (London Borough of Havering)
[EMMA GRAYSHAM?] (London Borough of Havering)
GEORGE MACKENZIE (Thurrock Council)
KIRSTY MCMULLEN (Thurrock Council)
CHRIS STRATFORD (Thurrock Council)
ADRIAN NEVE (Thurrock Council)
[MAT KILEY?] (Thurrock Council)
DR COLIN BLACK (Thurrock Council)
SHARON JEFFERIES (Thurrock Council)
MARK WOODGER (Essex County Council)
GARY MACDONNELL (Essex County Council)
MICHAEL BEDFORD KC (Gravesham Borough Council)
WENDY LANE (Gravesham Borough Council)
TONY CHADWICK (Gravesham Borough Council)
JOSEPH RATCLIFFE (Kent County Council)
NOLA COOPER (Kent County Council)
ABIGAIL ROSCOE (Kent County Council)
SUSAN LINDLEY (Shorne Parish Council)
DEBBIE WRIGHT (Higham Parish Council)

STATUTORY PARTIES

ALISON DABLIN (Port of Tilbury London Ltd)
PAUL SHADAREVIAN KC (DP World London Gateway)

SIMON TUCKER (DP World London Gateway)
ALEX ROBERTS (DP World London Gateway)
ALEX DILLISTONE (Port of London Authority)
LUCY OWEN (Port of London Authority)
MATTHEW RHEINBERG (Transport for London)

INTERESTED PARTIES

[JOHN JOHNSON?]
ROBIN BEARD
JACKIE THACKER
DAVID WOOD (Veolia ES Landfill Ltd)
[IAN WHARTON?] (Bellway Homes Ltd)
[BEN HUNT?] (Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group)
[HEATHER GUERDEN?] (Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group)
[EMMA POTTER?] (Emergency Services and Safety Partners Steering Group)
LAURA BLAKE (Thames Crossing Action Group)
LEIGH HUGHES (Thames Crossing Action Group)
MURIEL BLAKE (Thames Crossing Action Group)
ANTHONY LEEMAN (P.W. Leeman)

1 MR SMITH: Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. We will now make a start in
2 the physical room and virtually, too. Good morning and welcome, everybody,
3 to today's issue-specific hearing 3 for the Lower Thames Crossing, and we have
4 already dealt with the preliminary matters so I'll move straight to introductions.
5 My name is Rynd Smith; I am the lead member of a panel, which is the
6 Examining Authority for the Lower Thames Crossing application and I'm in the
7 chair for today's hearing. I'll draw your attention to the frequently asked
8 questions linked to our rule 6 letter and available on our website, and you'll find
9 my brief biography and a brief biography of all of my panel colleagues, and an
10 explanation for the purpose of the panel's appointment there. My fellow panel
11 members will introduce themselves shortly, and I'll start by moving to my
12 colleague, Dominic Young, to my immediate left.

13 MR YOUNG: Good morning, everybody. My name's Dominic Young, and I may have
14 some questions as we go through today. Thank you.

15 MR TAYLOR: Good morning, everybody. My name is Ken Taylor. Again, I'm likely
16 to ask some questions as we got through today.

17 MR PRATT: Good morning, everybody. My name's Ken Pratt and yes, I'm on question
18 duty as well today.

19 MS LAVER: I'm Janine Laver. Nice to meet you all.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, the nature of the engagement of the panel is
21 that because today's hearing is focused on design matters, it will be a little bit of
22 a tag-team event. I will be, as I say, in the chair today, but my colleagues will
23 all be interjecting as their own particular specialisms and issues arise, and we'll
24 try and make this as orderly and clear as we possibly can, and hopefully the
25 agenda has structured that in a way that makes clear how we will move through
26 the elements of the project that we'll be examining.

27 Now, having introduced my panel colleagues, I'll just also mention my
28 Planning Inspectorate colleagues that are working with us today. Bart
29 Bartkowiak and Ted Blackmore, jointly, are the case managers leading the case
30 team for these applications and they're supported by Spencer Barrowman in this
31 room. Ryan Sedgman and Jessica Weatherby are available online, supporting
32 the virtual side of what is a blended event.

33 You've seen, I trust, the agenda paper and I've given you a sense of the
34 nature of today's examination. Today's issue-specific hearing 3 is where we are

1 broadly investigating project design, and I think it's important to flag that we
2 have requested the applicant to prepare visual representations of key elements
3 of the proposed highway design to assist the discussions that we'll be holding
4 today. This, we felt, was quite an important thing to do here because this is a
5 very large, it's a very complex project, and one of the things that we want to try
6 and shake down around the table today is our understanding of the nature and
7 function of the key elements of the project: how they actually work, therefore
8 why they take the amounts of land they do, etc. And having a physical, visual,
9 functional representation of the proposed function of the project that we can turn
10 to and interrogate will help us, we trust as clearer questions but also help all of
11 us understand physically, in geographical terms, where we are when those
12 questions are being both asked and answered.

13 And so I will draw attention to the fact that we made a procedural decision
14 that was published on 1 September 2023, formally seeking the introduction of
15 this visual representation material by the applicant. It is fair to say that the
16 applicant has been in dialogue for a number of weeks with our case management
17 who were trying to secure a useful tool that could be put in front of all of us
18 today, and that procedural decision that we published to admit the result of the
19 work that the applicant had been doing in the background was taken in order to
20 formally bring that material in as examination documents that everybody can
21 refer to.

22 So I thought I would flag why we issued that decision, which also raises
23 that you will find information about that and indeed all of the other application
24 documents produced on the National Infrastructure Planning website in a thing
25 called the examination library, and you can use Google or another search engine
26 to search for Lower Thames Crossing Planning Inspectorate and you will be
27 taken there. Do please keep up to date with the documents on the website, and
28 also with the website itself because we use it to communicate with you and to
29 provide access to all of our procedures and documents throughout the
30 examination.

31 I'm going to spend a little bit of time briefly this morning talking about
32 the hearings that we're going to hold as we move through this week and next
33 week. My intention in so doing is to assist people, particularly who may not be
34 in the room today but are listening or watching online, because it will not then

1 be our intention to have long introductions to subsequent issue-specific hearings;
2 we will curtail introductions and move directly into substantive business in all
3 of the remaining hearings following on through this and next week.

4 So as a reminder, tomorrow we have issue-specific hearing 4 on traffic
5 and transportation. That's Wednesday 6 September from 10 a.m. Open-floor
6 hearing 4 will be held from 7.30 p.m. on the evening of the same day.
7 Issue-specific hearing 5 on tunnelling will be held on Thursday 7 September
8 from 10 a.m. Issue-specific hearing 6 on mitigation, compensation and land
9 requirements will be held on Friday 8 September from 10 a.m. and that will wrap
10 this week's events. These will all be blended events, held in person here Orsett
11 Hall and online at the same time.

12 Moving through to the following week, issue-specific hearing 7 on the
13 draft development consent order is to be held as a virtual only event on Monday
14 morning from 10 a.m. Monday 11 September. We anticipate that that won't
15 extend into the afternoon. Principally, the purpose of that is to provide a
16 monitoring point on progress around potential changes to the draft development
17 consent order and, to a degree, its business is driven by what is or is not said in
18 these hearings this week, because if substantial changes to the draft order are
19 flagged in these hearings, we will want to pin back to what those might look
20 like, how those might emerge and when they might emerge at that particular
21 point, whereas if relatively little is asked for during this week, there won't be a
22 lot to say. So I thought it was important understand that, the monitoring nature
23 of that issue-specific hearing on Monday.

24 Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week we are holding three
25 days of accompanied site inspections. Anybody who wishes to attend those
26 ought already to have expressed interest in so doing. The applicant has been
27 provided with all of those requests and has booked vehicles to enable the
28 accompaniment of the site inspections. It's worth noting that in a pair of
29 instances, inspections are being made on private land where, for good reasons,
30 access is proposed to be limited. The first of those is to an operational and soil
31 remediation waste recovery site around what is proposed to be the north tunnel
32 portal on Tilbury marshes. That is land where the landowner, as is their legal
33 right, has requested the number of people to enter on to the land to be limited,
34 and that's on the Wednesday morning, Wednesday the 13th. And then we are

1 also, on the morning of Thursday 14 September, proposed to visit a care home
2 facility at the request of the operators of that facility at Baker St, and again there,
3 because of the sensitive nature of the land use and because of the fact that it is
4 in active use and there are clients on site, it's been requested that we limit the
5 numbers of people attending.

6 An accompanied site visit – it's very important – is held because the
7 Examining Authority needs to see something on land that we cannot see from
8 the public domain. It's important that when we attend, therefore, we attend in
9 public and we're seen to be with representatives of the principal parties and the
10 parties can then assure themselves that everything that goes on on that private
11 land is properly conducted; there is due propriety and good conduct. So that's
12 why we go in company, but we must always remember that it is the private
13 landowner's right to actually restrict who goes on to the land. We will not carry
14 an accompanied site inspection if our minimum propriety expectations cannot
15 be met, so we'll always have to have a representation of the applicant, of the
16 principal local planning authority and the landowner to assure that this is a fair
17 process and that what is being done is fair and above board, and we can't assure
18 that then we will not go on to the land, but if you happen to be on that visit and
19 we ask you not to attend a particular part of it, please don't get too upset because
20 the landowner does have the right to say who does or does not go on to land.

21 So those are the three days, Tuesday the 12th, Wednesday the 13th and
22 Thursday the 14th. Those will be followed by two final hearings on Friday the
23 15th: a first compulsory acquisition hearing where we will be investigating the
24 applicant's strategic case for compulsory acquisition overall, and the degree to
25 which overarching statutory and policy tests are met, and the first of, we
26 anticipate, a number of individual objection compulsory acquisition hearings
27 will be held in the afternoon, and I would flag if you are an objector to
28 compulsory acquisition and you do not see your name on the list for compulsory
29 acquisition hearing 2, that isn't because we've forgotten you. It's because we
30 go through everything stepwise. We are hearing specific issues which we've
31 identified in that agenda, starting on the afternoon of Friday the 15th, but we will
32 walk through all of the outstanding objections and requests to be heard and we
33 have additional hearings, shortly to be notified, in both October and November
34 of this year.

1 So, hopefully that gives you a sense of how this coming fortnight works.
2 I'm very briefly now also just going to cover a few matters around the operation
3 of hearings in general terms. Firstly, we are of course being livestreamed and
4 recorded. Most people participating in this event have participated in previous
5 ones. Does anybody have any questions about the terms on which our digital
6 recordings are made or kept or published? Excellent, in which case we will
7 move on. What we now will do is take introductions from the people present
8 who are wishing to be heard, either on their own behalf or representing another
9 person or organisation, and what I'm going to do is I'm going to start with the
10 local authority and then statutory party requests to be heard, and then I'm going
11 to move through other interested parties, and then I'm going to come to the
12 applicant last. So, if I can then start – looking at my local authority list – with
13 the London Borough of Havering, please. Who's here for the London Borough
14 of Havering?

15 MR DOUGLAS: Good morning, sir. Good morning, everybody. My name's Daniel
16 Douglas. I'm the transport planning team leader at the London Borough of
17 Havering. I'll ask my colleagues Lee and Emma to introduce themselves.

18 MR WHITE: Yes, good morning, sir. [Lee White?], technical advisor to the London
19 Borough of Havering on all matters of DCO.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and welcome also into this process, the virtual room.
21 I was looking worriedly at the back bench at that point thinking, 'Where are the
22 London Borough of Havering?' and then, of course, they magically appeared on
23 our screens, which is excellent because it demonstrates that the technical issues
24 that we were suffering from a little earlier have now been resolved.

25 MS GRAYSHAM: Sorry. Just to add, sorry, you asked about the London Borough of
26 Havering. Good morning, I'm [Emma Graysham?], one of the technical
27 specialists supporting London Borough of Havering as well, so thank you.

28 MR SMITH: Apologies.

29 MS GRAVESHAM: No, that's absolutely fine. Thank you.

30 MR SMITH: And we're not seeing Ms Hooton[?] today, the ecological consultant. No.

31 MR DOUGLAS: No. Ms Hooton won't be attending the hearing today. It'll just be us
32 three.

33 MR SMITH: Okay, so returning to the physical room now, can I turn to the lead
34 representative for Thurrock Council, please?

1 MR MACKENZIE: Good morning, sir. I am George Mackenzie, a barrister; I will –
2 instructed together, I should say, with Douglas Edwards of King’s Counsel. I’ll
3 ask the remainder of the team to introduce themselves, but on Mr Edwards’
4 behalf, can I convey his apologies that he can’t be here today or tomorrow, but
5 he will be here for the remainder of the issue-specific hearings in the next
6 fortnight.

7 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, so to the remainder of the Thurrock team.

8 MS MCMULLEN: Good morning, sir. My name’s Kirsty McMullen on behalf of
9 Thurrock Council.

10 MR STRATFORD: Chris Stratford, planner on behalf of Thurrock Council. Can’t get
11 to a mic, so...

12 MR SMITH: That might actually be an issue, because although we can hear you, the
13 external room, the virtual room, probably can’t. We do have roving mics.

14 MR STRATFORD: In which case, let me repeat. Chris Stratford, planner for Thurrock
15 Council, and there are three other people towards the back of the room. Bart, if
16 you wouldn’t mind...

17 MR NEVE: Thank you. Good morning, Adrian Neve for transport for Thurrock Council.
18 Thank you.

19 MR KIELY: Good morning, [Mat Kiley?] for transport at Thurrock Council.

20 DR BLACK: Good morning, Colin Black from Thurrock Council.

21 MR SMITH: Right, does that conclude Thurrock’s representation? Now, actually it does
22 flag a matter that I will speak to briefly which is that until yesterday, we were
23 due to be conducting this hearing in a much larger room, but it’s a room that, I
24 think it’s probably fair to say, is an orangery and with today’s weather forecast
25 and a failing air conditioning system, apparently the decision was taken that it
26 wouldn’t be an appropriate room to conduct a hearing in in the temperatures that
27 we were likely to face, so apologies to those of you who are sitting on the b ack
28 chairs. This is a smaller room that we’d hoped to use, but I trust a considerably
29 more comfortable one. Moving on from Thurrock Council –

30 PARTICIPANT: Forgive me, sir, but before you do, I think we may have one person
31 online, I’ve been told.

32 MR SMITH: Yes, okay.

33 PARTICIPANT: It’s [Steve Plum?].

34 MR SMITH: Now, can we hear...?

1 MS JEFFERIES: Hello, it's Sharon Jefferies from Stantec, representing Thurrock
2 Council.

3 MR SMITH: Ms Jeffries heard loud and clear. Thank you very much. Does that...?

4 PARTICIPANT: I think it does. We thought there may be one more but it doesn't look
5 like – he may be here later.

6 MR SMITH: Okay, was that...?

7 PARTICIPANT: Steve Plum.

8 MR SMITH: Steve Plum, okay. Yeah, noted. Well look, listen, if you need to introduce
9 him later on, I'm sure that's relatively easily done. Let's then move on to Essex
10 County Council, and who is leading the representation For Essex?

11 MARK WOODGER: Good morning, sir, and thank you to yourself and the hearing panel
12 today for your very thorough introduction. My name is Mark Woodger. I'll
13 spell that for you in case you need it. It's W-O-O-D-G-E-R, and I'm a principal
14 planner and I work in the growth and development team at Essex County
15 Council, and I'd just like to also introduce my colleague to my left, Gary. Thank
16 you.

17 MR MACDONNELL: Hello, yeah, Gary MacDonnell, here representing Essex County
18 Council. I am a programme manager working in highways and transportation.

19 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Okay, if we can then move on to Gravesham
20 Borough Council, and I believe Wendy Lane is leading for that authority.

21 MR BEDFORD: Sir, thank you.

22 MR SMITH: Michael Bedford.

23 MR BEDFORD: Yes, sir. Thank you. Michael Bedford KC for Gravesham Borough
24 Council. Wendy Lane is here. She is the assistant director of planning, as indeed
25 also is Mr Tony Chadwick who is the NSIP project manager, but for the most
26 part I expect I'll lead the contributions and if I need to bring them in I will do
27 so.

28 MR SMITH: Excellent. Thank you, Mr Bedford. Now, can I then turn to Kent County
29 Council, and if I just check that – do we have Kent in the room?

30 MR RATCLIFFE: Thank you, sir. Good morning. My name is Joseph Ratcliffe. I'm
31 the transport strategy manager at Kent County Council and I'm supported here
32 today by two principal transport planners: Nola Cooper and Abigail Roscoe, but
33 it will be primarily me that will be speaker. Thank you.

1 MR SMITH: Okay, thank you, and then if I can just confirm that Brentwood Borough
2 Council said that they will no longer be attending, so that brings the principal
3 local authorities through. In relation to parish councils, can I ask if we have
4 Shorne Parish Council and Susan Lindley – apologies.

5 MS LINDLEY: Good morning, sir. Yes, I'm Susan Lindley from Shorne Parish Council.
6 Thank you.

7 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and then from Higham Parish Council, we should
8 have Debbie Wright.

9 MS WRIGHT: Yes, good morning. Hello, I'm Debbie Wright.

10 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. If we can then move on to other statutory parties,
11 Port of Tilbury London Ltd.

12 MS DABLIN: Hello, yes, Alison Dablin, associate with Pinsent Masons, here
13 representing the Port of Tilbury.

14 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and if we could then move on to DP World London
15 Gateway.

16 MR SHADAREVIAN: Sir, good morning. My name is Paul Shadarevian KC, and I'm
17 accompanied by Simon Tucker to my left here from DTA, and Alex Roberts of
18 LSH who sits behind me. Alex, would you raise your hand, please? There you
19 are.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and again, if you need the roving microphone, Mr
21 Shadarevian, please do ask for it.

22 MR SHADAREVIAN: I'm grateful, sir. Thank you.

23 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Can I then move on to the Port of London
24 Authority?

25 MS DILLISTONE: Good morning, sir. I'm Alex Dillistone, acting on behalf of the Port
26 of London Authority and I'm here today with my client

27 MS OWEN: And I'm Lucy Owen from the Port of London Authority.

28 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and then finally Transport for London.

29 MR RHEINBERG: Good morning, sir. Matthew Rheinberg, major projects urban design
30 manager at Transport for London, representing them today.

31 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. I'm now going to move on to interested parties who
32 have requested to attend. I do note that we did have a request for the attendance
33 of Dr Andrew Boswell, but he is not with us either virtually or physically. Let
34 me just check. No, he is not. Okay, do we have Mr [John Johnson?]?

1 MR JOHNSON: John Johnson, local resident –

2 MR SMITH: Just bear with me, Mr Johnson. We'll get a microphone to you.

3 MR JOHNSON: Hello, I'm John Johnson. I'm a local resident in Sole Street in Cobham.

4 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Mr Robin Beard.

5 MR BEARD: Robin Beard. I suppose I'm another local resident.

6 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Mrs Jackie Thacker.

7 MS THACKER: Hello, I'm Jackie Thacker and I'm an Orsett local resident.

8 MR SMITH: Indeed, and we're very conscious that you have attended these events

9 before. Can I check we don't appear have either Mr John[?] or Mr Wayne[?]

10 Thacker. Are you representing both of them? Excellent. Right, then we have

11 Mr David Wood of Hogan Lovells International LLP on behalf of Veolia ES

12 Landfill.

13 MR WOOD: Good morning, sir. That's me. I'm David Wood, senior associate and

14 representing Veolia ES Landfill Ltd.

15 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and then we have Mr [Ian Wharton?], an associate

16 director of transport for Bellway Homes Ltd.

17 MR WHARTON: Good morning, everybody. I'm, yes, Ian Wharton. I'm a consultant

18 engineer representing Bellway Homes.

19 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and then we have, I believe, [Ben Hunt?] of the

20 emergency services and safety partners steering group. Is Mr Hunt available?

21 We have multiple representatives. Okay.

22 PARTICIPANT: Good morning, sir. Mr Hunt gives his apologies; he's had to drop off

23 the call for another prior engagement. He will be monitoring this event and

24 hopes to be back with us for item 7, but he is representing emergency services

25 and safety partners steering group, so that is his role in this and hopes to, as I

26 say, be back with us as soon as possible.

27 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Okay, and so then [Heather Guerden?] and [Emma

28 Potter?] we do see before us on screen, so welcome to both of you. If I can then

29 move on to the Thames Crossing Action Group, TCAG, and I believe we should

30 have Laura Blake, Leigh Hughes and Muriel Blake.

31 MS L BLAKE: Good morning, yes. Laura Blake, chair of the Thames Crossing Action

32 Group, and I am joined by Leigh Hughes and Muriel Blake behind me should

33 they be needed. Thank you.

1 MR SMITH: Thank you, and again, Ms Blake, do call for the microphone should you
2 need it at any point. Do we have Anthony Leeman of P.W. Leeman?
3 MR LEEMAN: Yes, Anthony Leeman, P.W. Leeman Ltd, landowner at East Tilbury.
4 Thank you.
5 MR SMITH: Okay, now can I check – I don't believe we have, but will make sure – Tom
6 Rowberry, a solicitor at Pinsent Masons for St Modwen, or Nick Mansell who
7 is also a solicitor of Pinsent Masons for St Modwen. Any attendants from those
8 people? No, thank you, so that takes me to the end of the list that I'm aware of.
9 Is there any – before I go to the applicant and ask them to introduce their team,
10 is there anybody else in the room who believes that they have requested to speak
11 who we have not already covered? No, excellent. In which case, to the
12 applicant.
13 MR TAIT: Good morning, sir. My name is Andrew Tait, T-A-I-T, King's Council for
14 the applicant. I am instructed by BDB Pitmans, Mr Henderson on my right, and
15 I will also be appearing on other occasions with Isabella Tafur of Council.
16 Speaking today, there will be Mr Gary Hodge who is the highways technical
17 lead who will be dealing with the review of function and traffic movement at the
18 intersections, and so will be speaking to the material pursuant to your procedural
19 decision, PD 33. Mr Hodge is putting his hand up.
20 MR HODGE: Hello, sir.
21 MR SMITH: Good morning, Mr Hodge and thank you to you and your team for the hard
22 work that has gone on behind the scenes to hopefully simplify our way thought
23 this material.
24 MR TAIT: Sir, in relation to siting and land take and design mitigation, the remaining
25 items on the agenda, the speakers will be Mr Steve Roberts who is the design
26 and engineering director for LTC, two to my left, Ms Clare Donnelly, who is the
27 project architect and design advisor, who is in the row behind at the moment,
28 and also may call upon Dr Tim Wright, head of consents on my left, Mr Andrew
29 Kay who's the lead landscape designer who is –
30 MR SMITH: Mr Kay, thank you.
31 MR TAIT: Behind the pillar at the moment, and Mr Barney Forrest who's the
32 environment lead, who's also put his hand up. Actually, if it would at all assist...

1 MR SMITH: I don't know if there are any more chairs in that direction, but if that part
2 of the bench were able to shift slightly down room, they would see the panel a
3 little more clearly and we can see them.

4 MR TAIT: And so we anticipate perhaps moving when they come forward to speak,
5 doing a little bit of chair swapping.

6 MR SMITH: Good. Excellent. Even better, in which case, worry not. That will be just
7 fine. Okay, is there anybody else who needs to be introduced immediately from
8 the applicant team?

9 MR TAIT: Not at present, no. Thank you, sir.

10 MR SMITH: Okay. So, just a few more preliminary matters before we get stuck into the
11 agenda. When anybody begins to speak on an item on an item or to a question,
12 please remember to reintroduce yourself by name and say which organisation, if
13 any, you represent. This is very important because it helps people on the live
14 stream to understand what's happening, and of course we record events and
15 afterwards, if names are not said, trying to find out who said what and link the
16 transcript to the ideas, the words, becomes quite difficult. So please do
17 remember to reintroduce yourself, even if it appears to be boring to do so.

18 I will flag again, once an issue has been identified by one speaker, then it
19 doesn't need to be repeated by a second who agrees. If somebody introduces
20 something that you agree with, say you agree with it. We may also disregard
21 representations that are vexatious or frivolous and we will ask people to move
22 on if they substantially repeat what others have said. I will also remind
23 everybody of the importance of respecting all participants and allowing
24 everybody here to have their say. In fairness, none of us want to be interrupted
25 when we speak and so therefore please do not interrupt other speakers, and if the
26 panel needs to clarify something that somebody has said, we will intervene and
27 ask for that clarification.

28 If anybody, of course, does interrupt in a way that is unnecessary or
29 disrupts the hearing, then I will issue a warning. If I need to warn a third time,
30 then I could ask the case manager to exclude someone from the hearing, and
31 again, also people should be aware that repeat interruptions that lead to
32 disruption can be viewed as unreasonable behaviour, for which awards of cost
33 can be sought by other interested parties.

1 Finally, in terms of session lengths, what we're aiming to do is speak for –
2 to allow the proceedings to proceed for approximately one and a half hour
3 sessions and take 15-minute breaks, so the first, we will target at approximately
4 11.30 for about 15 minutes. We'll probably break somewhere around 1.15 for
5 approximately an hour for lunch and then we may take a 15-minute break in the
6 mid-afternoon, depending on our progress and coverage of the agenda, at around
7 3.45 p.m., and we hope to wrap up about 5.00 p.m.

8 If needs be, we may defer defined questions and issues into subsequent
9 hearings that are there, essentially, as holding positions in both October and
10 November, if detail threaten to overwhelm us but we do need to speak further
11 about a matter before it's closed. So that's how we will deal with overruns that
12 might happen today, and similarly, if anything goes awfully wrong with the
13 technology and we find ourselves unable to proceed today, then we will deal
14 with that by opening up a new hearing day within the October or November
15 hearing windows, so those are our contingency arrangements.

16 Those are all of the introductory remarks that I wish to make. Now, being
17 conscious of the fact that this is the beginning of a fortnight of hearings, if there
18 is anybody with any remaining questions about how we're going to do business
19 for the remainder of this week or next week, including on the accompanied site
20 inspections, please do feel free to ask them now. No, that's good news, in which
21 case I'm going to move on to agenda item 2 which is very brief because we set
22 out the purpose for this hearing in the circulated agenda papers and it has not
23 changed, so unless anybody has any questions about the purpose of today's
24 hearing... And again, do I see any hands? No, I don't. Then there is nothing
25 more to do. We can move directly into the substance of today's agenda, so let
26 us turn to agenda item 3.

27 As you'll have gathered, what we intend to do is to move through the
28 project in the direction that the applicant moves through the project in its own
29 submissions and plans, so I had a real southern hemisphere moment because
30 we're starting at the bottom and moving northwards, not, as would often be the
31 case, of starting in the north and moving south, but here we are, trusting that the
32 water doesn't go down the plugholes the wrong way in Orsett.

33 Let us start agenda item 3 and the A2-M2 LTC intersection. Now, what
34 we wish the applicant to do is to explain the function of the proposed junction

1 and the route paths through it that can be taken by traffic, and I think with little
2 more ado here, it would help if the applicant can start by showing what they've
3 prepared and we can start to test it by asking questions about, 'How does one
4 proceed from here to here? How does that particular slip road work and why?'
5 with reference to the tool that has been put forward to enable us to ask those
6 questions. So can I ask for that to be introduced?

7 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir, and it'll Mr Gary Hodge, sir, previously introduced, the
8 highways technical lead, and he will start to – with the pack from this
9 intersection and it is on – in the examination library, as you've indicated already,
10 sir.

11 MR SMITH: Excellent, thank you very much. Anybody needing to refer to this, of
12 course, will be able to move to the examination library online and see this as
13 well. Okay, so A2-M2 LTC intersection, let's actually see what the model does.

14 MR HODGE: Hello, sir. Gary Hodge for the applicant. I'll just take you now through
15 the slide presentation we prepared for the A2-M2 LTC junction to show the
16 functionality of the junction and also the route pass through it. I'd just like to
17 explain before we start, it's in two sections. We've got the functionality with
18 this series of slides, and then we go on to the traffic movements.

19 The first thing I'd like to explain is that we've got three connection types,
20 which are strategic, major and local, and they've been shown in blue, green and
21 yellow, and what we've done is we've – where it's an existing route, we've
22 shown it dotted, and where it's a new route, it is solid. So I just go to the first
23 slide, which is the strategic connection.

24 MR SMITH: And to be clear here, this is then demonstrating the existing line of the A2
25 to M2 and M2 to A2.

26 MR HODGE: That's right. Sorry, sir, I'm just trying to get the pointer up so I could
27 show the path of the...

28 MR SMITH: Yeah. Oops, let's have another go.

29 MR HODGE: Sorry, sir, about that. Right, so the first slide will show the connection
30 from the M2 westbound as it travels through the A2-M2 corridor and joins the
31 LTC northbound. The next slide – the next link shows the Lower Thames
32 Crossing southbound and the reverse, and going through the A2 corridor, and
33 that's why it's dotted because it's an existing route. We then have the two
34 connections on the west side of the junction which connect to the A2 but they

1 aren't as priority movements as the ones that go from the A2 from – towards
2 London.

3 MR SMITH: And can we just check there that that representation that you show there is
4 summarising a smaller traffic movement anticipated?

5 MR HODGE: That's right, sir. The key movement through the junction is from Lower
6 Thames Crossing down through to the M2. We've still got the A2 coming
7 through, but the priority movement for that particular junction is that movement,
8 but we still do have the links back into the A2 towards London, both southbound
9 from the Lower Thames Crossing and eastbound from the A2, to northbound on
10 the Lower Thames Crossing.

11 MR SMITH: Now, in terms of taking our individual questions on this, I mean, we are
12 now into the specifics of individual movements modelled here. We can either
13 ask as we move through – and if that wouldn't disconcert you too much, I think
14 that would assist us – or alternatively, we can wait until you've presented the
15 grand picture. What would be your preference?

16 MR HODGE: I don't mind. However you'd like to do it.

17 MR SMITH: Okay. Well, in which case I will probably ask as we walk through, and we
18 essentially have a dialogue, conversation. In terms of certain representations
19 that have raised concerns about, essentially, the residual mainline capacity
20 between the A2 and the M2, and the M2 and the A2, is it your view that the
21 nature and the volume of traffic moving, essentially, southbound from the
22 proposed LTC and east on the M2, and indeed west on the M2 to northbound on
23 the LTC will be that the primary movement needs to be accommodated through
24 that intersection? And if I can just follow that up with a brief supplementary as
25 well, is there enough – in your design opinion capacity – to enable the existing
26 east-west movement along the A2-M2 corridor provided for in the design?

27 MR HODGE: Yes, so I think if I go to the next slide that will help explain that, but – so
28 if I go to – this is now the major connection, so we've left the two key links on,
29 as shown, but then if I actually introduce the – what we've done is we've created
30 two – a parallel connector road, we call it – it's a one way, two lane parallel
31 connector road which starts just to the west of the junction, and goes all the way
32 through to the M2 junction 1, and there's the same in the opposite direction.
33 Now, these are key routes because what they're doing is they're taking out the
34 strategic traffic from the traffic from the Lower Thames Crossing joining the

1 M2. So what's happening is you're not getting a weaving in a section – which
2 is vehicles changing lane – because they don't have to come on at a junction and
3 go off, so that's how we're getting the capacity through that particular section.

4 MR SMITH: Right, which then takes us to one of the matters that led to the request for
5 this hearing, this process, to understand, essentially, the operation and rationale
6 for what we have been referring to as the eastbound and westbound frontage
7 roads – you may be using different terminology – because we have noted that if,
8 for example, one is seeking to access the A289, as we understand it, one would
9 need to leave the eastbound A2 towards M2 at what is currently the Valley Drive
10 – what we would refer to as the Valley Drive intersection, and then proceed
11 along your green frontage route, and that that would in due time take you out at
12 a replacement to the slip to the A289. It would take you that entire journey, and
13 you would essentially be removed from the LTC intersection itself.

14 MR HODGE: That's absolutely correct. It starts after the Gravesend east junction, so
15 the diverge is just slightly to the east of the Gravesend east junction, because
16 we've had to take out the two east-facing slips because of the proximity of the
17 Lower Thames Crossing junction. So the two slip roads on the east side of the
18 Gravesend east junction have been removed, so what happens is you would go
19 through the Gravesend east junction and then you'd go on to the frontage road
20 which – the green route, and then – so you'd bypass the Lower Thames Crossing
21 junction as it comes into the M2-A2.

22 MR SMITH: And similarly, the same would be true westbound from the M2, that if one
23 was seeking, for example, to access Park Pale, or Darnley Lodge or Brewers
24 Road, one would be needing to exit – well, can you just pop the pointer on where
25 you would be needing to exit.

26 MR HODGE: Yes, so this is the westbound, and it comes back in to the A2 at that point
27 there.

28 MR SMITH: Yeah. Okay, so that then leaves the existing accessibility to the mainline
29 at Brewers Road completely transitioned into access to the eastbound or
30 westbound frontage road.

31 MR HODGE: What's happened with the Brewers Road junction is the eastbound, we've
32 kept the same connections, so you can come off or go, but you can only go on
33 to the connector road. You can't, obviously, go on to the central LTC A2-M2
34 route, and on the westbound carriageway, we've actually removed the

1 connections at the Brewers Road junction, but we've provided them slightly –
2 well, it's about a kilometre further to the west. Some of this will become clear
3 when we go through the paths, but –

4 MR SMITH: I will let – I think probably the best thing I can do is to let you now walk
5 us through those paths. I do know that at least two of my colleagues, I think,
6 have follow up questions on this, but walk us onwards and let's see where we
7 go.

8 MR HODGE: So this, the particular slide I've got up now has obviously demonstrated
9 the frontage road, and we go to the next slide. What we've got here are the local
10 connections, and with this the – again, they're shown in dotted where they're
11 existing and solid where they're new. The key link here is that, because we close
12 the east-facing slip, so at Gravesend east, we've had to put a two-way connector
13 road in, which is this – sorry, it's gone. A two-way connector road which is the
14 solid line that joins Henhurst Road – with the new roundabout on Henhurst Road
15 – to Brewers Road roundabout, so that is a two-way connector road which
16 provides the link from Gravesend east to the Brewers Road connection.

17 MR SMITH: Yeah. Just to be clear, I think the mouse is probably suffering a little bit
18 of lag, because it didn't quite get to where we expected at – or...

19 MR HODGE: So the two-way connection starts from this location here – is that...?

20 MR SMITH: No, that's not where your mouse is on screen, I'm afraid. You're in a field
21 south of High Speed 1 on our screen.

22 MR HODGE: Sorry.

23 MR SMITH: No, look, we fight the technology, but I think we know where we are. I
24 mean, Ms Laver, are you content that you know where the beginning of that
25 two-way section is? It's the solid gold or yellow alignment –

26 MR HODGE: Immediately above Henhurst...

27 MR SMITH: Immediately above Henhurst Road, and that's the start and it would run
28 through to –

29 MR HODGE: To the east, so it goes along Darnley Lodge Lane and it connects to the
30 Brewers Road junction.

31 MR SMITH: And that is also the road that would receive the turning movements out of
32 the Thong Lane green bridge.

33 MR HODGE: That's correct. Yes, sire.

34 MR SMITH: Yeah, okay. Right.

1 MR HODGE: So that's the only new link that we have on the – so that's a two-way link.

2 MR SMITH: Can I just ask one more supplementary about that that's certainly been
3 scratching my brain? That, therefore, is the rationale for the proposed
4 roundabout. If we look at the wording on the plan, there, at Gravesend east
5 junction, immediately to the north, there is a roundabout shown. The purpose
6 of that roundabout is to allow ingress to and egress from the southern frontage
7 road to the local road.

8 MR HODGE: That's correct, sir.

9 MR SMITH: Okay. Yeah.

10 MR HODGE: Right, shall I...?

11 MR SMITH: Yes, please do .

12 MR HODGE: So this particular slide is to show the key local links to LTC and the
13 A2-M2, so it's for local connections, so this is – from the bottom of Valley
14 Drive, we actually have a connection directly on to the Lower Thames Crossing
15 northbound. We also have a direct route through the junction on to the M2. This
16 goes on to the M2 and not on to the frontage road, sir. We then have a connection
17 from the connector road up to Lower Thames Crossing northbound. That is from
18 the connector road on – the eastbound connector road.

19 MR SMITH: And the rationale for that is that's attempting to provide the same local
20 connectivity if one was moving west from the east – as you have just provided
21 on that diagram – moving north or east from the west.

22 MR HODGE: Yeah, that would be serving the Strood and Rochester traffic coming on
23 to the connector road. Then there is the southbound link. Again, this is joining
24 the connector road, so again, it's going on to the connector road and not into the
25 M2. There are other connections into the M2 and the... So the last local link is
26 southbound on Lower Thames Crossing and that joins in to Gravesend east
27 junction, so there is a spur off that link which also goes back on to the A2, and
28 then we've also got a link from the connector road on to the local two-way road
29 on the south of the scheme. So again, if people were coming from, say, the
30 Wainscott by, A289, or Rochester, they could come off on that link to get to the
31 Gravesend east junction.

32 So now, I go to the traffic movements, so what we've done here is we've
33 actually identified those in purple. There is one alternative that we've got in
34 there that comes later in the slide pack, and if it has a variation or a change, it's

1 shown in red with the scheme, so there's an existing, and then there's a slide
2 that's got with schemes. So we'll just go to the first slide, so this is a part – what
3 we've done is we've actually – we put origin/destination points that we think
4 will represent the best routes to show the links through the junction. So the first
5 one is from – so it's going literally from the A2 to the M2 and then going back
6 again. This is obviously in the existing situation. Then we've got the same with
7 the scheme, and there is no change. That will just be straight through. Then we
8 go to the next one; this is from the A2 to the 289, so this will –

9 MR SMITH: You do seem to have a little bit of feedback. Turn off microphones for a
10 second. Ms Blake, you had your hand up briefly.

11 MS L BLAKE: Yeah, thank you, sir. Laura Blake, chair of Thames Crossing Action
12 Group. I'd just like to point out, there, that Gary mentioned that there'd be no
13 change on that route, but the number of lanes would change. I just thought that
14 relevant to point out.

15 MR SMITH: Yeah, I'm very – I am conscious of that and what I am going to do is once
16 the applicant has set out its stall is I'm going to provide an opportunity to move
17 round the room and seek submissions on all of this material, and my colleagues
18 also have unasked questions, so I think if I can just ask you to hang fire, Ms
19 Blake, we will come to you. Turn to the applicant.

20 MR HODGE: Thank you, sir, so yeah, this one's showing the A2 to the A289 and in the
21 opposite direction, so this will use the frontage road, so that's the current route
22 and going reverse is showing the reverse. Then with the scheme, this shows that
23 it will then – the red section is where it leaves the central road and then goes on
24 to the frontage road, and coming back, again, you can see it comes off and... So
25 if I go to the next slide, this is very similar. This is the route into Strood and
26 coming out again, and again it will use the two connector roads.

27 So the next one is from Valley Drive to the A289, so currently you can get
28 on at the Gravesend east junction with a slip road directly on to the A2 and along
29 the A2 and come off and go straight up to Wainscott bypass, and the reverse of
30 that, again, is you can come off at the slip roads because we've moved the slip
31 roads from the east side of this. What we now have to do is to – our proposal
32 shows that you use the two-way link road on the south side, and then re-join the
33 connector road on the north side at Brewers Road to get to the A289. Going the

1 opposite direction, you use the connector road and you come off at the
2 roundabout on the connector road, the two-way link road and then re-join.

3 This is a link from Valley Drive to Cobham, and I've shown this using the
4 A2 just so you see what the scheme impact is on this particular route, so again,
5 with the existing situation, you come along the A2 to Brentwood Road, come
6 down to the – sorry, Brewers Road, apologies, Brewers Road – and then you can
7 go down Halfpence Lane down to Cobham again, and then the reverse again,
8 because there's currently an access at Brewers Road, you can come along, use
9 the A2, come off. With the scheme, this route again is to use the two-way
10 connector road to access Cobham, and again, going back it's using the two-way
11 – so what we're doing is we're taking that traffic out of the A2-M2 links.

12 Shorne to Cobham, that uses the Brewers Road – well, Halfpence Lane
13 and Brewers Road into Shorne, and then the reverse of that is obviously the same
14 route. Going with the scheme, there is no change on this particular route. Then
15 Shorne to the M2, so if you're in Shorne, there is an option here that you could
16 go up to the A226 and come down the Wainscott bypass and then join the M2
17 eastbound. The reverse of that is to go back up to... You can also go down to
18 the A2 and you can connect here at this – at the junction with Brewers Road and
19 the A2-M2, you can get onto the M2, but we've actually – this is one of the
20 movements we have removed, so you can't do that anymore but coming back –
21 so that would be the route. If we go to – with the scheme, what you'll see is that
22 the route down the A226 is the same, but the route – if you were to go down to
23 the Brewers Road junction to get on to the A2, you'd have to use the connector
24 road, which doesn't connect to the M2, so you'd have to go around the
25 roundabout and come back down to get onto the M2 eastbound. And the route
26 the other direction is that you'd come along the M2 and come off at the two-way
27 connector road and come back on yourself if you were to take that route, so we
28 wanted to show what the options were on that particular link.

29 MR SMITH: In broad summary terms, that second route is not a particularly
30 well-favoured or feasible route, is it? I mean, you're effectively signalling that,
31 although it's somehow possible, that it's not desirable.

32 MR HODGE: No, that's right, sir. I mean, it does obviously depend where you're
33 starting from and where you're going to, so we have taken the middle of
34 Shorne... But if you're coming out of Shorne Country Park, that might be the

1 desired route that you would take. It does really depend on where you're starting
2 from and going to. So that concludes the A2-M2 traffic routes and the junction
3 functionality

4 MR SMITH: Okay, thank you very much. Well, what I'm going to do is – I think I will
5 proceed to my colleagues and just whether there are further in-principle
6 questions that they wish to ask and test on, and I think the best way through this
7 will then be to run to items (b) and (c) under this agenda and essentially allow
8 the applicant to have its case completely stated. And then we'll turn to the rest
9 of the room because otherwise, I think we'll just get into a kind of tennis game
10 of representations.

11 MR TAIT: They're very closely linked questions, clearly.

12 MR SMITH: Yes, they are.

13 MR TAIT: We thought that would also be the right way forward. Might we – sorry.

14 MR SMITH: If I can just briefly check around the room with the principally represented
15 parties. Is everybody content that we do this in that order? Yeah, excellent.
16 Sorry, Mr Tait.

17 MR TAIT: So I was going to ask Mr Roberts, and then – yes, good, Ms Donnelly's now
18 come forward to the front row –

19 MR SMITH: Good.

20 MR TAIT: – just to run through –

21 MR SMITH: Just, though, before you do, I just wanted to check on those movement
22 plans before they evaporate from our vision. I did know that Ms Laver had a
23 question, and I think – Mr Young, did you, or are you going to leave it?

24 MR YOUNG: No, I'll leave it.

25 MR SMITH: Wait. Okay. Ms Laver.

26 MS LAVER: Good morning. Janine Laver, panel member. I think it's slide 5. If I could
27 get slide 5 put back on. Slide 14 might do it as well.

28 MR HODGE: Certainly, ma'am.

29 MS LAVER: I'm struggling on the little ones down there – keep turning behind me. I'm
30 particularly interested in the routes that go to the A289 and to Strood, so from
31 west to east. Yeah, that one. Yeah, I'm less interested in the M2 at this point.
32 It's more the green – it's the path of the green that I'm interested in.

33 I suppose the query I have is, if you want to go to the A289, once the LTC
34 is in place, you've got to make your choice at Valley Drive. Is that correct?

1 MR HODGE: That's right, ma'am, yeah.

2 MS LAVER: And if you haven't made that choice, and you find yourself on the blue
3 route heading eastwards, and you're thinking, 'Oh, gosh, I don't want to go the
4 M2,' what's your option once you've made the wrong choice at Valley Drive if
5 you want to go out to the A289 or to Strood?

6 MR HODGE: If you've actually missed the link, you then get onto the M2, and you'd
7 then go down to junction 2 of the M2, and you could, at that point, turn around
8 and go back into Rochester.

9 MS LAVER: So, if you then got down, you had to go into Rochester, and you went, 'Oh,
10 gosh, I've totally made it wrong,' you've then got to come back up. Where do
11 you then have to come back up to to make that journey back up to the A289? I
12 need the pointer to take me through that.

13 MR HODGE: Yes, unfortunately, the M2 junction 2 is off the screen slightly, so if you
14 were going through and you miss this link at that point there –

15 MS LAVER: I can't see your mouse, unfortunately. Sorry.

16 MR HODGE: I'm sorry.

17 MS LAVER: Yeah, you're up at Valley Drive with your mouse pointer.

18 MR HODGE: Yes, I'm up at Valley Drive, so you're going where the green starts on the
19 western end, so you miss that point. You then go through the middle, and you
20 join the blue and go down the dotted blue, continue down dotted blue, continue
21 to junction 2 of the M2.

22 MS LAVER: So how far along is that? If you've missed Valley Drive, how far do you
23 have to drive to make the diversion?

24 MR HODGE: I don't know off the top of my head. The difference would be the distance
25 from the junction down to the M2 junction, back again, which looks to me to be
26 roughly about 2 kilometres.

27 MS LAVER: Okay, so once you've turned around, you've queued to come off at
28 junction 2 – there may not be a queue, so I don't want to surmise, but you've
29 come off at junction 2, you've got to spin around, but you still need the A289.
30 What route do you follow then when you're coming back up?

31 MR HODGE: So you'd then use the M2, and you'd come off the normal link that goes
32 around into the A289 from the M2, so you can get off at junction 1 of the M2. I
33 mean, this will be clearly signed, obviously, before you get to the junction.

34 MS LAVER: No, I realise that, but we all make mistakes, don't we.

1 MR HODGE: Absolutely.

2 MS LAVER: And that was just wanting to understand that path through there. Now, is
3 that the same then for Strood – because you’re showing a split for Strood roughly
4 where you’d come off at the A289, so that’s normally the route. You’d take the
5 green. You’d take the split there if you wanted Strood, but if you missed that,
6 again, you’re saying you’d come –

7 MR HODGE: The same, yes.

8 MS LAVER: You come down and spin back around. Okay, that’s very helpful. I think
9 that’s my question on that. If I could just get some clarity throughout the course
10 as to what that distance is that you’d have to travel, that would be really helpful.
11 Thank you.

12 MR HODGE: Thank you.

13 MS LAVER: The other question I have, and it may be picked up, but we were looking
14 at traffic movements. You’ve got this – with this new service road – it’s the
15 connector road. I think you mean the Darnley Lodge Lane. There’s a lot of
16 traffic being pushed onto Darnley Lodge Lane, so two-way, single lane. It’s
17 currently single-lane, but it’s pretty much a local road.

18 But because of the way that the road is designed, a lot of traffic’s being
19 forced onto that to make connections to other local roads. I wonder if we could
20 just have a look at that again. I just want to understand, from what’s current and
21 what’s proposed, how many different local movements have to use that
22 single-lane, each way road?

23 MR HODGE: Yes, ma’am. Can you see the spike on the screen now? Is that...?

24 MS LAVER: Yeah, that’s got – that’s right. That’s the yellow one.

25 MR HODGE: Yeah, so it’s the link from Penhurst Road roundabout through to Brewers
26 Road junction. It is obviously a traffic-related question, which I think we might
27 be doing tomorrow, but that does provide the link from the Gravesend east
28 junction to the Brewers Road, so any local traffic that was going to go from
29 Gravesend east to either the A289 or to Strood would go down this route because
30 they can’t get onto the connector road directly from Valley Drive. So they would
31 have to go through that route and then go across the main – go from south to
32 north, to Brewers Road, and then connect on to the connector road on the north
33 side, as we call it, to go to either the A289 or Strood, yes. So it would be pushing
34 traffic along that two-way link.

1 MS LAVER: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that. Thanks.

2 MR SMITH: Anything further from my colleagues? I mean, I have one that I'm just
3 going to leave hovering on the table because it may well be a matter that we pick
4 up as we move on through the remaining item B and C, and it may also
5 potentially be something that the Mr Young picks up tomorrow. But that is
6 visitation to the country park using the access from Brewers Road. I'm just
7 getting embedded in my mind the nature of the traffic movements, the traffic
8 moving to and fro the Shorne Wood Country Park into Brewers Road would take
9 under the proposed change if they need to move eastbound and/or westbound. I
10 mean, if that can quickly be shown, then good. Otherwise, we'll pick it up as
11 we move.

12 MR HODGE: So, if you're coming out of Shorne Wood Country Park and you wanted
13 to go onto the M2 eastbound, you'd have to come – in fact, I think it's most
14 probably – if I show the – there's a slide that shows – so this is the slide that
15 shows the existing – although this is from Shorne, where the Shorne Wood
16 Country Park is, down towards the A2. If I show with the scheme, so this would
17 be the route. So, if they want to go down to the M2 eastbound, they would start
18 at the Shorne Country Park, join the connector road, and then have to get the
19 A289 to the junction with A226, go around and come back on themselves to –

20 MR SMITH: And again, I'll leave this hovering in your mind, but it does raise somewhat
21 of a concern in terms of some of the site inspection work we've done already,
22 including to Shorne Woods, where we've seen moderately substantial visitation
23 on a sunny summer day in Shorne Woods, and wondering about the numbers of
24 vehicles that might actually end up – whether that's been taken full account of
25 in the modelling as well, and it may be something that gets picked up tomorrow
26 rather than running the detail of that today – but whether the sorts of traffic
27 volumes and movements that that might generate on a busy day at the park is
28 something that's been taken into account in that layout.

29 MR HODGE: Yes, sir, we can feed some of that information.

30 MR SMITH: It might be something best followed up in writing, but I think it would be
31 useful just to have a clear explanation of how that element of it might work.
32 Okay, let's move on, and let's deal with items B and C with principle
33 submissions from the applicant. Apologies, no. Ms Laver.

1 MS LAVER: Sorry, before we do move on, I just had one other query. If you find
2 yourself east or west, ending up on LTC, you don't want to be on LTC, what's
3 your option? And I ask because the route, you show Valley – but if you come
4 off Valley Drive and you end up taking the left slip and you end up going
5 towards the portal, do you have to then go through the portal across to county
6 boundaries, go up through the tunnel, pay a toll and come back?

7 MR HODGE: Yes, ma'am, you would have to.

8 MS LAVER: That's what I thought. Thank you.

9 MR SMITH: Okay, so if I can return to Mr Tait, we'll deal with the siting and land-take
10 and design mitigation matters.

11 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir. So I'm going to do this in sequence, first of all with
12 Mr Roberts dealing with the rationale and then with Ms Donnelly dealing with
13 some of the design thinking and practicalities. So, in relation to this, there are
14 one or two slides that we were intending to put up from the existing material,
15 just to –

16 MR SMITH: Anything from existing material is absolutely fine. We only had an issue
17 in terms of needing to put in matters that were, in principle, new, which dealt
18 with those previous slides.

19 MR TAIT: So there are one or two slides. In each case, they have the APP number
20 written on it, so one can see readily the source.

21 MR SMITH: Good. And anybody following along, best thing to do is to actually look
22 that APP number up in the examination library and actually bring it up on your
23 own screen as well. Can I ask that phones are put to silent, please? All phones
24 to silent, please. Apologies. Thank you. I'll go to Mr Tait again and, hopefully,
25 you will get a good run at this now, Mr Tait.

26 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir. So, starting with Mr Roberts, please.

27 MR ROBERTS: Good morning, sir, panel. My name is Steve Roberts. I'll be speaking
28 on behalf of the applicant. So, as Mr Tait said, I shall be covering item 3(b) of
29 the agenda, siting and land take, and then dovetail with my colleague,
30 Ms Donnelly, to my left here, who'll be taking part (c) of the agenda.

31 It's very difficult to distil down into a short period of time, seven years of
32 –

33 MR SMITH: I know.

1 MR ROBERTS: – work we’ve done on Lower Thames Crossing. Just to say, we believe
2 we have a very highly evolved design, which has, as I say, progressed over a
3 number of years. It’s been led by a detailed understanding of local context and
4 site constraints. And importantly, it’s been informed through thorough
5 engagement with the stakeholders and, indeed, members of the public at
6 consultation events, so there’s lots we could say.

7 But I’d just like to point interested parties and panel to the project design
8 report, which covers a lot of what we’ve been talking about today. In particular,
9 the project design report, part G, which is application document 514, and that
10 gives the design evolution story as a whole and that goes to all junctions.

11 So, turning to the question of siting and land take, I’m just going to be
12 supported whilst I talk to this junction with the slide on the screen, which is an
13 extract from part D of the project design report, application document 509. So,
14 in terms of siting and land take for this junction, this was dependent on three
15 main factors.

16 And if I may spend just a little bit of time unpacking them here because
17 they apply to all three junctions and so it will save time later reiterating the same
18 points, so the three main factors are, firstly, seeking to maximise the scheme
19 benefits by providing appropriate connections to the existing strategic road
20 network and where appropriate local network, with regard to capacity to
21 accommodate the forecast traffic flow. So we’ve already started to talk about
22 some of that this morning and the connectivity choices that we’ve made.

23 Secondly, the second factor is taking account of the existing site
24 constraints. So these include minimising environmental impact, including those
25 impacts on communities, land and property; minimising impacts on physical
26 constraints, which include local road network, railways, water courses, and
27 utilities working with the existing site topography and existing ground
28 conditions.

29 Third point, in terms of siting of junction and land take, is design to ensure
30 operational safety, so this is really adherence to the relevant standards and, in
31 that case, that means the design manual for roads and bridges, which is the
32 governing standard for trunk roads in the UK.

33 And it’s important that the adherence to the standards are consistent and
34 commensurate with the type of road that we’re seeking to build. So, in our case,

1 we're seeking all-purpose trunk road, and so there are certain standards which
2 apply to the highway geometry, in particular, and the suitable junction designs
3 in terms of spacing and the merging and weaving between those junctions, which
4 dictate to some extent the land take that we then have.

5 MR SMITH: Can I just test something there? I mean, obviously, you'll need to have
6 appropriate and safe spacings between intersections. It is a key spatial driver,
7 the other being the degree to which you agree that it's functionally necessary to
8 interconnect a whole set of routes, and we've just been walked through that.

9 I mean, there is a residual question if you're looking at a constrained land
10 environment, which is whether it was ever in reasonable prospect to decide that
11 there were – to deliver a safely functioning intersection, there were certain routes
12 that would not be served, so you end up with a limited functional intersection to
13 a degree, because one of the things we've been working with, thinking our way
14 through the design of these, is looking at the degree to which they do broadly
15 provide, in most cases, most points to most points. They are quite flexibly
16 designed – well, very flexibly designed intersections, and whether there had
17 been thought given at any point to the balance to be struck between land take
18 and the impact on surrounding residential communities and the surrounding
19 environment by actually reducing that flexibility to some extent, and what was
20 the price one paid by doing that?

21 MR ROBERTS: So it's about striking a balance, so the connectivity that we've chosen
22 to include in the scheme directly correlates to the scheme benefits that might
23 accrue. It's true to say that, for the A2-M2 Lower Thames Crossing intersection,
24 we're providing an all-movements junction, but that's not the case at the A13-
25 A1089 junction, where we've been more selective because, in providing all
26 movements, there's obviously a price to pay in terms of impact on existing
27 constraints, so we're always balancing, weighing up connectivity versus the
28 impact on constraints, essentially.

29 MR SMITH: Okay. And it's your submission that you've struck that right balance and
30 that, in your view, if you start, on this intersection, filleting away connectivities
31 in the interests of reducing the land take and/or increasing the separation
32 between the intersection and key receptors, that you quite rapidly start to deliver
33 an unacceptable benefits outcome. I'm summarising a lot of material here, but
34 is that your broad submission?

1 MR ROBERTS: Yes. And so, I think this particular junction, it's more clear cut; there
2 are fewer choices to be made in terms of the trade-off between connectivity and
3 impacts. The A13 junction, there's more balance to be struck, so we'll perhaps
4 have that discussion when we reach it at item 4, the agenda. But certainly, at
5 this particular junction, I'm going to go on to say that the key movement, as
6 Mr Hodge has already outlined, is intercepting the traffic from the east, from M2
7 on to Lower Thames Crossing, and vice versa.

8 But it's also beneficial to have west-facing connections because they not
9 only serve some of the strategic traffic that may wish to use Lower Thames
10 Crossing rather than travel to Dartford across the Thames. But it also provides
11 that local connectivity that we talked about, Mr Hodge talked about, and your
12 questions followed up. So, yeah, it's a balance, but not always strategic –
13 sometimes local connections as well providing the opportunity for local people
14 to join the scheme. Shall I move on?

15 MR SMITH: By all means, yeah.

16 MR ROBERTS: So, having set out those three key constraints, if you like, if I take each
17 one in turn in terms of the site specifics of the A2-M2 junction, I've just
18 mentioned the predominant movement to the east and up the M2 to Lower
19 Thames Crossing and vice versa. To maximise the benefits of the junction, not
20 only are we seeking to provide all connections at the A2-M2, but we're also
21 seeking to provide free-flow links. That is to allow movement through the
22 junction from A to B without stopping. Again, that assists with journey times
23 and maximises scheme benefits.

24 Turning to some of the key constraints in this area, in the vicinity of the
25 A2-M2 Lower Thames Crossing junction, we have various environmental
26 constraints, including Shorne and Ashenbank Woods SSSI, Kent Downs AONB;
27 Claylane ancient woodland, which is to the south and west – sorry, west of the
28 junction; Shorne Country Park, and the junction is also relatively close to the
29 settlement of Thong, Riverview Park and Shorne, including the conservation
30 areas of both Thong and Shorne, so quite a few constraints in that bracket.

31 Turning to some of the physical constraints in this area, the site is bounded
32 on the southern side, along the east-west axis, by High Speed 1 railway, which
33 is a significant constraint, and it would obviously be prohibitively complex to
34 realign and move HS1 to create space for our junction. Equally, it would be

1 complex to construct above or below High Speed 1, so we've taken it as a
2 constraint position, a junction clear to the north of HS1.

3 Other physical constraints in this area include significant utilities,
4 including overhead high-voltage power lines. The topography in this area – I'd
5 just like to make a quick point about the topography in relation to the A2 corridor
6 and where the siting of the junction actually aligns quite well with a low point
7 in the topography, and where the junction sits is approximately 40 metres lower
8 than Brewers Road to the east. So, when you see it on site, you'll see that there
9 is a natural dip, and that helps in mitigating the vertical extents of the junction.

10 Thirdly, and finally, the operational requirements. As I said earlier, for an
11 all-purpose trunk road there, the requirements are fairly onerous, and the
12 standards require the need to have significant separation between junctions to
13 achieve merging and weaving links, so this is why it's important, where
14 Mr Hodges set out earlier, the strategy of creating these parallel frontage roads,
15 as you call them, allowed us to separate strategic traffic that was using the
16 A2-M2 from the local traffic that currently has to access the A2-M2 to progress
17 east/west to make local connections. So we're separating out those movements,
18 which is a safer operational layout.

19 MR SMITH: And can I just test at this point, very briefly, the question around the
20 maintenance of running speeds at a major and complex intersection, which I
21 suspect also underlies various of the concerns that certain other representations
22 have raised, which are that, if you've brought out that separation, then the main
23 line is no longer experiencing the same extent of lane change and preparation
24 for manoeuvre, and so, at least theoretically, the main line should continue to
25 run more often at an expected normal running speed.

26 MR ROBERTS: That's correct, sir, and that's perhaps a matter that my traffic colleagues
27 could add to tomorrow.

28 MR SMITH: Yes. I mean, that's pushing a little into –

29 PARTICIPANT: I'm not sure planning can discuss this junction in any detail tomorrow.
30 It's not on the agenda, so [inaudible].

31 MR SMITH: We better get it out today or followed up in writing. Well, look, take that
32 on notice in writing – I think is the best way to deal with it – because I think it
33 would assist us to understand your view about – it's essentially the design
34 running speed of the intersection and your view as to whether or not the design

1 was proposed sustains that, or whether there would be still some anticipated
2 issues that might lead to congestion.

3 MR ROBERTS: Thank you. Yes, we'll take that action, sir. So that concludes the points
4 I wanted to make on siting and land take. If I perhaps just move to – so it
5 concludes the point on part 1 of site and land take. Part 2, the question about the
6 relationship between the junction and the settlements at Thong, Riverview Park
7 and Shorne, if I may just touch on that.

8 MR SMITH: Can I just bring in Ms Laver? Apologies. Ms Laver.

9 MS LAVER: Thank you. I just had a question. On the screen, you're showing what is
10 a snap from one of your reports. But within the report itself, it's got a key and
11 some numbers. And for those who aren't south of the river, they're trying to
12 follow where Shorne is, Claylane Wood. And yet, on your – the same slide in
13 the actual APP-509, it's got a key. It's a little difficult, I think, for people who
14 don't know the geography of this bit of the south, particularly for those from the
15 north of it. Just following the discussion, I just wondered if there were meant to
16 be some little numbers and a key on this slide.

17 MR ROBERTS: Yes, of course. Perhaps I'll just explain, so we lifted the image from
18 the project design report to show on the screen because the numbers were, on
19 some of these, perhaps a distraction for a presentation mode, but further details
20 are in the project design report, including the key, as you rightly say. And
21 perhaps my colleague, Ms Donnelly, when she goes through her part of the
22 presentation, can point these features out better than I have.

23 MS LAVER: Thanks. I just wanted to make sure you weren't meant to have clicked
24 something to show the key.

25 MR SMITH: Yeah, okay. Please continue.

26 MR ROBERTS: Okay, so just to finalise this point about the relationship of the junction
27 with the settlements of Thong, Riverview Park and Shorne, as I think I said at
28 issue-specific hearing 1, we were seeking to basically strike a balance, the
29 impact on these communities, by aligning the Lower Thames Crossing to be
30 broadly equidistant between these two communities.

31 We also sought to use the existing topography to our advantage in this
32 location because, as we progress north, the road ramps down towards the
33 southern tunnel portal, so the roads – the link between the junction and the
34 southern tunnel portal is mostly in-cutting, in most places in quite a deep cutting,

1 and this vertical separation helps to mitigate the impacts of the junction and
2 Lower Thames Crossing on the nearby communities. And that concludes my
3 point, sir, on that.

4 MR SMITH: What I'm going to suggest, this is 11.30, almost precisely. I think the best
5 thing to do is to have item C proceed immediately after the break, so we'll break
6 now for 15 minutes. Can we return at 11.45? It's a little shorter than 15 minutes,
7 but I think we need to keep to target. Ladies and gentlemen, we will resume
8 then, and the applicant will complete their in-principle submissions on this item,
9 and then we'll move to other parties. Thank you very much, ladies and
10 gentlemen.

11

12 **(Meeting adjourned)**

13

14 MR SMITH: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. It is now 11.45, so if we can retake
15 our seats. Can I have a signal from the rear of the room when we're ready to
16 resume, and I do, so we are back in session. And we are returning on agenda
17 item 3 to 3C, design mitigation and the principle submissions from the
18 applicant.

19 MR TAIT: Sir, so this is Clare Donnelly, the project architect and design advisor. Could
20 I just mention one matter? I indicated that all the slides will have the APP
21 numbers on. I think this sequence don't but they have the source, and they have
22 the, in particular, National Highways numbering, so we will add further the APP
23 number before we submit.

24 MR SMITH: That will be much appreciated, and then they can come in at the written
25 submission deadline 4 with the APP numbers on them. Perfect. Ms Donnelly.

26 MS DONNELLY: Okay. Clare Donnelly for the applicant. Each junction is complex,
27 and the place-based design choices and mitigations are many and various.
28 Through a long and peer-reviewed process, informed by stakeholder and
29 community consultation, we've developed proposals which we believe
30 substantially mitigate the scheme and comply with both National Highways and
31 NIC principles of good design. These measures are described in our project
32 design report, which is APP number 506 to 515, and secure through the design
33 principles, which were recently revised under REP-3110[?].

1 They are too numerous to describe in detail, so we would like, with
2 permission of the inspectors, to describe some examples of how the design and
3 mitigation has evolved over the course of design development, with reference
4 from some visual material contained with our application, to demonstrate our
5 response to this question.

6 First of all, what you can see on slide there is an extract from our design
7 report, project design report, which describes our narrative. All strategies for
8 design have been developed with regards to a detailed understanding of the
9 landscape character areas through which the road passes. These were defined
10 by the design team as part of our design narrative, which was begun in 2018 and
11 subsequently developed to shape our mitigation design choices.

12 Based on this understanding, we have identified the constraints and
13 opportunities at each location and strategies for the potential integration of the
14 road infrastructure into that location. For example, this analysis led to a
15 project-wide strategy whereby tree planting is used at the junction as we found
16 that this was contextually appropriate in each location. This has the benefit of
17 visually screening the junctions while also narrowing the field of view of the
18 driver as they navigate the complex weaves and turns within the junctions.

19 We're going to be structuring our answer today to deal with design
20 mitigation first, by which we mean how we've shaped the engineering elements
21 and layout to respond to the site-specific considerations. And then we will move
22 on to mitigation design, which is how we have designed mitigation areas to be
23 multifunctional and balance the needs and different impacts of the scheme, and
24 also meet different requirements with different design disciplines and
25 stakeholders. Okay, so next slide.

26 Okay, so this is the site of the A2 junction. I'm going to point to some
27 elements. Hopefully, you can see my curve and stuff through here.

28 MR SMITH: Yeah.

29 MS DONNELLY: This is an image looking north towards the Thames in the distance,
30 and you can see HS1 along the bottom of the image here with the existing
31 M2-A2 corridor. The junction sits within the villages, which is just off-screen
32 to the west, Thong, which you can see here and, Gravesend east. As we noted,
33 it sits in a shallow point. You can just about make out in this image how the

1 ground rises towards these wooded hilltops around Brummel Hill Woods and
2 Shorne Woods Country Park.

3 There are pockets of woodland surrounding the site, so not only at Shorne
4 Country Park and Brummel Hill Woods, but also a pocket of ancient woodland
5 at Claylane, just here to the west of the site. There are a number of utilities
6 diversions required around this junction, some that you cannot see, such as the
7 gas pipelines that need to be diverted, and some that you can, most prominently,
8 a line of pylons that pass through the site.

9 If I then take you through to our design as it was at statutory consultation,
10 this is our first iteration of the design as we developed it. You'll notice that the
11 design is flat as it did not yet include the link and the new link eastbound from
12 Valley Drive through the junction, and it was kept low but relatively spaced out.
13 You can see that there were large pockets of trees within the junction and a large
14 drainage pond just to the west here.

15 Through the development that we've described and the stakeholder
16 feedback, which requested the additional link through the junction, we
17 developed these proposals as we went forward into supplementary consultation.
18 This is the process as they appeared on supplementary consultation, and you can
19 see that the new link is now included through the junction.

20 This had the benefit – sorry, we have tightened up, as you can see – and
21 I'm going to flick through back and forth a little bit – we've tightened up the
22 location of the slip roads and tried to pull those slip roads away from the most
23 immediately affected receptors at Thong, for example. So, if I go back, you can
24 see how we've pulled away in this particular area.

25 However, the inclusion of this link through here did mean that the height
26 of the junction did increase relative to those properties. Therefore, we sought
27 out new mitigations, for example, the inclusion of a four-metre false cut along
28 this edge, which would be planted with trees to screen the works. We also had
29 to make additional provisions as this new link then cleared the bottom of the
30 ancient woodland pocket at Claylane Wood.

31 Compensatory planting was provided elsewhere around the scheme, and
32 we broke down operational elements of the scheme, such as the ponds, so instead
33 of having one large pond in this location, we broke it down and located those
34 throughout the junction to try and bring that footprint in further.

1 If I was to go back to statutory consultation now and just talk a little bit
2 about the mitigation design, we received advice from the Defra families about
3 the scale and type of mitigation that we should be producing, both prior and
4 during statutory consultation. The things that they asked us to look at were
5 potential woodland links linking up the pockets of woodland in and around the
6 junction via a green bridge, and so you will see that, at statutory consultation,
7 our strategies of extensive tree planting around the junction and linking those
8 up, east-west across the alignment, were already in place.

9 However, as we developed our proposals and we were speaking with
10 stakeholders, particularly as regards to cultural heritage, we noted that this
11 actually materially affected the setting of the village of Thong, which is in an
12 open grassland setting at the moment. Therefore, as we move forward into
13 supplementary consultation, we revised our proposal to provide a woodland
14 edge to Gravesend, but to try and keep some of the open character that was
15 developed to maintain the setting of that village as it is viewed across the
16 junction.

17 Further mitigation – this approach was further refined as we went forward
18 into DCO planning, as we felt – as some of our stakeholders felt that that
19 woodland connection was not strong enough. And therefore, the area of planting
20 here was increased, along with the fringe planting – so I’m just flicking again
21 through here – to try and get the correct balance and mitigation of our impact
22 through our design.

23 You will also note that additional compensatory planting was planted in
24 this area up here, and also note the pound location when I’m not on this slide.
25 We strengthened that with more pockets of woodland compensation in this area
26 to have that better and stronger woodland link in and around the junction. And
27 the ponds here were moved from a location – moved up the hill in response to
28 archaeological investigations that had highlighted Mesolithic finds in that
29 particular area. That concludes our examples of how we believe we’ve mitigated
30 the design and impact of the junction and how we’ve complied with the
31 requirements of the national policy statement.

32 MR SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, can I just check whether there are any
33 further in-principle questions from the examining authority before we introduce
34 interested parties on this whole agenda item? No. In which case, can I just see

1 indications of those who wish to speak on this item? I am noting that each of
2 the councils will, so I will go to the local authorities first, then statutory parties
3 and the parish councils, and I do see TCAG, so I will come to TCAG at the end.

4 In terms then of moving through the councils, what I'm going to suggest
5 we do is, if we hear from the two county councils first, and then I'll go to
6 Thurrock, etc, in that. So would it be possible for Kent County Council to make
7 a start on this?

8 MR RATCLIFFE: Thank you, sir. Joseph Ratcliffe for Kent County Council. Yeah,
9 just start by saying that Kent County Council supports the Lower Thames
10 Crossing, so everything we say is in that context of overall support for the
11 scheme.

12 I mean, we've had many discussions with the applicant over the years,
13 from Mr Hodge over the design, and seen it change quite a lot from the early
14 days through to some tweaks towards the end and what we finally have now. I
15 mean, an overall observation, it does everything from a strategic point of view
16 and maintains local connectivity, albeit some of those local connections are
17 made more convoluted, as we saw from the Shorne Woods example. That would
18 be our main concern, was access into and out of the country park and that
19 convoluted access.

20 I would just like to correct one of the responses to the questions from
21 Ms Laver in the questioning, in that if you were to need to turn around at M2
22 junction 2 and backtrack, you cannot join the A2 eastbound into Strood. That
23 connection doesn't exist. You would simply use where you've got off at M2
24 junction 2 to take the A228 into Strood. That would be the logical way. You
25 wouldn't backtrack and come in. You just can't make that connection now as it
26 exists, so that was just a minor correction on that point.

27 But, yeah, I mean I do agree that the choice of route as early as the
28 Gravesend east junction, for whether you are going on the M2 or the 289, is very
29 early in that process to make that choice. And if you get it wrong, you do need
30 to divert. And so that'd be our concern from a strategic movement point of view,
31 as is the reduction in lanes, and I think one of the other groups had already
32 mentioned that, the two lanes as you go through on the M2 mainline.

33 We do have some concerns around the traffic and some of the capacity
34 issues, some of the queue lengths, especially on the local connections. But we're

1 having discussions with National Highways and their modelling team. I'm not
2 entirely sure if that is for today's agenda or for tomorrow, or maybe we follow
3 it up with some more detailed responses in writing, perhaps, on the detail of that.

4 What is key, of course, is that the monitoring and management plan is
5 robust to deal with these issues, with changes and, potentially, issues on our
6 network around those junctions. And we have significant concerns about that
7 plan. Again, probably not one for today.

8 Any, obviously, changes to our network at the junction arms will need to
9 be agreed at detailed design with our highway agreements team, through the
10 usual process that we have for any National Highways scheme that changes our
11 network.

12 Just finishing off a final point on the land take issues. Obviously, to
13 accommodate the junction, there is land take of Shorne Wood Country Park,
14 which is KCC's flagship country park. We have again worked with the applicant
15 over the years to reduce that land take. We are still waiting for confirmation, I
16 think, on the precise distance of the strip of land, between the A2 into our
17 country park, that you need, and the number of trees that will be lost, to check
18 that the compensatory planting is sufficient for that. Again, I think that's more
19 for Friday's agenda, but yeah, I think that that's everything that I wanted to say
20 on the issue.

21 MR SMITH: Okay. Can I just check on two points there? Firstly, in relation to the
22 ongoing operation of the Shorne Woods Country Park, which I understand – it
23 is your facility. I mean, it would certainly be very useful if the current state of
24 your conversations with the applicant is reflected in a written submission at
25 deadline 4, because what we want to understand is the degree to which you have
26 residual concerns about the usefulness of access to that facility, and the nature
27 that demands to access that facility, the expression of that demand on the local
28 highway network might have, looking at the potentially somewhat convoluted
29 route necessary to access it, and potential for delays and slightly odd turning
30 movements etc. So we're interested in that.

31 Turning back to this 'two lanes on the main line' point. I mean, it has
32 been one that's been raised by a considerable number of parties. Checking with
33 you, and again, you may want to come back to us in writing on this rather than
34 give an off the hoof response today, but we've received an explanation from the

1 applicant that talks about, essentially, the segregation of local, regional and
2 strategic network traffic through the intersections so that hopefully the needs of
3 all conceivable traffic movements are being met, and the effect of that ought be
4 that there is not additional congestion as a result of that change, notionally, but
5 again, we would be very interested in any finalisation of your view, having heard
6 the points that the applicant has put today.

7 MR YOUNG: Just adding to what Mr Smith said there, Kent, I'm not aware that you
8 have done any analysis of journey time through that junction. Now, you'll be
9 aware the transport assessment has looked at that, as table 7.11 onwards, and
10 there, that shows in the assessment scenario reductions in journey time along
11 that A2/M2 corridor. Have you presented any alternative assessment on journey
12 times, or are you planning to do that?

13 MR RATCLIFFE: Yeah. No, we have not. Sorry, Joseph Ratcliffe for Kent County
14 Council. No, we have not done any alternative assessments of anything on the
15 strategic road network. Our local impact report sets out our analysis of National
16 Highways' transport assessment, plus our own work looking at the wider
17 network impacts, but we have focused on KCC's local road network and the
18 knock-on effects, rather than the M2 itself.

19 MR YOUNG: So what are your concerns about the M2? What evidence is that based on?

20 MR RATCLIFFE: Well, as set out in our local impact reports, there are capacity
21 restrictions as you move through those junctions. We did have a discussion with
22 National Highways just a couple of days ago about the use of volume over
23 capacity versus other measures. So I think it'd be best if we submitted
24 something in writing which clarified our position on that, rather than, perhaps,
25 making an incorrect statement at this stage.

26 MR SMITH: Yeah.

27 MR RATCLIFFE: Yeah. If I could just come back on some of the other points that you
28 raised around Shorne Woods, I should have also said: yes, as well as the access
29 issues, both once the scheme's operational but also during construction, will
30 have an impact on the financial viability of that site. Again, possibly, one for
31 Friday's hearing, and the need for financial compensation over what is a viable
32 business, both in terms the educational provision, the café, the car parking, and
33 the general amenity value for the area. Yeah, I think that was everything. Thank
34 you.

1 MR SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, I'm very conscious that we're
2 currently firmly in the territory of south of the river and Kent, and the Kent
3 authorities. Did Essex County have anything that you wanted to say on this
4 agenda item?

5 MR MACDONNELL: Gary MacDonnell, Essex County Council. No.

6 MR SMITH: Okay. Excellent. Well, in which case, I will then move to Gravesham
7 Borough, and we'll stay south of the river.

8 MR BEDFORD: Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Gravesham Borough Council. So
9 just as an introductory remark, I make the point, obviously as you've understood
10 from our local impact report, that unlike Kent County Council, we are not
11 currently in a position of support for the project. We're in a position of objection
12 to the project. So I don't, obviously, rehearse that or the reasons for it, but that's
13 the context.

14 Having said that, we recognise, obviously, the subject matter of this issue-
15 specific hearing has, as it were, moved on from that, and so we're dealing with
16 the issues on the design as set out in the agenda. So our first point to note is that
17 whilst, obviously, we welcome the visual representation material that has been
18 presented today, which, I think, was uploaded possibly sometime late yesterday
19 – so we haven't digested that, and if you don't mind, we will, I think, reserve to
20 our written post-hearing submissions any detailed comments we want to make
21 on –

22 MR SMITH: Mr Bedford, I think you make a very, very important point here. We are
23 very conscious that this process is moving fast, and what I would therefore
24 extend to any party making oral representations here, so that we don't have to
25 go back over it, is an invitation to provide their reflections, having absorbed that
26 material that has now been uploaded, by deadline 4, and that is just as weighty
27 as anything that will be said in this room.

28 MR BEDFORD: Thank you, sir. I'm grateful for that, and that's, as I say, the way we
29 were intending to deal with that, in terms of any points of detail.

30 There is a slightly wider point on visual material. We did notice,
31 obviously, procedural decision 37, but until we saw what had been presented,
32 we weren't quite clear as to the ambit of your request. We, as you will have
33 seen from our earlier representations, have urged the applicant to provide more
34 information, particularly by way of 3D modelling, to enable us to understand

1 more clearly not only what you might say are the operational effects for users of
2 the scheme, but also to understand, in terms of environment impacts, issues as
3 to how the scheme actually will physically appear, and whilst we've already
4 made that request, which has not so far received any positive reaction from the
5 applicant. So we do just reiterate the point.

6 The applicant, obviously, has presented and has available to it, a
7 computerised, virtual representation of the scheme in its physical context, which
8 it's able to interrogate, as it were, at its own leisure or preference to produce the
9 still images, which appear in the visual material that the applicant has chosen to
10 present. The applicant has also produced a fly-through, which is obviously not
11 static, but which, as it were, a bird's eye level, and again, as it were, the location
12 of the bird is chosen by the applicant, and it moves through different parts of the
13 scheme, but what we would certainly request is: is there any reason why other
14 parties can't have access to that computer modelling, which presumably exists,
15 so that we can interrogate it?

16 Because there are, for example, ground-level locations where we would
17 want a better understanding of, 'Well, what does it look like? How is this going
18 to impact on either communities, landscape, or cultural heritage, matters of that
19 nature?' And so as to understand those issues, as I say, we rather wondered why
20 that can't be made available to us, given that, presumably, the computer software
21 programme exists. So that was a second point. Obviously, I don't expect the
22 examining authority to respond to that, but it would be helpful if the applicant
23 could tell us why that can't be done.

24 Then turning more specifically to the issues raised in the presentations that
25 we've heard this morning. Essentially, we note, that the A2/M2 Lower Thames
26 Crossing intersection is a complex junction for the various reasons that have
27 been explained, but we would want to stress to the examining authority that it's
28 certainly of great importance to Gravesham Borough Council, not, as it were, to
29 lose any of the connections that are provided by that complex junction, because
30 were that to happen, effectively, we see that being as a disbenefit to Gravesham
31 residents.

32 We think there are disbenefits to the scheme, but clearly, what we don't
33 want to do is compound those disbenefits by, as it were, removing local
34 connections and local connectivity, particularly noting that the A2, albeit being

1 part of the strategic road network, serves as a very important local road
2 connection.

3 MR SMITH: Mr Bedford, I mean, that was a key question that, through you, I was
4 intending to ask your client, and given that you've taken us straight there, we
5 might as well just finish it off. One of the trade-offs, essentially, in our mind
6 around the possible relationship between the scheme benefits and performance
7 overall, as against the management of specific risks and harms emerging from
8 it, was – you probably saw the thrust of my question to the applicant on this
9 point – the degree to which some measure of incompleteness in the connectivity
10 of the intersection might provide the benefits of better managing or mitigating
11 adverse effects, and/or reducing land take, but I take your submission as a very
12 clear one, that, 'Please do not...'

13 MR BEDFORD: Absolutely, sir. We did, actually, make that point, I think in our issue-
14 specific one submissions as well.

15 MR SMITH: You did.

16 MR BEDFORD: So I just reiterate that point.

17 MR SMITH: It's an all or nothing position, isn't it? 'This thing were better not built.
18 However, if it were built, you want it to work well for your residents.'

19 MR BEDFORD: Absolutely, and we certainly don't want to see, as I say, the ability of
20 local residents to make movements through the junction in any way impeded.

21 So then moving on to the next concern, what we do want to ensure, noting
22 that it's a complex junction, is that it's both safe and convenient to use – and we
23 obviously recognise we are not a highway authority, so we note that point – but
24 nonetheless, what we are concerned about is that, in simplistic terms, two
25 categories of users of this complex junction.

26 There will be those who are, essentially, regulars, who become familiar
27 with the junction and its, as it were, pros and cons, and for some of those, given,
28 particularly, the restrictions on, as it were, some of the journeys that can be made
29 and some of the consequences, some may choose to avoid the junction because
30 of its complexities, and we don't want to see overspill onto local roads by those
31 people.

32 There will be others, the less regular or infrequent users, who may be
33 confused by the junctions and this partly relates to Ms Laver's point about, 'Well
34 what happens if...', because however the signage strategy is, 'you get yourself

1 into the wrong lane, you can't get into the right lane, and you end up, as it were,
2 being taken around the houses, before you can get back to where you want to
3 get to? And what are the implications of that?' Again, for the way that the
4 junction works, as I say, we don't want to see this complex junction, as it were,
5 be perceived by those who are familiar with it, as it were, as either an accident
6 location or as a congestion location, which causes them, as I say, to find
7 alternative routes, which would involve using the local road network.

8 So that's the concern. Maybe it moves more into agenda item 7, as how
9 you deal with it, but at the moment, we do have a concern that the design
10 principles don't really appear to include that usability factor as a design
11 principle, and we will come on to agenda item 7 in due course, but we are also
12 concerned to ensure that we have, as the relevant host local planning authority –
13 we have a proper say in the finalisation of that design, so that we can be satisfied
14 that it works, as it were, for movements in a way that doesn't have disbenefits
15 to the local communities.

16 Then, sir, I think the last point to make is simply that we would agree with
17 the remarks made by the Kent County Council on the importance of monitoring
18 and management during operation, and we don't think, at the moment, the
19 arrangements are satisfactory.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you. Those are very clear submissions. Can I just check with my
21 colleagues whether there's anything else? I rudely interrupted you, Mr Bedford,
22 but I think we got to the core of the point that you were making. Looking then
23 at the geography of this and the fact that we are south of the river, can I just
24 briefly check whether either of London Borough of Havering or Thurrock wish
25 to submit on this point at all? In which case – I'm saying nods of 'no' – we will
26 then move to the two parish councils who are, I believe, both distinctly Kent
27 entities. So can I ask for Ms Lindley first, from Shorne Parish Council if there's
28 anything that you want to put on this?

29 MS LINDLEY: Thank you very much, sir. I won't dwell on this at this point, because
30 clearly, some of these things are better put in writing, but there are two points I
31 want to make. The first is that some of the slides that were presented from
32 AS145 are not correct. There's only limited trips presented where there are some
33 other trips which would be more difficult, or cause more rat running, etc.

1 I especially comment on slide 23, which is supposed to be the routes taken
2 by Shorne residents, and that suggests that the principal route that people would
3 take would be to head north to join the M2. That is just not correct. The
4 principal route, actually, is to go south past Country Park, and turn that way.
5 Whereas in the future, yes, people probably wouldn't do that, because it doesn't
6 pass the 'Are you in your right mind?' test to actually take that route. It would
7 be better to turn right onto the A226, but that has its own consequences,
8 particularly with regards safety.

9 And the other point I'd make is that we've had a lot of discussion with
10 National Highways – 'discussion' is a euphemism – over the difference between
11 a function being provided and providing something that is functional. We've
12 heard the connector roads referred to as 'convoluted,' and I think that's another
13 euphemism, really. We're talking about considerable extra distance for a large
14 number of residents.

15 I'm not talking just about Shorne – in Gravesham as well – a lot of extra
16 roundabouts, traffic lights and, as we've heard, a considerable risk of congestion
17 because of the large number of additional users that would be on these routes
18 compared to presently, and obviously, I share Gravesham's concerns,
19 particularly that people in the know will try and avoid these routes in various
20 ways, and this is going to be a problem.

21 Thank you very much.

22 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Ms Lindley. Now, if we have Councillor Wright.
23 Councillor Wright.

24 MS WRIGHT: Good afternoon, everyone. Yes, so following on a little bit from Susan's
25 comments, I think the diagrams that were shown earlier are useful but do miss
26 some key information. I think in one area for me is that, currently, Higham and
27 A289 and Medway residents, of which there's 300,000, if they wish to come up
28 the A2 may well just come up and go straight onto the A289.

29 I think one of the things that's been kindly added but may be an issue, and
30 we really need to see it through traffic modelling, is that we have a direct
31 connection from the 289 into the northbound LTC, and this then leaves us prone
32 to any traffic issues in the LTC, blocking up all Strood, Rochester and Higham
33 and Isle of Grain A289 traffic. So it's some consideration whether that A289
34 westbound, LTC northbound junction needs to be taken out.

1 In addition to that, I think, if you then took that out, actually to get to the
2 LTC A289 and Strood and Rochester, residents would then need to go up to the
3 Valley Drive exit to access the LTC, which is not necessarily a problem. I think
4 the issue comes is the congestion and the number of routes that are now
5 converging on the Valley Drive, Gravesend east Marling Cross junction. A lot
6 of routes are now converging onto that Eastbound exit, coming in from London
7 coastbound to that roundabout at Valley Drive. So not only will you have
8 London-bound traffic coming from there, but you'd also have LTC traffic, that's
9 coming from locally, potentially going there, and so I think that Valley Drive
10 junction could become incredibly congested.

11 Again, the congestion – if it happens currently on the A2, backs up a long
12 way onto the A289. A2 London-bound, in the mornings, can back up a long
13 distance onto the A289, and again, with the addition of being so closely related
14 to the LTC portals, I think the prospect of us – if you see some of the congestion
15 that's at Dartford Crossing, at least Dartford town is not directly linked to
16 Dartford Crossing in a lot of ways – there's 300,000 residents, or a portion of
17 them from Strood and Rochester, and from Higham and Grain, will be directly
18 linked to the congestion that's potential to occur at the LTC north portal – south
19 portal, northbound. So it's how we're going to mitigate that.

20 If you also think that one of our alternative routes would therefore be along
21 the 226 through Gravesend – that meets to Gravesend Council's point – but also
22 an alternative route would have been to come back up Thong Lane or Valley
23 Drive, and those routes, effectively, would not be there, and therefore you would
24 have to go all the way through Gravesend, potentially, up through Northfleet to
25 re-join the A2 if there's bad congestion. So I think there's very few alternative
26 routes if this junction gets blocked up, and it does on occasion, regularly,
27 currently.

28 To the point of the fact that this is in the dip of the road, I go back to Ms
29 Laver's point about signage, which is actually the road from the M2 up to
30 Brewers Road is incredibly steep, and the signage could be very difficult for
31 people to see to go on to the south portal, so that really needs to be considered
32 long and hard.

33 If you were to go from Valley Drive and missed the turning for the 289, if
34 you wanted to get back to Gravesend or to Higham, then you would have to go

1 back up to junction 1 and around, and that's going to be about seven miles, to
2 answer to Ms Laver's earlier point.

3 And just a final point: the access from Shorne through the 226 is not the
4 main route for Shorne residents. It is through the Brewers Road junction, and
5 also for traffic going to Shorne Country Park, particularly if they're coming from
6 the further end of Medway towns, again, they would have been going along
7 Brewers Road. They will now have to go up to Valley Drive and back round,
8 and also to note, the Brewers Road junction will be closed for 19 months.

9 Sorry. That was a lot of areas, but thank you for giving me the time to
10 answer that.

11 MR SMITH: That was very considerable detail embedded in that response, so thank you
12 very much for bringing that material in front of us.

13 Now looking at other statutory parties, I believe I have a hand from
14 Matthew Rheinberg of TfL.

15 MR RHEINBERG: Yes. Thank you, sir. Matthew Rheinberg, Transport for London.
16 Clearly this junction is significantly outside Transport for London's area of
17 responsibility, but there is one element of the project design that is quite
18 significant for London, we feel. So one of the benefits of the scheme is to
19 improve the resilience of the strategic road network, because when there are
20 planned or unplanned disruption at the Dartford Crossing, there is significant
21 impacts on the road network within London as traffic diverts to the Blackwall
22 Tunnel, Silvertown in the future, and one of the seven objectives of the scheme
23 is to improve the resilience of the Thames crossings and the major road network.
24 So we have a strong interest in Lower Thames Crossing being available as a
25 diversion route at times of disruption.

26 So the key question we have, really, is whether the design of this junction
27 provides significant capacity for specific movements, and that is, in particular,
28 between the Lower Thames Crossing and the A2 to the west, where at least parts
29 of those connections are one lane in each direction – is whether that does,
30 actually, provide a realistic alternative route without causing significant
31 tailbacks, which could result in it not being advertised as an alternative route in
32 the event of the Dartford Crossing being closed.

33 So we don't know the answer to that, but it will be very helpful to
34 understand whether the design of this junction actually does help meet that

1 objective of improving the resilience of the road network in London, and that's
2 really the key point we wanted to make and the question we wish to ask.

3 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, and the applicant we'll be returning to at the end
4 of these submissions I'm sure will wrap that issue up.

5 Can I then just check from the statutory parties who are requesting to
6 speak on this item – any other statutory parties, particularly the ports or Port of
7 London, wishing to speak on this item? No. In which case, we move on to other
8 interested parties, and I am going to go to TCAG, because I did note that Ms
9 Blake has been asking for some time to speak. Ms Blake, now is your
10 opportunity.

11 MS L BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. I'm sorry for jumping the gun a little earlier
12 as well. I just got a bit frustrated with the fact that they were saying it was the
13 same route when I knew it was a lane drop.

14 MR SMITH: Well, now's your ability to tell us that it's not.

15 MS L BLAKE: Thank you. I'm very much agreeing with a lot of the points that have
16 been made by those that oppose the scheme, and I'll try not to go over what
17 they've already said.

18 Regards to Ms Laver pointing out the complexity, and others have
19 commented on the complexity and the signage of there, just to point out you'd
20 actually pay the toll twice as well, obviously, because you'd have to go up and
21 then back, so you would end up paying it twice, and the confusion and the late
22 decisions that could result to incidents along that section as well, and also, whilst
23 it's not currently in place, I believe that government are looking into potentially
24 charging per mile for travelling, which, obviously, with things like that and
25 different incidences of the complex, long routes that we've seen would have an
26 impact on users' affordability for using the new route, and fear of being charged,
27 so maybe not taking that route.

28 Just touched on by TfL there about the route potentially migrating from
29 the Dartford Crossing to the LTC, and there only being one single network
30 connecting the A2 coastbound on to the LTC, that is, obviously, a very big
31 concern.

32 And then the other one that nobody, I believe, has actually mentioned, is
33 just the connectivity with the M20. With this being designed, predominantly, to
34 serve the ports, to get them from Dover and the south east, up to the midlands

1 and beyond, to come from the M20, you'd have to use Blue Bell Hill to connect
2 to this junction that we're being shown. I will touch on this, obviously, in the
3 written questions that you have asked Thames Crossing Action Group, but the
4 fact is there was variant C, which included improvements to that, which has been
5 ruled out by National Highways, and I think it just shows that this junction is
6 being shown as the start of LTC, but if you're looking at the traffic that it's
7 meant to be serving, it actually starts on the M20, and that connection comes
8 through via Blue Bell Hill.

9 So I'll keep that short and take the rest in writing. Thank you, sir.

10 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, can I check other interested parties presented?

11 A quick show of hands. We've got two, so can we just get the roving mic to the
12 gentleman here? Is this Mr Beard, Mr Robin Beard?

13 MR BEARD: Yes, it is. Robin Beard. We've seen a nice depiction today of all the
14 different routes and what I want to say is – well, it might be treading on the toes
15 of what we're talking about tomorrow with the traffic movements, but the only
16 reason that this junction needs to be as complicated as it is, with the high bridge
17 and the tunnel under the A2, and also the A2 would have to be – the actual
18 carriageway would have to be moved for about a mile to make space for it – the
19 only reason why it has to be that complicated is because of the link road on the
20 south side of the carriageway, one of the two that they were talking about earlier.

21 Now, it might be that link road is a vital part of the design, simply because
22 of the volume of traffic, and if that's the case, then the junction really does have
23 to be this complicated, but I'm not convinced. I think that you could potentially
24 do away with that link road, and if you could, then the junction would be
25 radically simpler. Well, you wouldn't have to move the A2. You wouldn't have
26 to dig a tunnel, and you wouldn't have to have any really high bridges either, so
27 it would be a big improvement.

28 MR SMITH: Mr Beard, noted, and I'm sure the applicant will respond to that point.

29 Now, can we move on, though, whilst another gentleman – sir, you are...

30 MR JOHNSON: John Johnson, local resident living in Cobham and Sole Street. I would
31 begin by saying I support this scheme, travelling regularly on the local roads,
32 overall, to relieve congestion at Dartford. I'd also echo particularly the points
33 made by Gravesham Council and by Higham Council. The additional point I

1 really want to stress relates to the Valley Drive A2 junction, and the junction on
2 the south side of the A2 with Henhurst Road. I have three points around that.

3 First, in relation to the new connecting road that the colleague on my left
4 has just referred to, whilst some traffic coming up the A289 will obviously be
5 able to join the A2 direct, a lot of traffic at the moment, particularly in the
6 morning rush hour, cuts through Cobham village, and then down to Wrotham,
7 Sevenoaks and so forth. 700 or 800 vehicles per hour is not an insignificant
8 amount, and that figure is recorded in the documentation.

9 By changing the junction so that the traffic has to use that connecting road,
10 it will put pressure on people to come down and then either cut through Henhurst
11 or, if they do go get on to the A2, they will cut through Wrotham Road.
12 Wrotham Road is an A road. Henhurst is a road that's less than five metres
13 wide. Kent County Council won't even put a white line down the middle of it.
14 It is totally unsuitable as a rat run.

15 The traffic that would have gone through Cobham will be displaced there,
16 as has been set out in other documentation. So something needs to be done at
17 the junction roundabout with Valley Drive to stop traffic going through, and the
18 obvious thing is, initially, a weight limit.

19 Second, the point that's made about congestion at the Valley Drive
20 junction – slide 5 of the first presentation clearly showed three roundabouts, an
21 additional roundabout going in. Traffic coming down the new connecting road,
22 and wanting to come off to Henhurst there, will be held up by traffic coming up
23 Valley Drive.

24 The reality of Valley Drive throughout the day, never mind just morning
25 rush hour, is it's a constant flow of traffic coming out of Gravesend. It stops
26 traffic joining the roundabout from the right. It will add to the congestion there,
27 as has already been said.

28 The third point. Traffic moving east on –

29 MR SMITH: Can I just interrupt you a minute? It would really help, I think, if the
30 applicant could show us the intersection slide, and then we can just –

31 [Off-mic discussion]

32 MR SMITH: I think it's slide 5. Yeah. Don't feel the need to wait, Mr Johnson, but
33 hopefully it will help once that's up.

34 MR JOHNSON: Okay. I think we're nearly there. I'll just wait a second.

1 MR SMITH: There we go, so we've got Valley Drive.

2 MR JOHNSON: Can we go on? I think it must be slide 6. Keep going and I'll tell you
3 when to stop. I must have mis-noted – that's it. That's the one. That's it. Thank
4 you. So you can see on that slide Henhurst Road, Valley Drive, triple
5 roundabout where they meet the A2, and in the yellow, the new connecting road.

6 So traffic coming down the connecting road is liable to meet traffic
7 coming up Valley Drive. Valley Drive, non-stop flow of traffic onto the A2
8 westbound in the morning.

9 Conversely, and this is my third point, in the evening, traffic leaving
10 Valley Drive backs up onto the A2 almost daily, in the rush hour. The
11 congestion there is already considerable. So in terms of mitigations, some
12 thought needs to be given to issues such as putting traffic lights onto the
13 roundabout, as is done at the Ebbsfleet junction, but my real concerns are two-
14 fold, in summary. Firstly, it's the congestion there. The second is the diversion
15 of traffic rat running through Henhurst. Thank you.

16 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr Johnson. Now, with apologies to Ms Dablin for
17 Port of Tilbury London Limited, it's one of the hazards of being hidden behind
18 a very long list of speakers in the virtual room, but I do believe we have your
19 yellow hand showing. So Ms Dablin, can I introduce you?

20 MS DABLIN: Thank you. Alison Dablin for the Port of Tilbury. I don't have any
21 comments on the layout of the junction in particular. One thing that did occur
22 as Ms Blake for TCAG was speaking, however, is she mentioned that you would
23 have to pay the toll twice. It would be useful if the applicant could confirm
24 exactly what the rerouting would be, because it appears that under the current
25 design, the junction that is immediately to the north of the tunnel would not be
26 available to turn around, which I believe would then force traffic to go on to the
27 A13, around the Orsett Cock roundabout, back onto the A13, and then onto the
28 Lower Thames Crossing to return southwards.

29 So it might be useful, purely to clarify the extent of the diversion were
30 road users to inadvertently join the Lower Thames Crossing. Thank you.

31 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Ms Dablin. Now, can I check – my understanding
32 is that we have received now all of the spoken interventions from those who
33 wished to respond on agenda item 3. I'm seeing no yellow hands in the virtual
34 room, and I'm seeing no more hands in the physical room, so I'm going to return

1 this item to Mr Tait for the applicant, and we'll bring this item to a close, and
2 Mr Tait, in closing it, go to your high points but be conscious that you have your
3 response in writing.

4 MR TAIT: So we're very conscious of that because there has been a large number of
5 issues raised there, and we think that most of them would be better served to
6 respond to those in writing, as part of the post-hearing submissions. But there
7 are three points that I think that I can ask Dr Tim Wright, to my left, the head of
8 consents, to pick up. Those relate to the point raised by KCC and others about
9 the reduction in lanes on the A2, Mr Bedford's question about 3D modelling,
10 briefly, and thirdly, about wrong choices in signage, if I can call it that. Dealing
11 with those in turn, please, Dr Wright.

12 DR WRIGHT: Thank you. Tim Wright for the applicant. First of all, I wanted to talk
13 about the use of the A2, and I think our point about moving local traffic onto the
14 connector roads, in terms of capacity, has been made and understood, but I wanted
15 to make it clear that we also see a safety benefit as well. This is traffic that is
16 making short journeys. It's joining and leaving the road network, and therefore,
17 moving it on to a connector road will lead to safer journeys for those people, and
18 for people who are travelling on the mainline because of less traffic coming on and
19 off that mainline. They will also experience safer journeys. I just wanted to make
20 sure that point was understood from us.

21 In terms of the 3D model, I wanted to talk and perhaps clarify a bit of
22 understand around what we have. Clearly, we do use CAD, and we have built the
23 engineering for the scheme through CAD, and that comes together in our model,
24 but that model is a very technical model designed for engineering purposes, and for
25 checking interfaces and so on. It's not really designed for the type of interrogation
26 and understanding that, I think, is being requested, and whilst we have used it for
27 the basis of our fly-throughs, which we've produced online – people will have seen
28 that information – that is a very heavily computer graphics layer that is placed over
29 that engineering model and requires a lot of work.

30 So it's not what – you might see a 3D model that you can fly around and
31 look at it. It is a layer of some quite complex CAD models, and recognising that
32 the examining authority did ask us to provide clarity about some of the areas
33 concerned, so we did, of course, put in the enhanced cross sections at deadline 2,

1 which I believe, so far, we haven't received a comment back on. I haven't seen
2 one, but maybe. So that, I think, is the best way to understand the scheme.

3 MR SMITH: Briefly, Dr Wright, in relation to that – because I think the examining
4 authority has a distinct engagement with this discussion as well – we have been
5 repeatedly scratching our heads about the best way to resolve the best level of detail
6 to assist us to make recommendations to the secretary of state, noting that all of this
7 very substantial CAF digital material is available underneath the fixed
8 representations of the scheme, as set out in the document set that had been submit
9 as the application documents.

10 One of our dilemmas is that if we ask for the submission of all of that
11 information, all of that information is then within the examination, or it needs,
12 legally, to be within the examination. We then need a technology that enables every
13 party to interrogate it in all respects.

14 That is an extraordinarily large ask in computing power terms, in cost
15 terms, and we did do some diligence of our own about the degrees to which we
16 could reasonably make such a request, not just of this applicant, but A. N. Other
17 applicant within the NSIP field at present, and be able to make that material
18 available through the digital gateway that we have to the world, which is the
19 National Infrastructure Planning Portal, and we would also have to capture that
20 material so that the Planning Inspectorate owned it, because if it was left in the
21 hands of the applicant, the applicant would have the opportunity to adjust that
22 material in real time, and affect the material on which the judgements that we, and
23 indeed then the secretary of state, must make.

24 There is a principle of our evidence that it must be, essentially, fixed in
25 time so that the secretary of state does have certainty about which he or she is
26 making a judgment upon. So we ended up concluding that we had to carry on using
27 fixed representations, rather than asking for dynamic access to a large area digital
28 model.

29 We may or may not have made the right call on that, but we believe, at
30 present – and if anybody wishes to put anything in writing to us on that at deadline
31 4 then do – but we believe at present that we have broadly made the correct call,
32 because the alternative is extraordinarily difficult, extraordinarily complex, and
33 expensive to deal with, and also throws up a whole load of data integrity issues, and

1 data government issues, that frankly haven't been fully and easily resolved within
2 the framework of an examination such as this, under the 2008 CAF.

3 So that's why, in our view, we are where we are, and we, at the moment,
4 feel that we have got, essentially, the right cut between the amount of information
5 we need to support ourselves and the secretary of state and not being
6 overcomplicated here. So that, I thought, was an explanation that the participants
7 in this examination deserved.

8 Dr Wright, back to you.

9 DR WRIGHT: Tim Wright. Thank you, sir. That was a helpful explanation of your
10 position. The final point is in relation to signage, and all I wanted to say on that is
11 National Highways operate the strategic road network up and down the country,
12 and whilst, yes, these junctions do have a number of connections, as we've heard
13 today, they're not dramatically different to other highways' connections up and
14 down the country, and National Highways has a lot of experience in putting signage
15 in place that supports people in making their journeys around.

16 That's not to say that people won't, occasionally, take the wrong line, but
17 the experience of National Highways, its designers, and its constructors, to put in
18 place signage that supports journeys, supports the end-to-end journey from the
19 customers, will allow people to navigate their way through these junctions, and
20 avoid taking wrong turnings, to the extent that it's feasible, given the way some
21 people do make mistakes.

22 I wouldn't want to correct some of the route points that have been made.
23 They are being correctly made about the divergency routes that you would take.
24 There is a point to note though, that in many cases, the route would be no longer,
25 in the future scenario, than it is today. It's simply that the decision point has been
26 moved. So broadly the routes would remain the same length, but the decision point
27 at which you might take the wrong turn, if you failed to follow the signage, would
28 be moved.

29 MR SMITH: Okay. I'll check with my colleagues if there's anything else that needs
30 clarification on those closing submissions from the applicant.

31 MS LAVER: Thank you, Dr Wright. I just wanted to pick up the point that Ms Dablin
32 raised. Do you intend to deal with that in writing? Because if so, we'll put it as an
33 action. I think she raised a valid point: what does happen if you don't get signage,
34 you miss it for whatever reason, and you end up in Essex – what do you do then?

1 And I'm happy for it to come at a later date than it to be put on the spot, but I just
2 want to clarify.

3 DR WRIGHT: Tim Wright for the applicant. Just to answer at a high level, there is no
4 direct return from the A13 junction, so it would actually take you on to the local
5 road network. I think we can supply the reasonable return routes in writing.

6 MS LAVER: Thank you.

7 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Anything further? No. In which case, that has
8 brought agenda item 3 to its conclusion. I did flag that we would break for lunch
9 at about 1.15, and that's my remaining intention, so I think now we know the drill,
10 we've done this once, we're going to do it again, but we're going to move this time,
11 notionally, through the tunnel, reserving all matters 'tunnel' to a future issue-
12 specific hearing, to Essex, and could I ask, then, the applicant to introduce agenda
13 item 4 A13 A1089 LTC intersection, and we will, I think, find this easier to do,
14 now we know what we're doing.

15 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir. So this is, again, Mr Hodge, on the review of function and
16 travel movements, and the additional material pursuing to your decision.

17 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Mr Hodge, when you're ready.

18 MR HODGE: Hello, sir. I'll just go through the same set of slides and the colours and
19 everything are identical to the ones for the A2. So if I go to the first slide. So this
20 is the strategic connections at the A13, A1089 and LTC junction. So the first
21 connections are the connections for the Lower Thames Crossing through the route,
22 so that was the northbound, and then you have the southbound, which crosses the
23 A13 at this location here. The next slide shows the A1089 northbound onto the
24 Lower Thames Crossing, and the second one here is going northbound on the 1089,
25 and going round and coming back southbound onto the Lower Thames Crossing.
26 This, obviously, is a key connection from the 1089 and Tilbury Port.

27 The next connection is to show the existing connection from the 1089
28 westbound to the A13, and the alternative – the opposite route, which goes from
29 the A13 eastbound and down into the 1089.

30 So those are the core strategic [inaudible]. This shows coming from the
31 A13 westbound. Here, this is a new connection, so it's shown solid. So we've
32 removed this connection from the A13 to the 1089, so the way that that movement
33 would be provided is that you'd go round the Orsett Cock roundabout, go on to the
34 A13 slip road, which goes back on to the A13, and then has a diverge, which then

1 goes and joins the A1089 southbound, and the other movement is if you're coming
2 northbound out of the 1089, and going eastbound onto the A13.

3 So that is the major connections.

4 MR SMITH: Can I ask a reasonably detailed question at that point? Because it was on
5 my list of questions to ask there, that, essentially, the west to southbound movement
6 from the A13 onto the A1089 now becomes a partially indirect movement, because
7 it comes off at the Orsett Cock, and then it continues through the new slip on the
8 1089 southbound. Whereas the northbound movement is retained as a direct slip
9 to the main line of the A13. I may have missed it somewhere in the many millions
10 of words that we've read, but I don't have, crystallised in my head, an
11 understanding of why the distinction. Why was it viewed as necessary to keep the
12 direct connection northbound, but the southbound was one was felt able to be an
13 indirect connection using Orsett Cock?

14 MR HODGE: The main reason for that is because of the slip roads, the layout of the slip
15 roads on the south side of the A13 are – in a previous version of this, we did have
16 a direct connection of the A13, which was the A13 southbound and the A13
17 northbound. We then took a direct connection off that, but what that did was it
18 prevented local traffic from the Orsett Cock roundabout accessing the 1089
19 southbound, because unless they were on the A13 to the east of Orsett Cock
20 roundabout, they would not be able to access the 1089.

21 MR SMITH: And this also runs to the question of port access to DP World London
22 Gateway, and Manor Way, because thinking about how they would move to the
23 1089 if they wanted to, they would need to make that movement.

24 MR HODGE: If that was a desired movement they'd want. It depends where they're
25 starting from and also going to. Yes, that's right, sir. Yeah.

26 MR SMITH: Okay. Yeah, please continue.

27 MR HODGE: So the next route shows the connection from the A13 westbound to the
28 Lower Thames Crossing northbound, and so that is using the new link road, which
29 is to the west of the Orsett Cock roundabout, and coming off and using this new
30 slip road that goes up through here. The next route is the southbound Lower
31 Thames Crossing link, when then joins into the A13 before the Orsett Cock
32 roundabout, and then there's the two from the south, so the A13 westbound to
33 Lower Thames Crossing southbound, and then the Lower Thames Crossing

1 northbound, with the loop slip road and coming back, and joining the connection
2 from the LTC southbound, and running onto the A13.

3 So that's the strategic and then the major connections, so if I now go into
4 the local connections. So again, if you're on the 1089 and you want to join either
5 Lower Thames Crossing either northbound or southbound, you can. So there's a
6 junction further down. There's obviously the Asda roundabout junction as well,
7 where people can get on and they can come up and join LTC northbound, or LTC
8 southbound.

9 The next connection – this is the one that I'd like to just explain, because
10 this is where if you're on the A13, again, if you're to the east of Orsett Cock
11 roundabout, you're able to join LTC northbound, but if you are at Orsett Cock
12 roundabout, you have not got a direct connection onto LTC northbound or
13 southbound, and that's because of the slip roads to the west of the junction. The
14 slip road from the Orsett Cock roundabout goes over the top of the exit slip road on
15 the A13, and then the link from LTC southbound, and here you could either come
16 off to go onto the A13, or you also join the Orsett Cock. So that I'll put that in as
17 a local connection, rather than a main.

18 So the connections to Lower Thames Crossing southbound is the same.
19 You would have to be to the east of the Orsett Cock junction to be able to join
20 Lower Thames Crossing southbound, but you do have the same access of coming
21 northbound on Lower Thames Crossing. You can then join both the A13 and Orsett
22 Cock.

23 This slide is really just to show the local roads where – the existing ones
24 are shown in dotted, whereas the realigned ones are shown in solid. We have to
25 realign the 1013 through here to be able to fit the slip roads in between the 1013
26 and the A13, and we have to move Baker Street, because of the implication of it.
27 Baker Street goes through the actual junction, so we have to realign that one, and
28 these are the traffic movements.

29 Again, the purple is the route, and if there's a changed route on the
30 [inaudible] scheme, it's shown in red. So again, we picked some points. They are
31 just representative of route paths that we thought might be useful. A point I'd like
32 to make here is this is [inaudible] A13. On the slides that we provided, actually,
33 yesterday, there's a wrong title on those. It's a –

34 MR SMITH: So you will seek to replace it.

1 MR HODGE: We'll replace that, yeah. Certainly. So this shows going from A to B.
2 This is the A13 going eastbound, and then the other direction, and then with the
3 scheme, there is no change. By 'no change,' I mean there's no change in route, so
4 – then [inaudible] Orsetts – sorry, Orsett, here, to Little Thurrock. This route goes
5 down the high street of Orsett and then down Baker Street, down the 1013, and
6 that's the reverse. With the scheme, it's slightly changed, because of the
7 realignment of Baker Street and the 1013, but it is a very similar route.

8 MS L BLAKE: Sorry to interrupt, sir. I just think that I'm hearing from some people in
9 the room a bit of confusion over these, and it did confuse me as a lifelong resident
10 of Thurrock this morning, when I first looked at these. Little Thurrock, if you look
11 at it and you're thinking the Deneholes roundabout, or Blackshots roundabout on
12 this map, and on the previous maps, if you think [Stifford Clays?], because,
13 although we've mentioned it's National Highways ongoing through the
14 consultations, they still intend on labelling Stifford Clays and Blackshots as Little
15 Thurrock. So that might help, actually, for some people to get their head around
16 what we're looking at.

17 MR SMITH: Indeed, yep.

18 MS L BLAKE: Thank you.

19 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Noted.

20 MR HODGE: Sir, I'll just run on to the next slide, which is A13 to Alsmitt[?], so that's
21 coming from the point B on the slide through the Orsett Cock roundabout and using
22 Retory[?] Road to go to Horsehead[?]. There are alternative routes to do this. You
23 could go up through the A28, but we've taken this particular route, just to show the
24 impact. Obviously, going reverse, it's the same route. With the scheme, that route
25 would still be available.

26 Then from Orsett down to point E – sorry, from A13 to point E, this would
27 use the A13 westbound through Orsett Cock and along the 1089. This route and
28 going back would be the same route in reverse. Then what we've got with the
29 scheme is that there's a slight difference, in that there's a realignment to the 1013
30 and that would be the same for the return journey.

31 The next one is the A13 to 1089, which is the one that we showed in the
32 functional plans. That goes from A13 westbound down to the 1089, currently, and
33 the other movement is this loop slip road that goes round and joins the A13
34 eastbound. With the scheme, this one would have to come off at Orsett Cock and

1 use the new link road that would be provided through the junction, to go down to
2 the 1089, and the other direction is unchanged.

3 So that finishes the traffic movement. We have got some movements here
4 for the Port. Would you like me to carry on with those, or...?

5 MR SMITH: Yes, no, that would be very, very useful, and I think probably when you've
6 finished painting that picture in principle, we might call lunch, which would then
7 leave item B: siting and land taken, the design rationale, to after lunch, and then
8 we will obviously hear from parties. So, over to you.

9 MR HODGE: Thank you, sir. So, this is showing access from Thames Gateway Port,
10 which is just slightly off the map, as Manor Way roundabout is about this
11 location here. So they come up the S10.14, along the A13, and they join the new
12 link road to get access onto LTC northbound, and they would again come this
13 way to connect us onto LTC southbound. And then, from the Lower Thames
14 Crossing, they could come down, join the A13 at the A13 junction, using the
15 A13 eastbound to go into the port, and with the north, they could come up and
16 around and do the same movement. So you do provide all movements from the
17 east. So access from Tilbury Port, again it's coming up the 1089 and directly
18 onto Lower Thames Crossing northbound, and the other movement is, again, the
19 same as before. It comes onto the loop slip road and southbound onto Lower
20 Thames Crossing.

21 The access into the port from the M25 would be from junction 30, along
22 the A13 and use the existing routing. Obviously, this link here would have less
23 traffic on it, and this point up to the connection with LTC would have less traffic
24 and the Dartford Crossing would have less traffic on it. That is seen as the main
25 route back into the port. However, there is another alternative, which would be
26 using Lower Thames Crossing going northbound, going around the loop to get
27 back onto the Orsett Cock roundabout, around the Orsett Cock roundabout and
28 then using the southbound link into the 1089. Obviously, it's a longer route and
29 you're going through traffic signal controls here, but that is an option, and then
30 the same with the southbound, you could come down and go through the Orsett
31 Cock and down to the 1089. That's the links that we've shown, sir.

32 MR SMITH: Okay.

33 MR SHADAREVIAN: I think Dr Wright can add on the ports point, in relation to the
34 volume of traffic predicted to be making those movements on the last two slides.

1 MR SMITH: Look, I think, in terms of pitching where to take a sensible break, it would
2 be very useful to get the complete story told from the applicant, as you see it, so
3 we can then open the conversation about it after lunch. So yes, Dr Wright.

4 DR WRIGHT: Tim Wright, for the applicant. So in terms of our own position about
5 connectivity to the ports, with one exception that we've talked about but I'll
6 come back to, the ports retain all of their existing access that is already in place,
7 except that along the A13, junction 30, the traffic is reduced and therefore that
8 access route is improved for them. The one exception is the direct link from
9 London gateway through down the 1089 to the Port of Tilbury, so westbound
10 and southbound, where initially they would have been able to come directly off
11 the A13 onto the 1089, and now they route through Orsett Cock, for reasons that
12 my colleague, Mr Hodge, explained.

13 In terms of additional routes, then, we provide a number of additional
14 routes, and most of them are free flow, provide good free access out for the ports
15 and for DP World good free flow into the port, as well. In terms of routes into
16 Port of Tilbury, obviously there is this route that could use Orsett Cock
17 roundabout, but our traffic modelling indicates that actually, it's not a preferred
18 route and the preferred route would continue to be to use the M25 and junction
19 30 and the A13, taking advantage of the reduced traffic on those routes.

20 And to give some sort of basis to that statement, we've pulled off from our
21 modelling the use of the – traffic that comes through Orsett Cock roundabout
22 and leaves by the link onto the A1089 southbound. And in 20.30 in the a.m.
23 peak to the p.m. peak, that is between 245 and 309 PCUs, if I can use that as a
24 shorthand for volume, and then when you get to 20.45, that's 327 up to 433 in
25 the p.m. peak, so it is relatively little used. By the nature of how these junctions
26 work, there are obviously a significant number of routing options that you could
27 take, all over the highway network. But our modelling shows that this isn't a
28 preferred route, and so we see, and would sign, that using the M25, Dartford
29 Crossing and Junction 30 as being the prioritised route to the Port of Tilbury.

30 PARTICIPANT: [Inaudible].

31 MR SMITH: Okay, fine. Okay, thank you very much, Dr Wright. Mr Shadarevian, I
32 see your hand on your light.

1 MR SHADAREVIAN: We do have a few minutes, so I'm just wondering whether it
2 would be possible for the applicant just to show, as a matter of completeness,
3 because it may be relevant, how –

4 MR SMITH: Mr Shadarevian, can I just ask you to hold for a second?

5 MR SHADAREVIAN: Sorry, apparently my mic wasn't in the right position, so I hope
6 people can hear me now. I was going to suggest that what we see is, where
7 traffic goes travelling south on the Lower Thames Crossing in order to get to
8 places Little Thurrock and Chadwell St Mary, because there is additional traffic
9 that is not accounted for, probably unassigned, and it may assist in tomorrow's
10 discussion about that just to show how those movements operate.

11 MR SMITH: Thank you, Mr Shadarevian. Is that something, Mr Tait, that your team
12 can assist with in the gap between –

13 MR TAIT: We'll ascertain exactly what it is that Mr Shadarevian is looking for and then
14 we will come back as soon as we can on that.

15 MR SMITH: Okay, well then maybe in that case we have reached a point where we
16 might break, because you can have those conversations after the break, then we
17 can return and hopefully clarify on that point. By the time we've finished, it will
18 be 1.10. Can we resume, please, at 2.10.? Does that meet everybody's needs?
19 Good, in which case we are broken until 2.10. Agenda item 4 is part-heard and
20 we will resume where we left off. Thank you very much, ladies and gentleman.

21

22 **(Meeting adjourned)**

23

24 MR SMITH: Ladies and gentlemen, it is now just passed 2.10 in the afternoon, and so
25 we are resuming issue-specific hearing 3 on design-related matters. We are part-
26 heard through agenda item 4; the applicant had completed its submissions on
27 items A through to A3. So we will go back to the applicant to enable us to hear
28 their submissions on 3(b), and then in the same way that we did this morning, I
29 will then move and introduce the other speakers on these items. Just before we
30 do, can I just make a polite request that when there is a speaker using the roving
31 microphone, we have had requests from outside the room that perhaps they stand
32 up to speak. Because apparently the cameras aren't capturing speakers using the
33 – if we're on these front desks, we can easily be seen as somebody who is
34 speaking, but yes, somebody speaking using the roving microphone isn't being

1 picked up particularly well on camera, so I will just relay that request. Mr Tait,
2 I'm going to return the submissions to you for the applicant.

3 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir. Just before the break, there was a question from
4 Mr Shadarevian, which has been clarified during the break, and I'm going to ask
5 I think Dr Wright to respond to that. Is that right? He's accepted that.

6 DR WRIGHT: Tim Wright, for the applicant. Quick conference there on who was
7 actually going to speak. So, we had a talk to London Gateway Port to understand
8 their ask, and they've asked us to just clarify around the movements in relation
9 to Orsett Cock junction. So if we could just move to the next slide, or bring up
10 these images, which I think are the best background, but I won't actually be –
11 and the next one, please? There we go.

12 So if you'll recall, we were talking about movements from Lower Thames
13 Crossing northbound, Lower Thames Crossing southbound, can leave and join
14 onto the Orsett Cock roundabout, and we talked about them then travelling down
15 the A1089. The clarification we were asked to provide and happy to is, of
16 course, there are other local connections that are available from Orsett Cock.

17 So as well as the A1089, you can join the A128 northbound, you can join
18 Brentwood Road southbound and you can join the A1013, both westbound and
19 eastbound, and in fact the A13 westbound from Orsett Cock roundabout. So I
20 did give numbers before and I will again. I'm not going to break them down by
21 turn in movement entirely, but to give a sense of the overall traffic using those
22 routes, in the do minimum – sorry, in the 20:30 model, do something, in the a.m.
23 and p.m., that would range between 1178 and 1687 PCUs, and in the 20:45 a.m.
24 p.m., it would range from 1459 to 2038, using that movement in total.

25 Now, obviously, some of those would be vehicles that are taking
26 advantage of the new route and making a journey through Orsett Cock
27 roundabout that they wouldn't have done previously, but many of those will be
28 journeys that would have otherwise come across the Dartford Crossing, travelled
29 along the A13, come off at Orsett Cock and made that journey anyway, so those
30 numbers I give are a combination of the existing usage that would happen in
31 minimum and existing users choosing to take that route.

32 MR SMITH: On that point, without making a detailed point that moves into too much
33 detail, are you able to give a kind of rough sense of the split there, between those
34 that would be new uses of the Orsett Cock and those who are just being

1 transitioned from one mode of passing through it into another mode of passing
2 through it? Because obviously it's the former that are the potential increase in
3 utilisation that might be relevant in thinking about how it performs.

4 DR WRIGHT: Tim Wright for the applicant. I'm afraid I don't have those numbers in
5 front of me now, but I'm happy to follow up on that response.

6 MR SMITH. Right. Excellent. Right.

7 MR SHADAREVIAN: Those numbers are quite important, as you might imagine, and
8 you've hit the nail right on the head. Those figures are important for you and
9 your colleagues have before you in making any determination about the capacity
10 of that junction, and its utility and any impact it may have on the operation of
11 the port and other impacts on the local road network.

12 So it's important that we get that information as soon as possible, and
13 obviously it's important that tomorrow's proceeding should be caveated on the
14 basis that, in the absence of that information, it makes discussion that much more
15 difficult.

16 MR SMITH: Yes, both those things are noted. And in that respect, given that, Mr
17 Shadarevian, there have been productive conversations, I trust, over the lunch
18 break that led you to where we have currently just heard from Dr Wright, if it's
19 possible to speak either in the break this afternoon or after the conclusion of this
20 afternoon's hearing with a view to getting some figures in for tomorrow, because
21 Mr Young will be going back through Orsett Cock in more detail – we are trying
22 to understand the big picture and the traffic movements here, whereas Mr Young
23 will probably be able to go into matters in more detail. So yeah, if we could get
24 something discussed before we commence tomorrow, I think that would be very
25 helpful. Mr Wright, is that going to be achievable?

26 DR WRIGHT: We'll endeavour to do so, but until I've actually checked from my
27 colleagues, who would have to and extract that data for me, I can't firmly
28 commit to that. But I understand the ask and why it's being made.

29 MR SMITH: Okay. Mr Shadarevian, does that help?

30 MR SHADAREVIAN: I'm grateful for that. I'm going to just say this as well, in advance
31 of tomorrow. There is a real issue with modelling at the moment and the amount
32 of information that's available, which again is going to impact on proceedings
33 tomorrow, and we are running out of time. And we do need to advance the
34 modelling between the parties in order to understand what those impacts are.

1 Bearing in mind we are a party who are in support of this proposal, subject to
2 those issues being resolved, because of the importance of this on the operation
3 of the port and the park, it is a matter of great concern to us that there is still
4 considerable delay, in getting a model, an appropriate model, together which
5 accurately identifies the impact on that junction. That is both Manor Way and
6 Orsett Cock in combination, having regard to the impacts of Orsett Cock. So I
7 just make that point now, sir.

8 MR SMITH: You have made it indeed, and accelerated it in the minds of many around
9 the table. I'm sure we will come back to that, and hopefully we can come back
10 to that in a way that delivers a productive solution that helps us to move forward
11 during these hearings, rather than afterwards. Yes, Ms Blake.

12 MS LAURA BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Laura Blake, Chair of Thames Crossing Action
13 Group. Can I just ask, as well, that we get some clarification on whether these
14 figures are actually taking the expansion at Tilbury Port into account? Because
15 on the uncertainties log, I'm unable to see anything about the Freeport and
16 Tilbury 3 and 4, so I just wondered if the figures being quoted include that, or if
17 they are just as they are now?

18 MR SMITH: Rest assured that Mr Young has that issue on his list for tomorrow.

19 MS LAURA BLAKE: Thank you.

20 MR SMITH: I do see Thurrock.

21 MR MACKENZIE: George Mackenzie for Thurrock Council. The first – we were
22 indeed also planning to deal with these matters tomorrow, but given the matter
23 has been raised now, for Thurrock, we just – I wanted to just effectively
24 emphasise our support for what Mr Shadarevian has said, and to add the
25 following top spin, which is that if these numbers are going to be produced and
26 shared – and we say they must be – then we would like to see the model and
27 quantitative outputs from local microsimulation models, as opposed to the
28 LTAM strategic model. And that's a point that we've made in our written
29 submissions, but I felt that it was necessary to emphasise it at this point, sir.
30 Thank you.

31 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Well, we have taken a tour around those matters,
32 and to a degree –

33 MS DABLIN: Apologies, I don't wish to interject. I had my hand up. Sorry, Alison
34 Dablin, for the Port of Tilbury.

1 MR SMITH: Apologies, Ms Dablin. One of these days I will see yellow in the screen in
2 front of me as well as a physical hand in the room. Ms Dablin, please do
3 continue.

4 MS DABLIN: Thank you. It was just a very short point in terms of the data that would
5 be very useful in terms of the Orsett Cock roundabout. Dr Wright gave some
6 numbers before the break as to the number of PCUs that were connecting with
7 the A1089, and then he has just given some numbers overall. And if I have noted
8 things down and done the maths correctly, it looks like approximately 20% of
9 all traffic on the Orsett Cock will be seeking to connect with the A1089, and that
10 seems like a very large figure and it would be useful to have the data in front of
11 us in written form, in order to be able to analyse it correctly. Thank you.

12 MR SMITH: Thank you, Ms Dablin. Okay. That point is noted and hopefully can be
13 taken into account before whatever emerges before tomorrow emerges. But I
14 am going to return to Mr Tait now.

15 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir. If I can now ask Mr Roberts, in relation to item 4 to pick up
16 siting and land take, before moving on to Ms Clare Donnelly.

17 MR ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr Tait. Steve Roberts, for the applicant. As Mr Tait notes,
18 I will be working with my colleague, Ms Donnelly, here, to take this agenda
19 item. I'll start with the more engineering matters, perhaps. So I will structure
20 my answer, if I may, in the same way, as I did to item 3B. That's under the three
21 headings of: firstly, seeking to maximise scheme benefits by providing
22 appropriate connectivity and to achieve the required capacity to coordinate the
23 forecast traffic flows; the second point being taking account of existing site
24 constraints; and the third, achieving a safe layout, compliant with relevant
25 standards. So, starting with connectivity, there are 16 possible connections that
26 could be made between the A13, the A1089 and the proposed Lower Thames
27 Crossing. Four of these are existing connections, which we saw this morning,
28 between the A13 and the A1089. Of these, we've decided to prioritise 10 of
29 these, so four of which are existing. So six new movements and we believe that
30 these new movements would provide the greatest benefit, and in balance with,
31 had we proposed an all-movements junction at this location, it would have
32 resulted in much greater land take and impact on existing constraints. Clearly
33 there are benefits to provide some links between Lower Thames Crossing and
34 both the existing A13 and the existing A1089.

1 However, having considered carefully the forecast traffic flows, we have
2 determined that the east-facing links onto the A13 would provide the greatest
3 benefit. It then follows, in terms of the siting of Lower Thames Crossing in
4 relation to the existing connections, that by placing the main line of Lower
5 Thames Crossing to the east of the A1089, it meant that we could make those
6 east-facing connections to the A13, without having to cross the A1089, either
7 under or over.

8 This also meant that Lower Thames Crossing was kept to the east side of
9 the existing junction, and therefore having less impact on the communities to the
10 west. We also recognise the importance to connect connections to the 1089.
11 And our decision therefore was to site the proposed junction as close as possible
12 to the A1089, to simplify and minimise the length of connections to it. So we
13 could have possibly sited a junction further to the east, subject to finding a
14 suitable location within existing junction, but then our connections back to the
15 1089, which we wanted to make, would have been longer and more circuitous
16 and possibly more impactful.

17 So, going onto the constraints around this junction, there are many existing
18 constraints, as you might imagine, at the A13-A1089 Lower Thames Crossing
19 junction, including the communities to the west, around Grays, Blackshots,
20 Deneholes, but also to the north and east, particularly Baker Street and towards
21 Orsett. There are various clusters – smaller groupings of properties – mainly
22 residential, to the south and east, including the Whitecroft care home.
23 Environmental constraints in this area include various heritage assets and also
24 the Blackshots nature area, which is to the west. There are significant utilities
25 in this area, which provide constraints on the design. And there – as we’ve
26 discussed just before lunch, there are various local roads which provide
27 important local connections which need to be accommodated within the overall
28 design.

29 Moving on to design standards, as I say, the strategy here was to make a
30 connection with the A13, with east-facing connections. The standards are – the
31 design standards are such that placing an entirely new junction between the
32 A1089 and the Orsett Cock roundabout would be difficult to accommodate, and
33 therefore our strategy was to modify and add to the existing connections already
34 provided around the A13, A1089. So in design terms, our strategy was to try

1 and over-replicate some of the existing features in the junction, such as the loop
2 slip roads that you see to the northwest, and to try and contain the junction within
3 that northwestern access and east-west axis, towards Orsett Cock junction. So
4 we've tried to keep to – perhaps use the word, slender, but narrower corridors,
5 then perhaps if we'd gone for a more traditional junction design, if you like.

6 So if I now may move to the point that you ask about, 'how did the
7 relationship between this intersection and the settlements at Baker Street come
8 about?' So we recognise that our proposed junction layout brings Lower Thames
9 Crossing and associated connections closer to the nearby communities,
10 particularly around Baker Street.

11 MR SMITH: Yes.

12 MR ROBERTS: One alternative to reduce that impact on communities, as I mentioned
13 earlier, would have been to site the mainland Lower Thames Crossing to the
14 west of the 1089. But, as I said, that would have meant that connections back to
15 the East would have had to cross and would have a greater vertical scale at the
16 junction, compared to the layout that we have got. And I think that concludes
17 the key points I wanted to make.

18 MR SMITH: Can I just explore that particular point for a moment? Because, I mean,
19 clearly on any measure, the proximity of this particular intersection as designed
20 to Baker Street, as a settlement, as a community, is very close indeed, and the
21 effects upon it are weighty matters that we will have to deliberate very carefully
22 upon, and we have felt a need to understand, better than we think we currently
23 do, what drove you to that particular very close physical proximity.

24 Now I do understand what you have then said about the nature of needing
25 to cross the 1089; the fact that if the main line of the LTC had been further to
26 the west that you would have ended up needing multiple crossings of the 1089
27 at depth, so you'd have ended up with a taller junction structure, one that would
28 have been a potentially more substantial impact in landscape terms. You would
29 also have ended up with an A13 main line that was physically closer to the pre-
30 existing settlements directly to the west and the south.

31 But would one have ended up with something that, in impact terms, was
32 equivalent to the effects that are being delivered to Baker Street? It's a moot
33 point and what we are not seeking to do is to essentially orally redesign that
34 which is before us, because we have to make a recommendation to the Secretary

1 of State on that which is before us, but we do have to appreciate why the specific
2 nature of the adverse effects, particularly on Baker Street, have ended up
3 essentially being recommended to us as acceptable in circumstances where they
4 are quite substantial, looking at the land available in the gap between the two
5 settlements. So if you are able to shine any more lights on that at all, it would
6 assist us.

7 MR ROBERTS: Thank you, sir. Steve Roberts, for the applicant. I think what I would
8 say, is that the – what we are trying to weight up here is perhaps an alignment
9 to the west, which would have those connections that we’ve just touched on, but
10 closer to the communities to the west, versus an even closer link to a smaller
11 number of affected properties around Baker Street.

12 So I would say that, had we put the main line to the west, we would have
13 been further from the existing communities than we are at Baker Street, but we
14 would have been affecting a greater number of people, and that’s what we’ve
15 weighed up, and that, in combination with the, as I say, the desire to have these
16 east-facing connections and not have them cross over the A1089, led us to prefer
17 the arrangement which is closer to Baker Street.

18 MR SMITH: Okay. I’ll just check with my colleagues. Any other follow-up on that
19 before we move on? Okay, thank you very much. So please then do move onto
20 the subsequent element of your submissions.

21 MR ROBERTS: Thank you, sir. I’m going to handover to Clare Donnelly at this point,
22 who will cover some of the mitigations that we’ve put in place.

23 MS DONNELLY: Okay. Clare Donnelly for the applicant. Just going to change the
24 slides. So once again, we plan to discuss mitigation measures through key
25 examples of how mitigations have been incorporated and implemented around
26 the junction, through its design evolution. However, before we commence that,
27 I think it’s very important that we should note the unavoidable impacts that we
28 are having on cultural heritage in this location, particularly the loss of listed
29 buildings and the impact on an ancient scheduled monument.

30 We have discussed these in detail with Historic England, who concede that
31 these impacts, while substantial, do not outweigh the benefits of the scheme as
32 a whole. And while we are focusing on the design of the junction today, we
33 would note that we are still continuing to make considerable efforts to limit
34 cultural heritage impacts through the development of the construction

1 methodology for both highways and utilities works. In the past, this has included
2 the avoidance of another scheduled ancient monument, the Iron Age enclosures,
3 which are to the north-east of the junction. So I'm not going to engage too much
4 more with the cultural heritage mitigation, but we understand the seriousness of
5 that.

6 Okay. So I'm going to take you through, once again, through one of our
7 aerial views. First of all, for orientation we are now looking at the existing A13
8 junction from the north, looking back south towards the river. You can see the
9 A13 running east-west across the page. Important features to note on this view
10 are obviously Baker Street, which runs straight north-south down through here;
11 the Baker Street windmill, which is a local landmark; the Whitecroft care home
12 here, as well.

13 The junction – existing junction is also located with surrounding open
14 spaces, which is very important. That includes Blackshots Nature Reserve, also
15 known as Ron Evans Memorial Park, and also the Orsett Showground, which is
16 just off to the left of this image, which I will talk a little bit more about, later.

17 Now if I take you to the statutory design layout of the junction.
18 Throughout, efforts have been made to reduce the overall layout of the junction.
19 Through course of design development, and response to stakeholder feedback,
20 the applicant has sought to reduce the impact of the works on spaces in and
21 around the junction. For example, the design was modified between statutory
22 and supplementary consultation to remove the requirement to realign Rectory
23 Road, which is, once again, off to the east of this image, which greatly reduced
24 our impacts on the Orsett Showground.

25 But to concentrate on impacts we can see in this image – supplementary
26 consultation then – we tightened up the design of the slip roads north, so if we
27 can concentrate on this area here, I will focus back – we pulled those slip roads
28 north to reduce our impacts on Blackshots Nature Reserve. We also, if I could
29 just draw your attention then again to Whitecroft care home, which I'm going to
30 go back through existing for - here, we go, it's in this location. Through the
31 course of design, between statutory and supplementary design, we managed to
32 pull those slip roads away from those key facilities, in order to reduce and
33 mitigate those effects.

1 In terms of the mitigation designs for residual effects, much of the work
2 for mitigation at this junction has been done through planting design. So the –
3 you will note, if we go back to the existing slides, the typology of landscape
4 through this location is generally flat, open land. It is slightly more rural to the
5 north of the A13 than the south of A13. The A13 acts as a natural barrier, and
6 planting along this corridor is read as a sort of wooded ridge line along the
7 horizon, and when it is viewed from either side. This is what gave support to
8 our strategy that we would do extensive woodland planting around each of the
9 junctions.

10 Statutory consultation, with regards to specific impacts. You can see that
11 we had quite large structures here located exactly on the fringe of the Baker
12 Street area. We have sought to reduce those visual impacts through
13 implementation of additional earthworks and mitigation. So in this version,
14 which is our design at DCO, you can see here, we have got a false cut, which
15 has been provided on the edge. We have reduced the scale of the structures, but
16 we've also provided that additional mitigation to screen the junction for
17 properties on Baker Street through here. In addition, and similarly, we provided
18 an earthwork fund, outside Whitecroft residential home, in order to mitigate the
19 visual impacts through there. There is extensive use of earthworks throughout
20 the junction, with some bunds rising up to 9m high above the surrounding
21 ground level.

22 We thought it might also be useful at this point to talk about views of the
23 junction from the other way, just to show the other ways that we have
24 incorporated earthworks. So here we have Orsett Cock roundabout in the
25 foreground. This picture was taken when there was roadworks being done on it
26 in the past, and you are looking towards the A13 junction with Blackshots Nature
27 Reserve here, and Grays in the background. This image shows how we have
28 used pockets of planting in the pockets between the various slip roads to screen
29 the works, but also how it is majority in cutting and it is particularly clear in this
30 image on the Chadwell link and the approaches coming into the junction, the use
31 of false cutting, which would screen the road from surrounding views.

32 The integration of those earthworks are particularly important, and we
33 wanted them to appear as contextual and tailored to its location as possible. So
34 careful integration of these earthworks is secured through the design principles,

1 S 11.01, which describes how earth bunding should be planted to appear more
2 naturalistic, and S 11.05, which specifically refers to the use of planting to
3 reduce visual impacts and integrate acoustic bunding within the junction. These
4 are in addition to project-wide landscape principles to retain existing vegetation
5 as far as possible and integrate visual screening. Together with the tree planting
6 of the junction, we believe this design has successfully balanced the function of
7 the junction with the mitigation of significant effects. That concludes our
8 response.

9 MR SMITH: So, then, running to our final question there, I'm taking it that it is your
10 submission that the design, as put before us, is therefore the best achievable
11 resolution in policy terms.

12 MS DONNELLY: Yes. Yeah.

13 MR SMITH: Okay. Any final probes from my colleagues before we open this up? Now,
14 looking to those who are here to speak on this item, just as before lunch we were
15 very much south of the river in Kent, we are now north of the river in Essex, in
16 Thurrock. So what I am going to do is I'm going to go to Essex County Council
17 first, then I'm going to come to Thurrock, who as a unitary I'm sure will have
18 most to say, but I will go to the county council first, so can I ask for Essex County
19 Council's observations on this item, please?

20 MR MACDONNELL: Gary MacDonnell, Essex County Council. Given that Thurrock
21 are the highway authority within the area, it probably would, if I may say, be
22 sensible for them to kick off, in terms of response on this.

23 MR SMITH: Okay.

24 MR MACDONNELL: I think that that might also save us a little bit of time, because
25 we'll probably end up supporting some of the points that they make within their
26 submission.

27 MR SMITH: Okay. In which case, let's cut to the chase. Thank you for that offer and I
28 will go to Thurrock, then, first.

29 MR MACKENZIE: George Mackenzie for Thurrock Council. Thank you, sir. Sir, the
30 way that we would like to deal with this, with your permission, is, I'm going to
31 ask Kirsty McMullan, seated to my right, to address you on, effectively, the
32 detail, and when she has done that, I'm going to look behind me and see if any
33 of the other wider team have any other comments to add at the end. But before

1 I hand over to Ms McMullan, I'd like to make two sets of preliminary
2 observations, if I may.

3 The first set of observations concerns the visualisations that we've been
4 dealing with today, and in particular the traffic flow diagrams. We are – firstly
5 we recognise that the applicant hasn't, perhaps, had much time to produce these,
6 and nor have we had much time to digest them. As and when further digestion
7 takes place over the forthcoming weeks, it would be enormously helpful for us
8 to understand precisely what the applicant means by the three different
9 categorisations of connection type. Strategic, major and local. At this point,
10 that's not clear, but we would welcome further clarification of that matter.

11 The second, kind of linked point under this head is we would also like to
12 know whether the strategic connection type shown on the plans are coterminous
13 with the proposed extent of the strategic road network, or not. And then the third
14 point in relation to these documents is this: that at this point today, we have
15 heard, as yet, nothing about public transport, and the way in which public
16 transport modes will circulate around these junctions, and perhaps it's a point
17 that will be addressed later, in writing, perhaps, but it's something that we flag
18 as a concern at this stage. Thank you. So that's the first set of observations to
19 do with these documents.

20 And then the second observation I make is to pick up on a point made by
21 Mr Bedford KC for Gravesham earlier this morning in relation to the access to
22 the 3D models, and so well understand the positioning that the authority has
23 come to, following consideration of effectively the request in relation to the
24 kinetic and dynamic models, and clearly there are practical and wider concerns
25 in relation to that, which we well understand. But what we say would be
26 enormously helpful to have access to, which hopefully avoids all of those
27 concerns are – is access to zoomable PDFs of the entire route. And at the
28 moment the position is that zoomable PDFs have only been provided in relation
29 to specific junctions, but we assume that a full set of zoomable PDFs exists.

30 That's effectively a 2D non-dynamic model, or data set, which we say
31 would be enormously helpful for us to understand at the fine grain level
32 effectively what is going on, and if we can effectively seek access to that data
33 set, we'd be very grateful. So those are my preliminary observations, and at this
34 point, I will, as I said, invite Ms McMullan to address you, if I may.

1 MR SMITH: Mr Mackenzie, just before you do, on that final point about zoomable PDFs,
2 because of course that is essentially through us, prospectively an additional
3 information request that we could make of the applicant, would you like us to
4 take that away and deliberate on it as a procedural decision? And if so, before
5 we do, in fairness to the applicant, we need to hear their position on it, as well.

6 MR MACKENZIE: Yes, of course, sir.

7 MR SMITH: Okay. So I will just flip that back to the applicant. Is there anybody else
8 who needs to speak on it? You don't need to repeat what Mr Mackenzie has
9 said, but before we go to the applicant, is there anybody vehemently opposed to
10 this – the usefulness of this idea or with a different consideration that they want
11 to bring forward?

12 MR BEDFORD: Michael Bedford, for Gravesham Borough Council. No, we're not
13 opposed to that, in the sense that any additional information that enables better
14 interrogation of the visual impacts of the proposal would be welcome, so we
15 would support the request that's been made, but we will in our post-hearing
16 submissions add some further thoughts on other ways in which taking on board
17 the points that you have made and that Dr Wright made about our original
18 suggestion. We will add some additional thoughts in our post-hearing
19 submissions about other things that may hopefully move us forward, as well.

20 MR SMITH: Okay. We have apparently just lost the live stream, so I will just briefly
21 put this hearing onto hold until we can be informed that that has been remedied.
22 And if I could ask for a signal from the technical team in the rear of the room
23 once it's clear that we are able to resume.

24 Ladies and gentlemen, we seem to have service restored, in which case we
25 are returning, after a very brief break, to agenda item 4 and to a discussion,
26 effectively, on a point raised by Thurrock Council about the possible usefulness
27 of zoomable PDF material that might be submitted by the applicant. Now, we'd
28 heard from Mr Bedford, and I believe we had a – Mr Bedford, was your point
29 sufficiently finished? Okay. Ah, it looks as though we are offline again. So
30 bear with us, ladies and gentlemen. As soon as it's known that we are service
31 restored, I will resume.

32 Can I just ask for an update? What are we – what do we think is the -
33 okay, I've just been advised on behalf of the technical team that there is a matter
34 that is taking some time to resolve, so I'm going to call a 15-minute adjournment.

1 So can we resume, please, ladies, and gentlemen, at 3:05 pm, and we will attempt
2 at that point to take a straight run and that may mean we cut out what otherwise
3 would have been an afternoon break. Thank you very much, ladies and
4 gentlemen.

5
6 **(Meeting adjourned)**
7

8 MR SMITH: We're good to go. Excellent, and the relevant [inaudible] slides have been
9 removed from the virtual room. Ladies and gentlemen, Rynd Smith, panel lead,
10 returning to chair this afternoon's session and apologise for the brief and
11 unplanned intermission. Occasionally, digital technology, which does
12 wonderful things for us, doesn't perform quite as well as we would like. It is
13 important that we do try and make sure that those who have relied on the virtual
14 technology are able to be with us to the extent that we can have them with us,
15 and we understand that their participation is now fully restored.

16 So we're returning to agenda item 4 and we were moving into the start of
17 Thurrock's submissions and we were resolving a question about access to
18 essentially one or more Zoom-able PDFs and I'd received various submissions
19 and I believe I was going to go to Mrs Thacker just before we broke, so can I
20 just go to Mrs Thacker? Just before I do go to Mrs Thacker, can I just check
21 that there is nobody else who wants to address us on this point once we've heard
22 Mrs Thacker because I will then put it to the applicant? Good. It's just you,
23 Mrs Thacker.

24 MRS THACKER: Thank you. Jackie Thacker, local resident, opposite Baker Street area.
25 During many of the consultations over the years, I've frequently requested that
26 there be an actual physical model of the project so that the visual impact can be
27 appreciated by the general public, especially those that don't have the
28 technology or the ideas to actually initiate the programme and use it sufficiently,
29 and it's been denied so far. Is there any reason for this, please?

30 MR SMITH: Okay, right. What we're then going to do is we're going to just put that
31 back to the applicant. I mean, essentially, as we understand this request, it would
32 be whether or not the design of the scheme could be resolved into a single – or
33 possibly two or three – Zoom-able PDFs. That would still leave a meaningful
34 amount of data visible to avoid the dilemma that I know we all face, which is

1 running through individual sheet by individual sheet to follow the design. Dr
2 Wright, I'm assuming you're going to respond on this point.

3 DR WRIGHT: Tim Wright for the applicant. So we took advantage in the break to speak
4 to Thurrock Council and understand a little bit more of their ask and we can
5 confirm that we would be able to produce our engineering drawings on a Zoom-
6 able PDF. We will look at doing further of the general arrangements which they
7 also asked for. That may be challenging in terms of the resolution of
8 information, but we will look at that. What I would say is they're going to be
9 quite large drawings, so I think I would ask for a conversation with the case team
10 about the best mechanism to submit these into the process.

11 MR SMITH: Absolutely, because if we're going to accept them – and the reason we've
12 been very [inaudible] so far is that we need to have publishable documents that
13 are downloadables and so therefore the case team needs to be convinced that
14 they can receive them and that they can disseminate them onwards through the
15 examination library. Assuming we can solve those problems, then, yes, it
16 sounds like we have the core of a usable solution on both sides, so Thurrock
17 agreeable as well to that solution. Let's make a target to try and solve these
18 matters by deadline 4 if we can.

19 MR WRIGHT: Tim Wright for the applicant. I'll confirm back to you whether that's
20 feasible.

21 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Much appreciated. In which case, let's return to
22 the substance of this afternoon's hearing and Thurrock Council and the
23 observations that they were going to make on agenda item 4.

24 MS MCMULLEN: Thank you very much, sir. Kirsty McMullen on behalf of Thurrock
25 Council. The applicant has covered all of agenda item 4 in one go, splitting it
26 down into three pieces. There's a lot there to cover. Conscious of time, but also
27 we've got a lot to say. At this stage, we'll have to make a written submission
28 for further detail, but I will go through our points. So in terms of the function
29 of the junction, as Mr Mackenzie said, we are concerned that there hasn't been
30 any mention of public transport or active travel to date, and how road users – all
31 road users – would be able to navigate through the junction, how they would be
32 impacted both in terms of journey time, reliability for public transport services,
33 how they could be impacted in terms of the commercial viability of public

1 transport services, given the congestion and delay that is shown on the localised
2 modelling of this junction that we've been reviewing.

3 I won't dwell on modelling. We'll cover that tomorrow. So we would
4 request that the applicant provides – as well as the submissions that they've
5 made last night – clear evidence in terms of how all road users would use the
6 junction. Turning on to the junction itself, so one of the council's key concerns
7 is that it's clear from those route diagrams that the LTC requires the use of Orsett
8 Cock in order to function and Orsett Cock is part of the local road network.
9 What the modelling is showing is that there would be an increase of 14% in the
10 a.m. peak, 19% in the p.m. peak by 20.45 in terms of traffic increase using that
11 part of the local road network.

12 It was recently upgraded as part of the A13 widening scheme to support
13 economic growth in Thurrock. The council is concerned that the project utilises
14 that recently provided capacity that was intended for Thurrock growth as well
15 as for the growth of the ports, and given the congestion shown within modelling,
16 that it would stifle that growth rather than support it, which is one of the
17 objectives of the scheme. Turning to the other aspects of function, we've raised
18 a number of very detailed road safety points with regard to the design of the
19 scheme, none of which have been responded to by the applicant. They're set out
20 at appendix C, annex 2 of the LIR, which is rep 1284.

21 There are a couple of examples of this that I'll give you. One in particular
22 is the short weaving length between the eastbound approach of Orsett Cock
23 Junction, and it requires vehicles leaving LTC to merge with traffic on the
24 eastbound A13 offslip. That's just to the west of Orsett Cock as they're
25 approaching Orsett Cock. Those two streams of traffic would have to weave
26 over that 90 metre distance on their approach. Both of these links, we
27 understand, are subject to national speed limit while they're making that
28 weaving in 90 metres. This has been raised as part of the modelling work stream,
29 which we can come on to tomorrow, but what we're concerned about is that the
30 modelling has been done in isolation to the design of the junction and they don't
31 actually correspond.

32 So in order to respond to this concern that we've had, the model has
33 extended that weave length to over 200 metres, but that hasn't been replicated
34 and updated within the design of the junction. The next point – one key point

1 that we've raised – is about the actual gyratories, the tight radiuses of some of
2 the movements that have been designed within the junction. Currently, on the
3 A1089 – this is shown in slide 7 of their pack – I don't know if it's easier to get
4 it up – but at present there's a 270 degree gyratory.

5 MR SMITH: Would it be possible to get slide 7 onto the screen, please? Thank you. No,
6 please continue.

7 MS MCMULLEN: That's alright. That's fine. So the A1089 as you're going
8 northbound and you're trying to travel eastbound on the A13, currently, you can
9 see that tight gyratory. So that's the current movement that traffic has to make,
10 including port traffic. There have been lots of incidents of toppling of HGVs,
11 and in order to resolve that, a number of years ago the National Highways
12 implemented a scheme – and you can see it on the ground – whereby there's a
13 maximum 30 miles an hour speed limit.

14 There are signs warning of toppling as vehicles are going around that tight
15 gyratory. What we're concerned about is that effectively that's been mirrored,
16 you can see, just to the north. So on slide 29 – if that's able to be put up –
17 they've introduced another very tight 270 degree gyratory – even tighter radius,
18 we understand – and we don't know – have they sent, in terms of what the design
19 speed is at that part of the junction, how that complies with DMRB standards
20 and what alternative design configurations have been considered.

21 One of the scheme objectives is to improve safety, and we are concerned
22 that the detailed points – they are just two points I've raised – there are a number
23 of points that we've raised – safety concerns and design the junction – that are
24 not being addressed now and they may not be able to be addressed within the
25 order limits at detailed design stage, which we don't have any input to. The
26 accident analysis shows that there is forecast to be eight additional fatalities
27 within Thurrock over the accident analysis time frame of 60 years and an
28 increase of 35 serious casualties. To our understanding, this is the only National
29 Highway scheme that actually increase accidents once the scheme is in place,
30 rather than reduces them.

31 Moving on to the local road network – I've explained about Orsett Cock
32 and that being an integral part of the scheme – fundamentally, we're very
33 concerned that the design has been fixed and it isn't integrated within the
34 modelling. We need that localised modelling and support, kind of what DP

1 World was saying, that we still have a long way to go with that localised model
2 and we can go through it in detail tomorrow, but they need to speak to each
3 other. The design and that localised modelling really do need to speak to each
4 other and we need to have those designs updated to reflect that localised
5 modelling.

6 In terms of the ports, one concern that we've raised a number of times is
7 about Tilbury Link Road. I'll come onto it in a bit more detail under the land
8 take aspect, but in terms of the local refinement consultation that was in May
9 2022, the applicant stated at that time that the new operational access of Tilbury
10 has been designed in consultation with us with future development in mind and
11 helping to involve potential disruptive rework at a later date.

12 So whilst we're talking about this junction in particular, we see in terms
13 of design evolution and option testing, there's a real relationship between
14 Tilbury Link Road and this junction and the ability for Tilbury Link Road to
15 mitigate some of the impacts and harm that are shown and demonstrated within
16 the design of this junction. We've been told and reassured within that
17 consultation – the local refinement consultation – that the operational and
18 emergency access has been designed to cater for that future port traffic, but
19 we've been given no evidence to demonstrate how that could happen in the
20 future without a total rework of the design of that junction, the operations and
21 emergency junction.

22 Going on to the siting and the land take, the junction is extremely complex
23 and usability has been mentioned this morning – we've got real concerns with
24 that – but we have a lot of concerns in terms of the land take that it takes up. So
25 we've estimated that it takes around 112 hectares. It's difficult to try and put
26 that into context, so we've tried to come up with a comparison. So as a
27 comparison, Spaghetti Junction takes up less than 20 hectares. So this junction
28 is effectively six Spaghetti Junctions. We were trying to work out how many
29 football pitches it was, but I'm not very good at football.

30 MR SMITH: And to be clear, that's Spaghetti Junction, Gravelly Hill Interchange, on
31 the M6 in central Birmingham.

32 MS MCMULLEN: Exactly, I shouldn't call it by its [inaudible].

33 MR SMITH: I don't mind it being referred to as Spaghetti Junction. I think we all know
34 about –

1 MS MCMULLEN: Exactly, junction 6 of the M6. So this is six times the land take that
2 is being taken up by that junction, the famous Spaghetti Junction in Birmingham.
3 So we contend that we're still not at the position where we've got localised
4 modelling that is showing what we consider to be severe impacts that need to be
5 addressed with further design iteration and potentially further land take. We're
6 not sure that that can be achieved within the order limits that have been defined
7 by the applicant, but the other aspect goes to design evolution and we're not
8 disputing that there has been an element of design evolution. That's summarised
9 within the application documents. We'd also previously received a summary
10 from Mr Hodge of a design evolution of this junction in May 2021.

11 What we're concerned about is that there hasn't been a transparent and
12 effective way of option assessment, looking at the function of the junction and
13 how that would meet with the scheme objectives. How those different option
14 testing of different permutations of this junction, how they may reduce harm,
15 how they would reduce the impact on the environment, reduce impact on land
16 take. There was mention, I think, by Mr Roberts, about there being 10
17 movements that have been accommodated out of the 16 potential movements.
18 We've seen no evidence of why those 10 movements, why that could not be
19 rationalised to less movements, could be increased to other movements and
20 different option testing could be undertaken with the LTAM model.

21 We're not asking for detailed micro-simulation modelling. So the LTAM
22 model could have been used to look at and to assess different options and
23 movements and how they compare. We asked for this for a long time and
24 eventually the applicant agreed to assess a limited number of options for us. So
25 they are set out. We've done our own analysis of that – quite detailed analysis
26 of that information, those LTAM runs – and they all include the Tilbury Link
27 Road, but different configurations of this junction and different movements and
28 that's set out in detail in appendix B of the LIR, which is rep 1282.

29 Now, interesting, what that shows us is that – based on all of those options
30 – there's no real difference in the relief that's being given to Dartford Crossing
31 compared to the preferred option. They all provide a very similar level of relief,
32 but they have different levels of harm, different levels of land take and different
33 impacts. So what we require – and is missing – is that option testing of this
34 junction so that that planning balance can be considered. The only mention that

1 has been made of this is whereby in – I think it was in response to our LIR,
2 which was rep 1281 – the applicant stated that they’ve used professional
3 judgement informed by the traffic model, rather than undertaking a sequence of
4 detailed models of all possible alternatives as proposed by the council. So that
5 is the only response we’ve received to the assessment that we’ve undertaken.
6 So it is the council’s view that there are alternative junction designs that include
7 the Tilbury Link Road that would better meet the scheme objectives and would
8 reduce the harm in this area and these options should be developed and assessed
9 as part of an integrated alternative option, including a package of supporting
10 sustainable transport measures.

11 Just moving on to the next point, which is – and we’ve got more detail to
12 say about Baker Street, but it’s connected to what I’ve just been saying about
13 this option testing – that we’ve just heard from the applicant and Mr Roberts
14 about the justification for the siting and land take of the junction and how that
15 relates to Baker Street. This goes back to this option testing, that actually it
16 assumes that all of those 10 out of the 16 movements were required. Had there
17 been a detailed assessment and a comparative assessment that was transparent
18 and looked at the different options and the function of this and how that meets
19 the scheme objectives, we may end up with less land take, less movements, a
20 more rationalised junction that may have less harm to Baker Street, so it’s all
21 interconnected with that point.

22 MR SMITH: Can I just explore that very briefly, because when we reached a similar
23 point in Mr Bedford QC’s submissions for Gravesham, I did say, ‘Well, in the
24 best of all possible worlds, you’re saying the scheme would not proceed, but
25 then if we’re looking at restructuring, reframing, redesigning this junction’ –
26 essentially, in a nutshell, he said, ‘Don’t fiddle with it,’ whereas I take it that
27 your submissions are very opposite to that.

28 MS MCMULLEN: Very opposite, yeah.

29 MR SMITH: It is your principal submission that the scheme will not proceed. However,
30 if it does, you think there are a broad range of distinctly still mitigable adverse
31 effects that you would urge upon the applicant as needing to be addressed.

32 MS MCMULLEN: Precisely.

33 MR SMITH: Yes, and it’s in that sense that you are pushing us towards the idea that you
34 would like to see further option appraisal.

1 MS MCMULLEN: Mr Stratford would just like to add a few comments on Baker Street,
2 but I think I've covered the main points that we wanted to make on this junction
3 and we'll put the rest in writing.

4 MR SMITH: Indeed. Well, Mr Stratford, just wait until you have the microphone and
5 then the rest of the room can hear you.

6 MR STRATFORD: Chris Stratford for Thurrock Council. Thank you. I want, perhaps
7 on behalf of the residents of Baker Street, to make an emotive plea, if anything,
8 but the significant construction impacts at Baker Street are quite well
9 summarised by the applicant in their community impact report, which is ap. 549,
10 and if I can just summarise what they might be, and if you could maybe put
11 yourself in the position of a Baker Street resident. Baker Street will be closed
12 several times in different locations for five years – five years – south of the A13
13 for road realignment. 10 months in – well, the time period is less relevant – but
14 for 10 months, there are utility modifications for seven months, weekends for
15 bridge works and for alignment changes.

16 There is also a range of access restrictions, traffic, bus, pedestrian, cycle
17 diversions for various periods. Bus journey times would increase on affected
18 routes, and there would be – presumably – noise and air quality and cultural
19 heritage effects as well. Now, that's the situation as explained by the applicant.
20 Now, two years ago, we were given a very interesting presentation by the
21 applicant about different ideas they might have for how to treat Baker Street
22 after this is all finished. They were interesting ideas. There was a whole range
23 of ideas about parking provision, enhanced cycle provision, enhanced pedestrian
24 provision, planting, traffic calming – a whole range of things – and we never
25 heard anymore.

26 So then when we found out about all these construction effects, we then
27 said, 'Well, okay, let's go back, please, and find out what you want to do,' and
28 the applicant has unilaterally and wholly taken the decision to do nothing. So,
29 in other words, Baker Street residents – which arguably are probably the worst
30 affected – get no legacy, they get no enhanced mitigation. They get basic
31 mitigation, or what might be called embedded mitigation, certainly. So if a
32 footpath is shut, it'll be diverted, but nevertheless, at the end of it, it's just a
33 reinstatement job, it's nothing else, and we believe this is unacceptable, and as

1 Kirsty has mentioned, there might be other options that would lessen the scale
2 of impact. That was it. Thank you.

3 MR SMITH: Thank you very much.

4 MS MCMULLEN: Sorry, I just wanted to raise two very quick points before I finish, if
5 that's okay, sir. One was a further request for information in terms of – as well
6 as the public transport and active travel and the routes through the junction, if
7 we could have diagrams – we think it would be very helpful – that shows the
8 elements of the network that are strategic or the elements of the routes that are
9 part of the strategic road network and local road network, as opposed to the
10 diagrams that have been provided to date, and then the only other aspect was
11 that Mr Roberts – when we talked about the south of the river – alluded to the
12 fact that the design philosophy of the junction to the south of the river has been
13 different to the design philosophy and the approach taken to this junction, and
14 we're not sure if that's been answered in terms of what that difference was.

15 MR SMITH: Okay, well, the applicant obviously is going to respond globally to all of
16 the submissions on this point. I'm then just going to check. Mr Mackenzie,
17 does that conclude submissions for Thurrock?

18 MR MACKENZIE: George Mackenzie for Thurrock Council, sir. Yes, thank you. I
19 believe it does.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you. In which case, I am going to offer Essex County the
21 opportunity to come back on this before I check who else in terms of the
22 statutory parties wishes to speak and then –

23 MR YOUNG: Can we ask a few questions on what you've said?

24 MR SMITH: Yes, pardon me. Apologies, just before I release you, Mr Mackenzie, and
25 your team, Mr Young.

26 MR YOUNG: Dominic Young, panel member. Just to clarify, so it's clear in my head,
27 Thurrock's position on this. You're arguing that one of the big drawbacks of
28 the A13 injunction is the lack of a direct connection to the A1089, but then on
29 the other hand, you then seem to suggest that we ought to be taking more links
30 out, so I'm a little bit confused. You're sort of criticising for not providing that
31 one link that it hasn't provided, and then you're suggesting that we could be
32 taking even more links out, and I just wondered, if we are taking more links out,
33 could you be a bit more specific about what those would be, that the applicant
34 might be able to respond to those?

1 MS MCMULLEN: Kirsty McMullen on behalf of Thurrock Council. I would point
2 towards the study that was undertaken in appendix B of the LIR, rep 1282. What
3 we're saying is that there was a huge amount of land take with this junction and
4 we are concerned that there isn't a sound evidence base for the junction design
5 and we haven't seen that option testing. So we are not necessarily saying that
6 certain movements need to be taken out or added in; we're saying that evidence
7 hasn't been put before us. We have done four option tests and we've
8 summarised those within appendix B and we've recommended that two of those
9 should be explored further based on our analysis, and off the top of my head –
10 I'm trying to remember which two they were –

11 MR YOUNG: You can send it in writing.

12 MS MCMULLEN: Yeah, that's fine.

13 MR SMITH: Excellent, okay. Anything further?

14 MR YOUNG: No.

15 MR SMITH: In which case, I'm going to move back to Essex County Council, so...

16 MR MACDONNELL: Thank you. Gary MacDonnell on behalf of Essex County
17 Council. I'll keep it relatively brief. There are a lot of points raised there by
18 Thurrock. There are three that we support and would absolutely like to see
19 further information brought forward on. First of them is around active travel
20 and public transport. The current documentation is almost silent on those
21 matters throughout and a lot more could be done and could be brought forward
22 around that, in our opinion.

23 We absolutely share the concerns that Thurrock have expressed this
24 afternoon around the increase in traffic movements and increase in congestion,
25 noting that that is likely to have an adverse effect within the Essex County
26 Council network as well, so we absolutely share that concern, and finally, the
27 Tilbury Link Road, we all understand why that was removed from the scheme.
28 However, it is short sighted and there is an opportunity there for the scheme to
29 be so much better if that was just reinstated back into the scope of the project.

30 MR SMITH: Clear and succinct. Any questions from the remaining local authorities?
31 My working proposition has been that nobody south of the river wants to speak
32 on this item, but I will just briefly check whether London Borough of Havering
33 – it's a long way from their territory – whether they might wish to...

1 MR DOUGLAS: Daniel Douglas, London Borough of Havering. We've got no
2 comments to make on this particular item, sir.

3 MR SMITH: Okay, and I will make the same quick check with Transport for London for
4 the same reason.

5 MR RHEINBERG: Matthew Rheinberg, Transport for London. No further comments
6 from us on this junction either. Thank you.

7 MR SMITH: Okay, thank you very much, which then takes us – noting that we have no
8 parish councils represented north of the River Thames to the statutory parties.
9 Can I just see by show of hands on screen or in the room whether any of the
10 ports – Port of Tilbury, London Limited, London Gateway or Port of London
11 Authority and the Port of Tilbury – wish to speak? I do see Alison Dablin for
12 Port of Tilbury. Mr Shadarevian, are you...?

13 MR SHADAREVIAN: I'm grateful, but nothing more from us today.

14 MR SMITH: Nothing more from you today, so I'm going to go to Ms Dablin then.

15 MS DABLIN: Thank you. Alison Dablin for the Port of Tilbury. This junction is fairly
16 key in terms of the Port of Tilbury's concerns. The junction in its present design
17 – we've considered the function and the design of the junction and our
18 conclusion is that it will have adverse effects in respect of providing access to
19 the Port of Tilbury and Tilbury 2. Three out of four connections to the A1089
20 southbound are indirect, all of which necessitate a route via the Orsett Cock
21 junction.

22 This includes the removal of the existing direct connection from the A13
23 westbound, which leads to a net disbenefit in relation to access, and in addition,
24 the proposed rerouting via the Orsett Cock junction induces congestion and
25 substantial delays at the junction and any vehicle movements through the Orsett
26 Cock roundabout lead to an increase in journey times due to the congestion, as
27 well as the additional journey distance through routing to and from the east via
28 the A13.

29 Inevitably, this will result in unreliable travel times, disruption and
30 uncertainty for port users. One thing that we did note in the applicant's
31 submissions as to the considerations as to the design of the junction was that
32 they didn't mention considering the connectivity of an access to the ports as one
33 of the main considerations, although this is what is provided for in government
34 policy in the form of the port's NPS.

1 We agree with the submissions of Thurrock and Essex that the removal of
2 the Tilbury Link Road is short sighted and the view of the Port of Tilbury is that
3 there are significant mitigation benefits – in respect of the issues surrounding
4 the A13/A1089 LTC junction – that the mitigation is provided by the simple
5 expedient of providing the Tilbury Link Road or, as a minimum, a ‘Tilbury Link
6 Road ready’ solution. We’ve provided more detail in that respect in our written
7 representation.

8 In terms of the Orsett Cock roundabout itself, transport consultants have
9 suggested that there are a number of improvements that could be made to help
10 mitigate the impacts of the A13 LTC junction on the Orsett Cock roundabout,
11 including an additional lane on the eastbound slip, signalisation of the A128
12 approach, which is from the north, an additional lane southbound and
13 northbound on the overbridge section, signalisation of the A1013 approach and
14 signalisation of the Brentwood Road approach, which is from the south.

15 In terms of access to the port generally, it is currently accessible by road
16 only via the A1089, which is a single point of failure, and it was very interesting
17 to review the slides this morning to note that there are three slides that show the
18 connection from the A1089 onto the Lower Thames Crossing, noting that this is
19 the same route as both on slide 5 as a strategic connection, slide 10 as a local
20 connection and slide 30 showing access from the Port of Tilbury, and yet, when
21 you consider what is clearly an important route in reverse, the connection from
22 the Lower Thames Crossing to the A13 is at best on slide 9, a major connection
23 though this stops before the Orsett Cock roundabout and does not proceed to the
24 A1089.

25 And in fact, the only slide showing how one connects from the Lower
26 Thames Crossing to the A1089 is that of slide 32, which shows what is an
27 extraordinarily convoluted route that adds significant amounts of distance
28 beyond what a direct connection would require and also a significant amount of
29 distance beyond what would be needed were a Tilbury Link Road in situ. I don’t
30 wish to go into too much detail as to the traffic modelling at this point. However,
31 I did note that Dr Wright made some submissions before, I believe, the first
32 break, suggesting that the benefit to the Port of Tilbury is reduced congestion on
33 Dartford. He then provided some figures showing the amount of use that would
34 nevertheless be made of the extremely convoluted route to connect from the

1 Lower Thames Crossing to the A1089, suggesting that this shows that it isn't
2 going to be particularly well used.

3 We would argue that that is not what those figures demonstrate. We would
4 suggest that what it instead shows is that despite the routing being so convoluted
5 with the additional distance and the additional complexity, the desire to use the
6 Lower Thames Crossing to connect to the A1089 is so desirable – and it makes
7 sense as it is the reverse of what is a key strategic route – that even with the
8 additional distance, the induced delay and the congestion at Orsett Cock, it is
9 still preferred by some users – likely those to the southeast – to utilising the
10 Dartford Tunnels.

11 Now, in our response to deadline 2 submissions, we did some initial high
12 level review of the data that had been provided, which suggested that up to 7%
13 of all traffic on the Lower Thames Crossing travelling from the south –so
14 travelling north – would seek to connect with the A1089, and from the
15 submissions of Dr Wright today – and some early playing with the figures – it
16 looks like that could in fact amount for a significant proportion of the traffic that
17 is going to be utilising the Orsett Cock junction.

18 So the Port of Tilbury strongly supports the submissions made by
19 Thurrock, that a Tilbury Link Road represents a significant mitigation for the
20 problems that are inherent in the current design of the A13/A1089 LTC junction
21 and for these reasons we have been seeking to find solutions whereby even if
22 the Tilbury Link Road is not brought forward within the Lower Thames
23 Crossing scheme, a plug and play solution can nevertheless be secured in order
24 that the legacy value of the Lower Thames Crossing scheme is fully realised to
25 the greatest extent that is now possible. That concludes my submissions. Thank
26 you.

27 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Ms Dablin. Right, let us then move on. I believe
28 that's brought us to the end of statutory parties who expressed a wish to speak
29 on this item. Do we have others present in the room? And I do see TCAG, Ms
30 Blake, but just let me check around and Mr Beard. I'm going to go to TCAG
31 first and then I'm going to go to you, Mr Beard. So Ms Blake, the roving
32 microphone is yours.

33 MS LAURA BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. Laura Blake, Chair of Thames
34 Crossing Action Group. Just a few quick points. Hopefully not going over

1 anyone else's comments too much. I'd like to start by saying when we were
2 actually looking and National Highways were telling us about the impacts of this
3 junction on the local communities, there was no mention to the travellers site.
4 They are part of our community. They are part of our group that we represent.
5 So the fact that that wasn't even pointed out, considering the close proximity to
6 the junction to the travellers site, I think is something that I just wanted to bring
7 up, and I think I'd be doing my job as Chair if I didn't represent that part of our
8 community by mentioning it.

9 Secondly, the comment about the fact that it would be the preferred route
10 for port traffic and A1089 traffic to use the M25 rather than the long route that
11 would be the alternative option. Just to touch on what other people have said by
12 the fact that if that's the case, why are we also progressing with the Tilbury Link
13 Road as another needed road? And also the fact that would the M25 Dartford
14 Crossing really be realistic as an alternative, considering that we still believe it
15 will be over design capacity, and if the applicant is talking about taking it back
16 to journey times of 2016, in 2016 it was already over capacity.

17 We were already suffering, so why would drivers – especially professional
18 drivers accessing the port on a regular basis who know the history of that road
19 and experience it on such a regular basis – be looking to take that route? So we
20 don't feel that that is adequate. Also, we note that the routes shown at this
21 junction completely have missed the point of the fact that whilst they try and sell
22 the benefits of this project – of the local communities having benefits from it –
23 where were the routes that show us how locals in Thurrock could connect to the
24 LTC? They've avoided it because they don't want to have to show the fact that
25 we'd have to go via the Stanford detour – as we know it – going down the A13,
26 up and around the roundabout, down at the A1014 Manorway Junction and come
27 back to access it.

28 All of the places we're looking on in the local vicinity that are impacted
29 the greatest are not going to have access. That's obviously not to say that as a
30 group we support this project in any way; we don't want it. However, I just want
31 to highlight that up there and also, the other thing that I don't feel has really been
32 mentioned to any extent is the fact, as with south of the river, there's no actual
33 inclusion of how traffic will migrate when there are incidents – not if, but when

1 there are incidents – at the Dartford Crossing and there are not adequate
2 connections at this junction to fulfil that.

3 If, for instance, there's an incident at the QEII bridge and traffic comes off
4 the M25 onto the A13, it would have to go down and take the Stanford detour to
5 come back to get on the LTC. If instead it actually came off the M25 onto the
6 southbound LTC, that's five lanes of M25 traffic at that point going onto two
7 lanes southbound, and alternatively, if there was an incident at the Dartford
8 Crossing and the traffic comes down the A2, not only has it got that one single
9 lane bottleneck to get through, then when it comes up, if it wants to go
10 westbound on the A13 again, it has to come up and go round the Orsett Cock as
11 a U-turn. So there are many different examples of why that is missing the
12 adequate links. Thank you.

13 MR SMITH: Okay, thank you very much, Ms Blake, and then finally, Mr Beard.

14 MR BEARD: Robin Beard, local resident. I've already made my opposition to this
15 particular junction clear in the open floor hearings a couple of months ago, and
16 I submitted what I think was quite a compelling case against it back in July, but
17 I'm sure you don't want me to reiterate the points I've already made.

18 MR SMITH: Absolutely not, no. Apologies, but those points were clearly made and we
19 have them on board.

20 MR BEARD: Okay, well, just based on what I've heard today, I do have one or two
21 additional things that I'd like to say, because we heard from the applicant – they
22 said that part of the reason why they chose this particular location for the
23 junction is because they wanted to provide access to the A1089, but we've just
24 heard that most of the links to the A1089 involve going via the Orsett Cock
25 roundabout. So even though they did build the junction at this location, they
26 haven't really provided very good access to the A1089, and I believe that they
27 could have provided better access than that if they built the junction somewhere
28 else.

29 We've also – where is it? Yes. I don't think that they chose this particular
30 location because of the A1089 at all. I think they chose it because the original
31 goal of the Lower Thames Crossing project was to try and reduce congestion at
32 the Dartford Crossing, and if you want to do that, it makes sense to build a new
33 crossing somewhere nearby so that all the vehicles that are queuing for hours at
34 the Dartford Crossing have got an alternative route that they can take somewhere

1 within easy access and if you look at the early designs for this junction, they had
2 slip roads that were going to and from the west – connecting to the A13 – which
3 makes sense.

4 All the cars and lorries from the Dartford Crossing would be able to come
5 along the A13 and use this crossing instead if Dartford was too busy, but back
6 in 2016, I think it was, they changed the design of this junction and got rid of
7 those west facing slip roads. Now, I asked them why they did that at the time
8 and they said that they'd run a computer simulation – back then – and the
9 computer simulation told them that connecting to the west here via this junction
10 would be a bad idea. I can't tell you why. I wish I'd asked them to go into more
11 detail, but I didn't. But anyway, that's what I was told back then.

12 However, if you look at the documents that have been submitted as this
13 DCO just recently, they don't mention a computer model. They say that one of
14 the reasons why they did not provide access to and from the west is because
15 there wasn't enough space at this location. Now, they must have known when
16 they changed it in 2016 that there wasn't enough space because they wouldn't
17 have changed it otherwise surely. So at that point, they should have recognised
18 that building the junction here was not a good idea and they should have looked
19 into building it at other locations. That's what I did and that's why I came up
20 with my alternative just down the road, but when I pitched my alternative to
21 them in 2018, I think it was, they said to me then that they didn't have the
22 authority to change the location. Once this location at Orsett had been chosen,
23 it was set in stone and they were lumbered with it essentially.

24 They didn't use such injudicious language, but that was the impression
25 that I got, so they might make the case that they deliberately chose to build it
26 here because it was the best place to provide access to the A1089, but I'm not
27 convinced. I think they chose to build it here because they originally wanted to
28 connect it to the west, so as to reduce the congestion at Dartford, and then when
29 they found out that they couldn't do that, they had to build it here anyway
30 because it was too late to build it somewhere else and, if that's the case, then it
31 doesn't say much for this particular junction because I'm sure they've done their
32 best under the circumstances. But you can't have a good junction at a bad
33 location, and that's, I think, all I want to say.

1 MR SMITH: Mr Beard, thank you very much. So I believe that then brings us to the end
2 of submissions on this agenda item, other than, of course, the applicant's right
3 of response, where again, I will remind them of their ability to deal with all
4 matters of detail in writing. So, again, Mr Tait, to the highlights, please.

5 MR TAIT: Certainly just the highlights, sir. We well understand that and just by way of
6 preface, before bringing in Dr Wright on those seven or so highlight points, as
7 well as Mr Roberts, one point was made that there are certain matters not
8 mentioned in the presentation – the travellers' site, for example, or public
9 transport. It has of course been a highly condensed explanation and we will refer
10 to all the places in the submission material, where those matters are picked up,
11 and we'll deal with that in writing.

12 MR SMITH: Indeed and in doing that in writing, it will be very useful for us because
13 one of the matters that we're giving very careful consideration to is the nature
14 of the agendas for potential additional hearings in both October and November,
15 and I think, when we're talking about a broad range of topics from impacts in
16 relation to the traveller community, right the way through to active travel and
17 transport, we are not yet finalised on the question of what we will further
18 examine orally. So that's something that we're giving careful consideration to
19 as well. Over to you then.

20 MR TAIT: Dr Wright.

21 DR WRIGHT: Dr Wright, for the applicant. So there were a number of points that I'd
22 like to pick up, starting with some signposting, though I have quite a large
23 number of references here, so I think a lot of them will be better provided in
24 writing afterwards. But just a flag on public transport, we do set out the impacts
25 in the transport assessment and then we talk about our position on future use of
26 the scheme for transport, in the statements of common ground and the response
27 to Thurrock Council's local impact report. All of those references we'll provide
28 in writing afterwards, including IDs and section references, so that that can be
29 found. Similarly, on active travel, we talk about the impacts in the transport
30 assessment and also the HEQIA, but we talk about our overall position and what
31 we provide in terms of active transport in the planning statement, and we respond
32 of specific concerns from Thurrock Council in the statement of common ground
33 and the response to the local impact report, and again, we'll provide those
34 references.

1 In terms of Tilbury Link Road, I think we've stated our position a number
2 of times, so I won't reiterate that here, but there was a particular point that was
3 picked up on whether the design is suitable for use for a future operation, and
4 again, a signposting. We've set out our position in the statement of common
5 ground under item 2.1.167. Again, we can provide that in writing afterwards,
6 essentially setting out that, because of the uncertainty of what might need to
7 connect in future, we cannot give a categoric answer on that until such time as a
8 firm proposal is brought forward for what the Tilbury Link Road might be,
9 notwithstanding that National Highways continue to develop the Tilbury Link
10 Road as a separate project.

11 In terms of the extent of the road network, and particularly the strategic
12 road network versus the other highways in the area, I wanted to draw attention
13 to the classification of road plans, which set out the nature of the highway, the
14 road that we proposed to designate as strategic road network and the road that
15 we be proposed to designate as other highways, and to note that, where no
16 designation is shown on that map, that indicates no change is proposed to be
17 made to the current designation. But perhaps that would be helpful as a source
18 of information there.

19 I then wanted to come to three more in principle positions and just put
20 forward our perspective on this. So the first one really relates to the benefits of
21 the project in relation to Thurrock Council and in relation to the performance of
22 the A13 junction. Our economic appraisal does show that there's significant
23 economic benefits that accrued to Thurrock through the development of the
24 Lower Thames Crossing, and those are reflected by the better connectivity that
25 we provide to the ports in terms of their access and out onto the network, and in
26 terms of where we don't provide additional connectivity by the more freely
27 flowing routes that they used due to the removal of such significant congestion,
28 as has been referred. So our view is, on Orsett Cock roundabout, yes. We
29 acknowledge that we do increase the traffic that's flowing through that, but a
30 large part of that is traffic that is rising from the growth within Thurrock Council
31 and serving the delivery of growth within Thurrock Council.

32 In terms of casualties, the reference was made to the number of casualties
33 with the scheme. The reference made was correct, but there are a substantial
34 number of re-routed journeys and, as we have been very clear in our application,

1 there is an increase in the number of total kilometres travelled by people, arising
2 as a result of the new journeys the scheme makes possible. If you measure the
3 casualties on a per kilometre basis, we see a fall and a reduction in the number
4 of casualties.

5 In terms of safety, I just want to turn to my colleague, Mr Roberts, who I
6 think has something to say on the safety matter. This is in relation to the radii
7 and the [inaudible].

8 MR ROBERTS: Mr Roberts, for the applicant. So with regards to the safety concerns at
9 the A13 junction raised by Thurrock Council, I can confirm that those concerns
10 were received in writing by the Lower Thames Crossing design team. As part
11 of our design process, we're required under the design manual for roads and
12 bridges section GG-119[?] to undertake an independent road safety audit at
13 different stages of the scheme design. So preliminary design, which is the basis
14 of our DCO submission, we're required to commission a stage one road safety
15 audit, which we did, and we shared with the auditor team the concerns raised by
16 Thurrock Council. They were provided to the audit team. The outcome of the
17 audit was then shared back with Thurrock Council. We, as a design team, are
18 required to provide a designer's response to the audit, which we did, and we also
19 shared that with Thurrock Council. So that is the position that we are at today.

20 MR SMITH: In terms of the consequences of that, if I can just be clear for the panel, it's
21 therefore your underlying or remaining position that that design as submitted to
22 us is therefore satisfactory in audit terms, and therefore you believe that there is
23 nothing more that you would do to it to achieve a satisfactory safety
24 performance.

25 MR ROBERTS: That is correct, sir.

26 MR SMITH: Okay. Right, so, Dr Wright, I take it you're not finished.

27 DR WRIGHT: One last that I wanted to come back on, which was Mr Beard's comments
28 on the development of the scheme, and I would like to say that we have
29 continuously monitored and ensured that, as we develop the design of the
30 scheme, that it suits the purpose that it's meant to fit, and so I wanted to basically
31 say we were not in a fixed position after preferred route announcement, that
32 despite having made an announcement, we were no longer able to progress the
33 scheme that we wanted to. This is the scheme that we wanted to progress. It
34 serves to provide the connectivity to the A13 through to the A2 that is needed to

1 relieve the Dartford Crossing, and we're satisfied that the scheme we brought
2 forward is the appropriate scheme and not high-bound by a previous decision.

3 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, I do see Mr Taylor of the Examining
4 Authority has a question.

5 MR TAYLOR: Yes, please. Ken Taylor, panel member. It's a question for the applicant,
6 really. We heard from Thurrock Council a suggestion that you provide similar
7 slides, that we've been looking at today, but for other users, so for users other
8 than for vehicles, and so just wanted to have an understanding of the feasibility
9 of that, because it's something that could well be a helpful additional pack of
10 documents. The public rights of way –

11 MR SMITH: – and NMUs. Yeah.

12 DR WRIGHT: Dr Wright, for the applicant. We produced some public rights of way
13 plans that were submitted at deadline three, and I think in the first instance it
14 would be good to review those and identify whether there's any further
15 requirement beyond that. Thank you.

16 MR SMITH: Yep. Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very conscious of the passage of
17 time, that we lost some time this afternoon to unanticipated disruption, so I think
18 it's worth just briefly reviewing where we are. We have agenda item 5, which
19 must proceed. I think it's very important that we do that the same honour as we
20 have agenda items 3 and 4. Agenda item 6 – again, it would be very useful if
21 we could get to the end of that by the end of today. Agenda item 7 can rest on
22 the table and be a matter that we return to in subsequent hearings, unless
23 anybody has a burning observation, that they have come here desperately for
24 that and nothing else and that they would be terribly disadvantaged by us not
25 proceeding with that orally today.

26 So that's going to be my proposal, that we deal then with agenda items 5
27 and 6, but we allow ourselves to return to agenda item seven at a later hearing,
28 to deal with the loss of time that's happened this afternoon. Is everybody content
29 with that? I'm not seeing any hands raised and I will just check with my
30 colleagues as well to see if everybody's content. Okay. That gives us a target
31 to meet.

32 If we then look at proceeding into agenda item 5, at risk of delaying us
33 even further, I am going to suggest that we do take another 15-minute break
34 because, although there has been disruption, we have been in session for a very

1 long time. I think people's thoughts, people's participation will be more focused
2 if we come back refreshed. So I'm going to suggest that it is now approximately
3 4.15, that we resume at 4.30, and that is when we take agenda item 5, which
4 means we will sit on past 5.00 p.m., I'm afraid, ladies and gentlemen. But I
5 think in these circumstances it's worth our taking the steps necessary to complete
6 the remaining elements of the agenda, so returning at 4.30.

7
8 **(Meeting adjourned)**
9

10 MR SMITH: It is now 4.30, my name is Rynd Smith, panel lead, and we are returning
11 to issue-specific hearing number 3 at the start of agenda item 5. We all know
12 what we are now doing. I'm going to turn to Mr Tait and ask him to bring us
13 through this material.

14 Now, before you do, Mr Tait, I will make clear that our expectation is that
15 we won't take quite as much time with this item as we have with the other two
16 main items, not to diminish the importance of this particular intersection, but it
17 is simply a smaller and more limited intersection design.

18 MR TAIT: That's correct, sir, yes. We will be speedier on this. So turning to item 5,
19 M25/LTC intersection, starting with Mr Hodge, and this is obviously the last
20 segment where there is the additional material pursuant to your procedural
21 decision. Mr Hodge?

22 MR HODGE: Hi, sir. Right, I'll just take you through the visual representation for the
23 M25 and LTC interchange, and it's obviously in the same format as we did
24 previously. So I will go to the first slide. The actual keys and everything are
25 also the same. So the first strategic connections that we've got are the LTC
26 northbound going to the M25, and then we've got the existing M25, which
27 comes through the junction and connects – remains on the M25. Southbound
28 M25 to LTC comes down and it just comes off on the spur at the bottom of the
29 slide, and the existing M25 just goes through, so there's no other strategic
30 connections in that. So the only other strategic connections we've got are from
31 the A127, both southbound onto the M25 and also the northbound connection,
32 and then we've got the opposite, coming from the A127 from the east, which
33 goes northbound and southbound.

1 Then, if I just add in the major connections which we've got coming from
2 the M25, you can go westbound onto the A127 and you can also go eastbound,
3 and then in the opposite directions, you can come southbound on M25 and go
4 eastbound and also go westbound.

5 So this takes me just to show where the local roads are, so we've got
6 Orpington Road towards the bottom of the slide; St Mary's Lane – they're the
7 key roads that cross the M25 at this location.

8 So if I now go to the tracking, moving the slides, I'll do the existing first,
9 which is M25 to M25, and then if we have a look at that with the scheme there
10 is no change. If we go to the M25 to the A127, existing, you can see that the
11 connection to the A127 on the M25 is towards junction 29 at the top here, and
12 then that's the reverse route.

13 If we go to with the scheme, there is a difference here. What we've had
14 to do in this location, because junction 29 on the M25 is close to this connection,
15 we've had to put another parallel link road on the west side of the scheme
16 because we haven't got enough length on the main line to accommodate the
17 weaving, so what it means is that any traffic coming up the M25 northbound has
18 to come off in between the point where the Lower Thames Crossing joins the
19 M25 and connects onto this connector road, which then joins into junction 29.
20 So that means that anybody coming up the M25 wanting to get off at the 127
21 would have to come off at this point. They could not now get off at the – because
22 we've removed that connection.

23 Then that just shows in the other direction, going southbound. We have
24 also, at the junction 29 put dedicated left turns on the northbound off to the A127
25 westbound, and from the A127 eastbound, southbound onto the M25. That
26 shows the key routes at that particular junction.

27 MR SMITH: Thank you very much.

28 PARTICIPANT: Roberts next?

29 MR SMITH: Indeed, same pattern as before.

30 MR ROBERTS: Mr Roberts, for the applicant. Is that sound coming through?

31 MR SMITH: You're a little faint. If you could possibly...

32 MR ROBERTS: Mr Roberts, for the applicant.

33 MR SMITH: That's better. Thank you.

1 MR ROBERTS: Sir, I'll take the usual pattern with my three points: connectivity to
2 achieve scheme objectives, maximising scheme benefits, then existing
3 constraints, and then achieving a safe layout compliant with relevant standards,
4 and my colleague here has just put a plan on the screen to help if we need to
5 orientate ourselves at any point.

6 So firstly, in terms of connectivity, quite simply at the M25 tie-in, we're
7 proposing relatively straightforward connection with north-facing links only, so
8 it's not an [all-movements?] junction. Turning to constraints in this area, a
9 significant constraint is the Upminster and Grays branch railway, which you can
10 see on the plan is orientated in a north-west/south-east direction. As Mr Hodges
11 explained, we wanted to bring the junction as far south as possible to give us the
12 best merging/weaving length with the M25, but we wanted to avoid having to
13 cross the Upminster and Grays railway twice, as it would require us to do, and
14 indeed cross the M25 as well, so hence we've sited the junction just to the north.

15 In terms of geometry and compliance with standards, what we're seeking
16 to achieve here is a suitable horizontal radius to bring the road around and under,
17 and importantly we're trying to minimise the impact of this location by going
18 underneath the M25, and we're balancing the horizontal radius to tie back into
19 the M25 and minimise land take, but also not have the crossing under the M25
20 too skewed. We could have a tighter radius at this point, but that would mean a
21 more skewed angle of the structure under the M25, which would be complex to
22 build and possibly more disruptive as well.

23 So those are the main points that we considered with the siting and the
24 land take for this junction. I think now I'm going to turn to my colleague, Ms
25 Donnelly.

26 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Ms Donnelly?

27 MS DONNELLY: Clare Donnelly for the applicant. Okay, so once again, I'm going to
28 talk you through some of the key mitigations at this site, examples of these.
29 Unfortunately, for this junction, I don't have one static image that we visualised
30 all the way through the different stages of design evolution, so I'm just going to
31 have to talk you through a little bit more the context for each of those.

32 Okay, so the context for the M25 junction – so this is a view taken to the
33 south of the junction, and we're in an area which we call Ockendon Open
34 Farmland, which is predominantly arable land looking north upwards to what's

1 called Thames Chase Forest, which is on the higher ground towards Upminster
2 and Brentwood. Obviously, key features of this landscape in this photograph
3 are the north/south route of the M25 and the railway line, which you can see at
4 the crossing point here.

5 Our design at statutory consultation is shown here, and by the time we've
6 got to this point, as my colleagues noted and described in the project design
7 report part G, which is referenced at 514, many of the significant moves to
8 reduce the visual and noise impact had already been made between preferred
9 route alignment and statutory consultation. Crossings above the M25 and the
10 railway line were removed, with all slips moved to the east of the railway line,
11 and the northbound A13 to M25 slip now going underneath the M25 instead of
12 over it.

13 Therefore, and having reduced those impacts, we were free to pursue our
14 general strategy of reinforcing the junctions and screening them with tree-
15 planting. This was particularly appropriate in this location, as we have – I'll just
16 go back again, you see slightly on the horizon – the Thames Chase Forest, which
17 is in this – can you see my cursor? Okay, great – which is in this location on
18 this image.

19 In the development – we haven't really talked about the development and
20 people and movement around any of these sites, but I would like to touch on it
21 for the development of our landscape proposals in and around the M25 junction.
22 This is a slide from the Green Infrastructure Study, which is submitted as part
23 of the planning statement, appendix H, application reference 503. This
24 highlighted several third-party strategies and projects for improving green
25 infrastructure in the immediate area of Thames Chase Forest Centre. One move
26 was to improve forest links between pockets of forest woodland north up to a
27 more extensive area of forest planting in that higher ground I pointed out.

28 Another was to link routes east/west to what they call the forest loop and
29 out into the Mardyke Valley. This connectivity had previously been stymied by
30 both the M25 and the railway line, which creates a degree of severance east/west
31 across the landscape.

32 The works to the junction at the M25 junction 29 raised an opportunity for
33 the applicant to act in accordance with the national policy statement, which
34 notes: 'The government expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in

1 infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities
2 and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking.’

3 So I’m going to take you back now to another view. So this is a view
4 slightly further north – it’s as existing of the one I saw you before, we’ve just
5 moved north on the M25. The railway line is through here, and you can see
6 Thames Chase Forest Centre, which is bisected by the M25. The only crossing
7 of that forest centre is by a culvert at the northern extent through here. Therefore,
8 we sought to provide structures and routes around the junction that addressed
9 the historic severance, as well as that created by the new A122 through the
10 provision of a new footbridge that connects both halves of Thames Chase Forest
11 Centre, and you can see it in the proposals here.

12 Other landscape mitigation practices we looked at were the provisions of
13 extensive areas of forest planting going back to that aspiration to link those
14 woodlands of pockets all the way up to junction 28 – is it 28? 29, sorry, of the
15 M25, but I am going to talk about junction improvement works at that northern
16 extent of this junction as part of agenda item 6.

17 Extensive earthworks once again were also used within the area to screen
18 the junction from surrounding receptors, and similarly to the A2 junction, we
19 modified our strategy of tree-planting, this time in response to a landowner
20 request from [Mr Mi?], who requested that this pocket here be retained as a
21 hayfield, so we have just put our tree planting to the edges of that.

22 Other key mitigations we have chosen in order to safeguard existing
23 vegetation within Thames Chase Forest Centre include much steeper
24 embankments than we have elsewhere, which have allowed us to reduce our
25 construction footprint and retain as many of their trees as possible.

26 That was going to be how we concluded that item, but we would like to
27 return to the item on the integration of structures within the junction, for which
28 I’m going to return to Mr Roberts.

29 MR SMITH: Yes, Mr Roberts.

30 MR ROBERTS: Mr Roberts, for the applicant. So with your permission, we actually
31 think it might be best, given the time, to wrap that into agenda item 6, and we’ll
32 cover it then.

33 MR SMITH: Okay, fine.

1 MR TAIT: It's a general point that also came up under item 4 about sufficient design
2 resolution. It might be easier just to bring it all together under item 6.

3 MR SMITH: By all means. Okay, so Mr Tait, does that lead you to the end of your...

4 MR TAIT: That concludes item 5 from our...

5 MR SMITH: Okay, now in terms, then, of who wishes to speak on item 5 for the
6 assembled interested parties, from a local authority perspective, quick show of
7 hands, who wishes to speak? We have Thurrock and then we have Essex County
8 Council. Can I just check to see if we've got London Borough of Havering as
9 well wishing to speak on this item? I believe you are online.

10 Right, well in terms of the best and most logical order to do this, because
11 it's shared spaced, isn't it? Some of it's Thurrock; some of it's Havering. Is any
12 of it actually directly in Essex? Apologies for...

13 MR WOODGER: Mark Woodger, Essex County Council. Yes, is the straightforward
14 answer to your question. It is, sir, and you're right to assume that this junction
15 is probably not quite as complex as some of the ones that we've discussed today,
16 but nevertheless it is a really important junction, because every motorway has to
17 start somewhere and finish somewhere, and if there's congestion either side it
18 has an obvious effect on the function of the road network itself.

19 But yes, some of it is. The spur that goes to the western side of the M25
20 and then down to the county boundary, which is probably about 500 metres south
21 of the railway line – of the main east coast railway line that runs parallel with
22 the A12 – is in Essex, so we think that's really important. But we've made our
23 comments in our local impact report, and I don't necessarily wish to repeat those
24 today again because of time, but what I would like to say is in response to Mr
25 Jung's comments today about our representation at the LIR, which is your
26 reference REP1226, in that we've requested that the southbound of LTC is
27 increased to three lanes, and this morning I believe you said did the parties have
28 any evidence to back that up, and the answer is that we do not, but what I would
29 say to you as the Examining Authority is that in my lifetime, I've never seen a
30 motorway reduced in size; I've only seen motorways that are increased in size,
31 so therefore, to me, it suggests that if you had a two-lane motorway, there is
32 potential to extend it to three, and if it's not done here, then what's the best place
33 to put it from public money to do that? So that's my only comment.

1 Also, to add to this, there is the added complication to not necessarily the
2 strategic highway network, but also the local highway network in relation to the
3 relationship between Lower Thames Crossing and Brentwood Enterprise Park.
4 Brentwood Enterprise Park, as you know, and you will see when you go on site,
5 is to the south-west of the M25 A127 junction, and this would preclude access.

6 Just to let you know that we're still in discussions with National Highways
7 and Lower Thames Crossing and Brentwood Borough Council, with the idea to
8 rectify any issues that you have and try and make sure that access is safeguarded,
9 and we would update the Examining Authority in due course, at various
10 deadlines, when we reach that decision. Thank you.

11 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Anything further to add for Essex? No.

12 MR WOODGER: Mark Woodger, Essex County Council. No, sir, thank you.

13 MR SMITH: Thank you. In which case, I am then going to go to London Borough of
14 Havering and then I will come to Thurrock at the end. So, London Borough of
15 Havering, please.

16 MR DOUGLAS: Good afternoon, sir. Daniel Douglas, London Borough of Havering.
17 I just wanted to start off by reiterating the council's formal position on the
18 project, just so everyone's aware of that. So, as has been stated in our written
19 representation and in our Local Impact Report, the council does support the
20 crossing in principle, and we have done for some time. That said, the council
21 does continue to have a number of concerns around the impact the project will
22 have on the local area and on our residents, and those issues will be aired during
23 hearings and through our written representations.

24 In terms of the particular junction that's being discussed under this item,
25 a few points I wanted to make. One is the issue of severance and the impact that
26 the northbound LTC road, as it goes underneath Ockendon Road on towards the
27 northbound stretch of the M25, will have on Upminster Cemetery in our
28 borough, which is located just to the west of where the new LTC road is going
29 to be located.

30 Upminster Cemetery and South Essex Crematorium, as we've set out in a
31 lot more detail in our Local Impact Report in section 9 – that's REP1249, so I
32 won't go into too much detail on it – other than to say it's the eighth busiest
33 crematorium in the country, and we have 3,000 cremations annually there, and
34 as it currently stands, Ockendon Road, in order to accommodate the scheme

1 elements, most notably that northbound lane that I've just referred to, will be
2 fully closed for a maximum of 10 months just around where the road goes over
3 the railway line. Now, whilst that's a reduction from the 19-month closure that
4 the applicant was initially stating – and we do welcome that reduction – from
5 our perspective, it's still too long.

6 Furthermore, around 17% of cremations at the crematorium come from
7 the north-east or the east of that site, and most likely will use Ockendon Road to
8 access it. So there's a real concern, from Havering's point of view, of our ability
9 to perform our statutory function in terms of running that crematorium over that
10 closure period, and there's also a real concern around the emotive and emotional
11 impacts that closure is going to have on grieving families either coming to visit
12 graves of loved ones or trying to attend funerals and cremations.

13 We are continuing to talk to the applicant about that particular point, and
14 we're looking to have a discussion with the appointed contract for the northern
15 section of the route – Balfour Beatty – in the next few weeks to try and see if we
16 can find a way to reduce that closure further.

17 The other point I would want to make about this particular junction is, as
18 it goes through the Thames Chase site onto linking up with the M25 northbound,
19 that is an area of designated open space in Havering's local plan, and again,
20 further detail of that can be found in our Local Impact Report. The applicant
21 has put forward replacement open space lands towards the north of that existing
22 site and towards the south-west, which is welcome, and the overall net-gain for
23 Havering in terms of open space replacement, compared to loss over the entire
24 route – because there's a bit of open space further north that we're going to lose
25 – we are thankfully going to get a bit more back than we're going to lose, which
26 is also welcome.

27 But the point, I guess, I do want to make is in our local plan, policy 18,
28 open space and recreation, where open space is to be lost, it has to be replaced
29 at equivalent or better standard, and that comes onto the point about accessibility
30 to it. So the area of open space towards the north of that junction – and I expect
31 we'll go onto this maybe in item 6, around [Hole Farm?] – there's a real issue
32 around how we access that site, which is still outstanding. So I won't go into
33 any more detail on that on this item, but I did want to actually make that
34 particular point.

1 The other points that I want to just touch upon were: representatives have
2 been made earlier on in this hearing around the issue around traffic modelling
3 around junctions that have been discussed and the challenge of getting an
4 understanding around how junctions operate at a local level and the lack of
5 information that there's been, in some cases with regards to that. We've raised
6 similar concerns with the applicant around the impact this scheme is going to
7 have on our local road network, particularly where the junction is and how that
8 impacts on junction 29 further north, and then on some of the roads to the west
9 along the A127.

10 The applicant did carry out some local junction modelling at our request,
11 which was welcome. Ourselves and Transport for London had concerns about
12 the ability of that modelling that's been produced to get us the clarity that we
13 need, because flows, to be put into that model, were taken from the LTAM
14 strategic model that National Highways have produced, so Havering and TfL
15 undertook our own local modelling work, and that's been submitted to the panel
16 at deadline 1, and that's REP1247, so I won't go into any more detail on that,
17 because that's already been submitted, but that does highlight where Havering
18 feels there is going to be an impact on some of our local junctions.

19 The other point I wanted to make, and it kind of follows on from Mr
20 Woodger's comments from Essex County Council earlier about the southbound
21 road from the M25 being currently two lanes, compared to three, as it was
22 originally proposed. In terms of the southbound road being two lanes, that isn't
23 a matter that Havering's specifically objected to. However, we do recognise
24 submissions from Brentwood Borough Council around the lack of the strategic
25 model that National Highways have produced, including some of their forecast
26 growth, particularly the Brentwood Enterprise Park, and I think that's
27 particularly important when trying to understand what the overall impact is
28 going to be of the southbound Lower Thames Crossing lane being two lanes as
29 opposed to three.

30 Those are the main points that I wanted to make, but I'll just invite my
31 colleague, Lee, to add anything in further if he wants to.

32 MR WHITE: Thank you, Mr Douglas. I mean, I think you've covered all the points
33 quite thoroughly there. I think some of the other matters we've got will fall into
34 item 6 at a later date, as you say. I've got nothing more to add, sir. Thank you.

1 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. In which case, then, can we move directly to
2 Thurrock.

3 MS MCMULLAN: Thank you, sir. Kirsty McMullan on behalf of Thurrock Council.
4 Just one quick point. It was interesting to hear Mr Roberts say in discussion
5 with the design iteration of this junction that the weaving length had been
6 maximised on the approach to the M25. Obviously, when we were discussing
7 the previous junction in item 4, I was raising concerns with weaving length, and
8 the response that we received was that, 'There's been a safety audit, we've
9 received a safety audit.' What we would like is to have – what we haven't
10 received is – I'm assuming the safety audit's been done of this junction as well.
11 It would be helpful if we could have the brief that was provided to the auditors
12 with the departures of standards for this junction and the A13 LTC A1089
13 junction so that we can get to the bottom of this weaving and the discrepancies
14 between weaving lengths, that one's maximised and one's very short, so that we
15 can then understand it from a safety perspective in terms of two different parts
16 of the scheme and how they've been dealt with in different ways. Thank you,
17 sir.

18 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Anything else to be brought out from Thurrock or
19 are we done? Okay, well now then, looking at the statutory parties, before going
20 onto anybody else, I note there is no hand, but I did just want to check with
21 Transport for London if they are still present. Oh, I do see Transport for London.

22 MR RHEINBERG: Thank you, sir. Matthew Rheinberg, Transport for London. Just a
23 quick check from me, really, whether our issues are associated with junction 29
24 and whether you would like to cover those here, or under item 6(b), I guess.

25 MR SMITH: Yes. I think ideally 6(b), if you don't mind waiting on.

26 MR RHEINBERG: That's fine by me.

27 MR SMITH: Because I think we would like to wrap this particular item up together if
28 we can. So moving on, then, to any other statutory parties who wish to speak
29 on this particular intersection. I don't see it as necessarily one for either of the
30 ports or Port of London Authority, and we've got no interested parish councils
31 here. So then, if I can move to the rest of the room, I do see Thames Crossing
32 Action Group. Is there anybody else? Have we got a Mr Wharton on screen?
33 Well, I will go to Thames Crossing Action Group first, so Ms Blake.

1 MS LAURA BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. Laura Blake, Chair of Thames
2 Crossing Action Group. Just a few quick points to make – just showing on the
3 impacts that were presented there, I noticed there was no mention of Cranham
4 Solar Farm, that would be demolished if the LTC goes ahead. For a road that’s
5 professing to be the greenest road at the built, to actually destroy a solar farm in
6 the name of environmental mitigation should be noted. Also, the fact that
7 Thames Chase community involved a lot of planting by the community as a form
8 of compensation for the M25 when it came through.

9 So the fact that that’s now being impacted again by another road project is
10 something that volunteers there aren’t too impressed by, and also just touching
11 on the fact we’ve heard about the closures of Ockendon Road on the
12 crematorium, but also the impact that would have on routes to schools. A lot of
13 children use that route to go to school with a bus service going through there,
14 which would involve a long diversion, and that would impact the times you’re
15 closing a large percentage of a child’s school schooling time, and that obviously
16 has impacts on them having to get up earlier, getting home later, so making them
17 a lot more tired and less concentrating at work.

18 Just finally, I know we’re going to jump onto the bits in between the
19 junctions in the moment, but I just think I’d like to say a note of all three of the
20 junctions that we’ve seen today. Every single one of them has had restrictions.
21 Every single one of them has problems, and I think, on behalf of my group, I
22 would just like to say that I think that just stresses the fact, this is the wrong
23 crossing in the wrong location. Thank you.

24 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now I am going to move, with no further ado, to
25 Mr Wharton, who is an associate director for transport for Bellway Homes
26 Limited. Mr Wharton.

27 MR WHARTON: Thank you, sir. I’ll keep it reasonably brief. We have made
28 representations for Bellway Homes through the written reps at various different
29 stages. Bellway Homes have a land interest in the first parcel of land the Lower
30 Thames Crossing is proposed to pass through, but as you move to the east from
31 the M25, just to the bottom right of the screen, as you can see below, effectively
32 the Lower Thames Crossing severs the land into two parcels – a larger southern
33 parcel and a smaller northern parcel. Bellway has been promoting the land at
34 south Ockendon since 2018, as part of the emerging[?] Thurrock local plan.

1 During this time, a number of very positive meetings have been held with
2 planning officers at Thurrock Council, who have been supportive of the
3 approach we have taken to date. They've also intimated to us that the site is
4 likely to be allocated for a housing-led, mixed-use development, when the
5 preferred options, through reg 18 consultation, as published later on this year.

6 We are close to entering a planning performance agreement with Thurrock
7 Council to assist with the delivery of the development and we consider that the
8 future development of the site is an important material consideration for the
9 LTC. Bellway Homes considers it is reasonable that the planning conditions are
10 imposed on the LTC, that require detailed design to be tested and reviewed
11 against Bellway's emerging masterplan, to establish agreed detailed design to
12 ensure Bellway's scheme is not prejudiced, and both schemes can provide huge
13 public benefit.

14 I'll very briefly summarise the consultation that we've had to date with the
15 applicant. With regards to the technical impacts of the LTC route, our
16 representations have been set out in deadline 1 reps, dated 18 July. We
17 acknowledge that the applicant has responded in document 9.53, which is rep 1-
18 312. Subsequent to that response, a meeting has been held between Bellway
19 Homes and the applicant team to further resolve the areas of concern. Whilst
20 the discussions are positive and ongoing, there is no statement of common
21 ground between the parties. As a result, our representations regarding noise
22 concerns of the LTC on the development site, the drainage implications,
23 particularly of the northern parcel of land severed by the LTC, concerns over the
24 permanent land take associated with a public right of way network on North
25 Road, and requests and requests to minimise easements and consultation zones
26 of utilities, diversions or replacements are still outstanding.

27 We're expecting to continue to liaise with the applicant on these matters
28 in due course, to see confirmation of the extensive impacts and to minimise the
29 effects the LTC may have on the development quantum of a key site within
30 Thurrock Council as a major local plan. However, we felt it was important that
31 we bring these matters to your attention in this forum and that's it. Thank you
32 for the opportunity to speak.

33 MR SMITH: Thank you for that contribution. Is there anybody else wishing to speak
34 from the assembled interested parties? I'm seeing no further hands, either online

1 or in the room, so I'm going to return this item to Mr Tait for the applicant's
2 response, and again, in the normal way, detailed in writing, please, Mr Tait.

3 MR TAIT: Sir, it'll all be detailed in writing, I think, on this occasion, having regard to
4 the time as well.

5 MR SMITH: I'm grateful. In which case, let's move on to agenda item six, which is
6 going to be the last substantive item today. So again, we know what we're doing.
7 We've asked the applicant to lead on the questions on the paper as identified.
8 So, if I can move to Mr Tait, and ask him to introduce the applicant's
9 submissions on these items, please.

10 MR TAIT: Thank you, sir, and it'll be Ms Clare Donnelly who will be talking to this.

11 MR SMITH: Okay. Ms Donnelly.

12 MS DONNELLY: Okay. So, Ms Donnelly, on behalf of the applicant. Let me just get
13 to the right slide. Okay. So we've taken, in response to this question, three
14 different instances of mitigation on the three links between the junctions. Our
15 overarching strategy for the mitigation design between the junction is one that
16 we call landscape-led. By which, we mean it responds to the specific context
17 and characteristics of each place through which the project passes, unlike the
18 junction strategy, where we've done the same thing, but it's been the same
19 response. It's generally been quite heavily wooded treatment around each of the
20 junctions.

21 This has underpinned several project-wide approaches. So while we have
22 used planting and earthworks to screen the road from view wherever possible,
23 and contextual, which includes the extensive use of false cuttings along each
24 of the embankments, we have tailored these so that they sit well within the local
25 landscape character. For example, we have used planting that does not
26 necessarily reinforce the linearity of the alignment of the road, and instead
27 responds to local and natural features, such as block planting at field woodlands
28 and other natural features in the landscape. This approach extends to other
29 elements of the road works, for example through the provision of naturalistic
30 landscape and drainage ponds, as secured by the design principles.

31 So the first example I'm going to use today is going to be everything from
32 the north of Thong Lane. We're back down in the south of the alignment. The
33 A2 junction is behind us, but we're still looking north towards the river in this
34 location. It's a very narrow crossing here between the edge of Gravesend and

1 the village of Thong. The character area that we defined here is called Chalk
2 Sloping Farmland, which then falls down via Shorne Marshes to the Thames.
3 The A226, which is broadly along this line here, broadly separates those two
4 character areas. As noted previously, we also have to either side of us, those
5 with hilltops. I think an important part to note about this particular part of the
6 alignment as well is that we have recreational amenity in the form of Cascades
7 Leisure Centre and the now redundant Sun Valley Golf Course.

8 So at statutory consultation, as we noted earlier, we already had the
9 provision of a narrower green bridge. I think it's also important to note that
10 between preferred route alignment and our proposals at statutory consultation,
11 the portal, which you can see glimpsed here at the back, had already moved
12 600 metres north, to reduce our impacts on the image of Thong. But most, as
13 you can see of the road has been in cutting. However, the fact that the portal
14 was right up against the A226, did lead to a severance impact between Chalk
15 and Gravesend East, which we attempted to resolve at this stage of the design
16 through footpaths, which you can see – foot bridges, which you can see here,
17 which were very high above the cutting.

18 Between statutory consultation and supplementary consultation, the portal
19 was moved a further 350 metres further south. This would help reduce, once
20 again, the impacts on Chalk and Gravesend East. It also allowed better
21 recreational links between Gravesend and Shorne Woods via a new,
22 semi-natural, open space, which we call Chalk Park, which also provides
23 essential mitigation for the works. While shortening the cutting also reduced the
24 volume of excavated material produced as part of the works, Chalk Park also
25 makes beneficial use of these cutting materials to provide a wooded hilltop park,
26 appropriate to this local typology, with views out and over the estuary, which
27 also helped to mitigate the project's traffic impacts during construction.

28 Further refinement was done post supplementary consultation to reduce
29 the impacts of utilities on surrounding properties, so if you could just draw your
30 attention to these two properties here and the location of the pylons. This
31 allowed us to retain those properties in place and reduce our land take, and as
32 noted previously, we had removed and refined the locations of our ponds to
33 avoid archaeology that had been found further down valley. We also refined the
34 pattern and type of tree planting, increasing the wooded blocks and trying to

1 break up the linearity, as I say. So we've gone for patches of planting, which
2 don't draw attention to this cut through the landscape and hopefully integrate it
3 successfully into its context. Shall I move on to the next –

4 MR SMITH: Yes. Do, please. I think we'll proceed through your sections and then I'll
5 open it up to the rest of the interested parties.

6 MS DONNELLY: Okay. Alright. My second example is what we call the Chadwell
7 link, which is between the Northern Tunnel portal and the A13 junction. We are
8 at the moment we're overlooking Linford and East Tilbury, towards West
9 Tilbury. Important things to note are the link at Muckingford Road through here,
10 the Tilbury Loop railway line – obviously we're looking towards the river
11 through here – and also Hoford Road, which is noted as a protected laneway,
12 which is a sunken character and nature with a wooded corridor. I think another
13 important landscape character feature of note through here is the Chalk
14 escarpment through in this area, where we have a slight rise to the land and that
15 forms a – there's a scrub, woodland ridge shallow valley, which goes along this
16 line through here.

17 Up to the design of development between preferred route alignment and
18 statutory consultation, focussed also on making sure optimising the alignment
19 so that we avoided as many of these lines of pylons, which you can just see in
20 this image as well, which would have greatly increased the cost and disruption
21 during construction, should we have had to realign or cross them. The resulting
22 alignment, if I show you – so this is our design at supplementary consultation
23 and to orient you, this is the Tilbury viaduct crossing over the Tilbury Loop
24 railway line. It comes down and enters into cutting. It goes underneath a new
25 green bridge on Muckingford Road and then continues down through here and
26 then under another green bridge on Hoford Road.

27 The treatment of the landscape in this particular area through here shows
28 what we mean by landscape-led. Our planting follows the existing topography
29 of that Chalk escarpment and the shallow valley, rather than trying to reinforce
30 the linearity of the road by planting right up to it. We've planted [scrub
31 woodland?] within the valley, which also has the benefit of linking pockets of
32 woodland at Ashen Shaw and Rainbow Woodland. Other key mitigation
33 measures in this area are also – we have managed to provide new areas of open

1 mosaic habitat, with the idea of trying to link habitats along the alignment and
2 provide pockets for that invertebrate mitigation.

3 The green bridges are Hoford Road and Muckingford Road are key
4 elements of mitigation. They're required for ecological purposes, but also to
5 improve the user experience, particularly for walkers, cyclists and horse riders
6 who are transitioning and trying to make those east-west routes. The design of
7 those was further developed and refined as we approached DCO with further
8 and more detailed planting arrangements to help screen the new road and provide
9 boundaries along its alignment.

10 I will then move on to the Ockendon link, which is between the A13 and
11 the M25 junctions. Okay. So this is the Orsett Fen character area. It's
12 characterised by long views across a flat landscape in the Mardyke valley. This
13 is the Mardyke running through the site, through here. A little bit like the M25,
14 I'm afraid I don't have a lovely, consistent image. I can take you through all the
15 stages, but I will try and orient you as we go. This view is once again looking
16 north and you can see a higher ground around Brentwood and the Thames Chase
17 areas in the distance. Much of this area is in flood zone three, and it is one of
18 the last remaining areas of fenland that was drained and is now in prime
19 agricultural use, but you can see through some of the damper areas through here
20 that it's still a fairly wet landscape.

21 The alignment running through this area is elevated approximately
22 8.5 metres above and surrounding ground level, as we're in flood zone three. So
23 we're on viaduct and embankment throughout this area. If I go then to the next
24 slide – so you'll have seen the slide before as part of the Thames Chase item.
25 Whilst we've made extensive use of false cut elsewhere in the project, the flat,
26 open character would make that incongruous and landscape earthworks are not
27 permitted in the flood zone. Therefore we needed to take a more contextual
28 approach to the design of the foregrounding views for our new viaduct. The
29 Essex Wildlife Trust had identified restoration of the wetland landscape as an
30 aspirational project, which we have found through the Green Infrastructure
31 Strategy. So you can see here Bulphan Fen and Orsett Fen identified as potential
32 projects by them for future rewetting. This very much helped inform our
33 mitigation proposals.

1 At supplementary consultation we show – sorry. This is the different view.
2 This is as existing, slightly tighter in, and the Mardyke is now running in this
3 orientation through here. I will go back. At supplementary consultation we
4 showed the viaduct passing through a wetland landscape, created largely by
5 altering the drainage regime and creating scrapes with some blocks of woodland
6 planting, to break up linearity of the road alignment. I’m going to go back to
7 our old existing view, and show you again. Then finally, our design at DTO
8 moved on considerably. Through a process of stakeholder engagement, it
9 became clear that the water vole habitat mitigation, previously located close to
10 the Thames was – its location was at risk of tidal flooding. We’re looking for a
11 new location for this.

12 The Mardyke valley, with its wetland character, was the natural location
13 for this new habitat creation. The new habitat also works well with the flood
14 design, acting as floodplain compensation. Other watery aspects of the design
15 – the project drainage ponds – were refined to minimise their land take and
16 integrate them into the existing field pattern of the area. So these were the
17 existing field boundaries, and so the ponds were split and put either side of the
18 road to fit in with that. As noted, while this mitigation provided appropriate
19 foreground setting for the viaducts, it’s exposure in the landscape makes the
20 design of those viaducts, and the preservation of views under and around it,
21 particularly important. It was for this reason that the Mardyke and Orsett Fen
22 viaducts were designated as Project Enhance. Okay. So that’s part of the
23 alignment choices. The M25 is item 6(b).

24 MR SMITH: Indeed.

25 MS DONNELLY: Go straight to that?

26 MR SMITH: Go straight to that and then, as I’ve indicated before, I’ll move directly to
27 the interested parties who wish to speak on all of the items, and then we’ll, I
28 think, move through them as efficiently as we can, given the time.

29 MR TAIT[?]: Yes, sir, and then a very concentrated answer to a sufficient design
30 resolution. She touched upon that briefly, and Project Enhance structures. I’ll
31 come back to this.

32 MS DONNELLY: Apologies. I have skipped over –

33 MR TAIT[?]: Ms Donnelly, propose the M25 design.

1 MS DONNELLY: Okay. Alright then. So now we're looking at improvements around
2 junction 29 of the M25. These works sit quite firmly in the Thames Chase
3 Woodland character area of the work and we have pockets of ancient woodland
4 in and around the junction. Also a note in this particular slide is the site through
5 here, which is the site of the Brentwood Enterprise Park application at the
6 moment. At statutory consultation, our proposals were shown like this and here
7 you can see the free-flowing slips that were designed in and around the junction.
8 That was particularly important for us, and an important consideration, because
9 previously, though it could not have been considered safe, walkers, cyclists and
10 horse riders have been coming across the junction on the south side and crossing
11 these slip roads, in order to be able to take journeys east to west.

12 At supplementary consultation, as with our junctions at the A13 and the
13 A2, we sought to try and refine the design and pull those slip roads in, tightening
14 up the alignment and trying to reduce our impacts in these particular locations.
15 I'll just flick in and around for these through there. I think an important point
16 then – once we had identified this issue with the east/west movement, it became
17 important to identify opportunities to remedy this severance. So that was made
18 through the introduction of two footbridges. I'm afraid I'll have to zoom out
19 because they're actually quite far-spaced[?] around – one in the east, at
20 Brentwood Enterprise Park and one in the west. These have the benefit,
21 combined with crossings on the northern side of the junction, of allowing people
22 who are walking or cycling along the A127, who have been able to cross to the
23 north side, pass through the crossings, come along here and then pass through
24 the south side, improving the historic severance created by the A127 as well.

25 At the moment there is an at-grade crossing on the A127, which I've used,
26 and it's a bit hairy. So I think this is particularly important improvement. I think
27 there are some secondary benefits of providing this too. You'll notice on here,
28 as part of our ancient woodland compensation measures, we are proposing to
29 infill blocks of woodland up and down the Thames corridor, linking to the new
30 community woodland being created. That whole farm is a combination of
31 ancient woodland compensation and NDEP[?]. This bridge through here,
32 connecting as it does up through Folkes Lane, improves access to those new
33 areas of woodland from Thames Chase all the way up to the new woodland at

1 Hole Farm, via the other bridge, which is just off the north. That concludes my
2 main presentation. Moving to structures –

3 MR TAIT: So, Mr Roberts, very briefly on design resolution for the structures in the
4 various locations we've looked at.

5 MR SMITH: Yes. Just before we move on, Ms Laver had a question on that last
6 submission.

7 MS LAVER: Yeah, thank you. Jeanine Laver, Panel member, speaking. While we've
8 got that slide on and we've got the Brentwood Enterprise Park shown, their reps
9 have suggested that your footbridge impacts a potential bridge as part of their
10 planning application. I'm wondering if, while we're here with this slide, I know
11 that you've put in a change request for a change to the limits of deviation for
12 that, and I don't want to talk about that specifically. I just want to understand
13 with this slide what the implications are for the planning application for their
14 proposal for a bridge.

15 MR ROBERTS: Steve Roberts, for the applicant. I'll try and summarise quite a
16 complicated picture in –

17 MR SMITH: Very brief – time.

18 MR ROBERTS: So we've had very good, active engagement with the landowner, the
19 developer, St Modwen, Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council,
20 and we continue that engagement. We've looked at the scenarios where the
21 Brentwood Enterprise Park is brought forward before Lower Thames Crossing
22 and what that might mean for amending our design to be compatible with theirs,
23 and equally, in the eventuality that Lower Thames Crossing goes ahead before
24 Brentwood Enterprise Park, or if one or other doesn't happen. So we're trying
25 to cover off all bases and ensure that the infrastructure provided is mutually
26 beneficial and not overlapping.

27 MS LAVER: I've got a follow-up on that. Your bridge proposal is for just walkers,
28 cyclists and horse riding – yes – but their proposal is for a traffic bridge. I recall
29 reading, possibly in the St Modwen submission, why would we have two bridges
30 here? Would we not just build one bridge that serve two purposes? I don't know
31 if it was in their representation that I read that, but I'm wondering if you could
32 just explain what the implication would be for two bridges across the A127.

33 MR ROBERTS: Steve Roberts, for the applicant. It's a question of timing on when
34 which comes first. So what the St Modwen development team are proposing is

1 that if their application comes forward first, then they wish to construct a new
2 vehicle access over the A127 into Brentwood Enterprise Park, and then they
3 wish to repurpose the existing bridge that crosses the A127 at that location as a
4 dedicated bridge for walkers, cyclists and equestrian users, and in that
5 eventuality, the Lower Thames Crossing bridge proposal would not be required,
6 and there's quite a detailed design principle which covers this. I'm just being
7 handed a reference – design principle – S1422.

8 MS LAVER: Thank you, that's really helpful. That's what I thought would be the case.
9 I realised there was a timing issue. Their representation did suggest that.
10 Obviously, it's who comes first, but I wanted to understand if your bridge
11 essentially fell away and you've just given me that answer, so thank you.

12 MR TAIT: So staying on now, Mr Roberts, you're going to deal with sufficiency of
13 design resolution for the structures in general.

14 MR ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr Tait. Steve Roberts, for the applicant. So very quickly,
15 reaching back to agenda items 4(c) part 2 and 5(c) part 2, which ask, 'Is there
16 sufficient design resolution for the structures at the junctions?' Essentially, they
17 were asking there. Our response to that question is essentially, yes. We believe
18 there is sufficient design resolution. Let me explain why.

19 Firstly, the preliminary structures designs are set out in the various DCO
20 application documents, but most notably the project design report, part F, which
21 is application document 513, and the book of plans which cover the engineering
22 drawings for the structures, which is application documents 043 and 044. So
23 with regards to bridges generally, and I'm going to pass back from Ms Donnelly
24 here in a second to talk about Project Enhance structures, but structures generally
25 – the key technical parameters and constraints for each bridge were developed
26 in accordance with the design manual for roads and bridges, and other relevant
27 standards, to establish structural options and space-proofing requirements for
28 each. These reports investigated different span arrangements, common forms of
29 construction materials and options we'd[?] develop, which were reasonably
30 conservative and use normal span to depth ratios and limitations on skew angles,
31 etc, to give some tolerance for the detailed design development.

32 Deck widths for each bridge have also been extensively reviewed, with
33 respect to design for both vehicles, non-motorised users, and in the case of green
34 bridges, planting zones, and as a result we have included specific space-proofing

1 requirements within the design principles, which is application document 516.
2 So overall, to summarise on general structures, the primary features of the
3 preliminary design for each structure in its location, the scale and the massing,
4 including headroom clearances, have been resolved to what we believe is an
5 appropriate level of detail for this stage of design, but maintaining a degree of
6 flexibility to allow final details on structural form, materials and appearance to
7 be developed by the contractor teams, who themselves will bring industry,
8 expertise, best practice, such as design for off-site manufacturer, low carbon
9 innovations, etc, and their detail designs will be guided by the design principles.

10 Then turning, if I may, to the Project Enhance structures – so I'm going to
11 quickly outline where we have what we consider to be Project Enhance
12 structures, and then, Ms Donnelly will explain a bit more about what they are.
13 So in the south, between the A2, the M2 junction and the southern tunnel portal,
14 we have two Project Enhance structures. That is the Thong Lane green bridge
15 over Lower Thames Crossing and the southern tunnel portal structure. Moving
16 into the north, at the north tunnel portal on the A13, we have the north tunnel
17 portal structure and the north portal access overbridge, and then we have also
18 the Fen and Mardyke viaducts and finally the Thames Chase footbridge in the
19 very northern most section of the route. I'll hand over now to Ms Donnelly to
20 explain a little bit more about Project Enhance structures.

21 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Ms Donnelly.

22 MS DONNELLY: Thank you. I think it's important to note, and when we're talking
23 about Project Enhance structures, that it's not only the Project Enhance
24 structures that we care about in terms of design quality. There are a number of
25 design principles in the structure section of the design principles document that
26 cover all structures. That includes bridges, retaining walls and then other
27 structures along the alignment, such as STR01, which requires a landscape
28 integrated approach to structures along the project route, STR07 requiring a
29 consistent approach to bridge structures, and that includes a common materials
30 pallet for all of them. STR09, which talks about the integration of noise barriers,
31 and STR17 which looks to ensure that we don't have bolt-on utility structures
32 on our bridges in the future – that that is all designed and consistent as part of
33 the approach upfront.

1 It has to be said, though, in the development of our contextual proposals,
2 we did identify certain bridges which we felt were particularly sensitive. Sorry
3 – bridges and structures, because we do include the portals – and in the PDR
4 part F, section 3.3, we note that these are at particularly sensitive locations or
5 key thresholds along the project route, and that means essentially as you enter
6 the A122 from the north and the south, when you're on the main alignment,
7 having got past the junction – so we have designated therefore in the north
8 Thames Chase a footbridge as the first Project Enhance structure you enter from
9 the north, and Thong Lane north green bridge, as you enter from the south. The
10 portals themselves are obviously very key thresholds in the project, marking that
11 transition as you go into the tunnel and under the river, and associated with the
12 north portal, the access bridge in such close proximity and the design and
13 composition of the approach roads and ramps make it important that that one
14 was also designated a Project Enhance structure.

15 I believe I also addressed the reasons why the Mardyke and Orsett Fen
16 structures were designated as Project Enhance structures in our previous
17 response. There are a number of different requirements for Project Enhance
18 structures, that they have an even more consistent approach, that they feel like
19 they're a part of an overall consistent design language for the project, as well as
20 location-specific requirements. So, for example, structures 04, which is about
21 the Mardyke and Orsett Fen viaducts. It talks about having a smooth, curved
22 and haunched beam profiles, and that really is about making sure that you get
23 views underneath the viaduct. So we're maximising those because, as I said
24 previously, the main character of that area is those long views across the flat
25 landscape to the higher ground beyond.

26 Similarly, Thames Chase – we wanted to have this idea that you would
27 have the footbridge spanning between these two pockets of woodland, that being
28 the overriding character, and therefore we have asked that there'd be no primary
29 structures –

30 MR SMITH: I'll just interrupt very briefly. It has become a little distracting that there's
31 a side conversation happening on the Thurrock benches, I'm afraid. If there's
32 any means of enabling that to continue using electronic media, that would be
33 massively appreciated because I think we do need to move through this material

1 quite swiftly, which includes hearing it accurately. So, apologies for
2 interrupting, Ms Donnelly, but I will return to you now.

3 MS DONNELLY: I was very near the end. Just to make that point that we have a number
4 of, as I say, completely structure-specific design principles for those Project
5 Enhance structures, as well as the project-wide approach. They complement
6 those. They're not singled out. It's not only those ones where we're going to
7 want the quality of good design, and I think through this calibrated approach,
8 the design that we've presented and the design will go forward should achieve
9 the high quality we're expecting in the future. Thank you.

10 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, I'll just check with my colleagues whether
11 there are any other matters that they wish to pursue. Yes, Mr Pratt.

12 MR PRATT: Good afternoon. Ken Pratt, panel member. It's only a very quick question
13 regarding the various presentations that you've made today, and I just want to
14 check with regard to the drainage impact, the drainage channels and ponds that
15 you've illustrated. Your intention is to have them natural looking, or – because
16 many of them in today's presentations are looking very engineered.

17 MR SMITH: Natural form water channels then or –

18 MS DONNELLY: Sir, I will say, when we talked about design resolution at preliminary
19 design, we haven't fully naturalised these ones, and we have put that in a design
20 principle. I'd need to find the reference that we're asking and expecting the
21 contractors to do more work on the naturalisation and the appearance of those
22 ponds post DCO.

23 MR SMITH: Okay. We will consider it further. I'm now then going to seek
24 contributions from interested parties and in the normal way we'll go to the local
25 authorities first. Now, the scope of that material covered the entirety from Kent
26 all the way up to the London Borough of Havering. Can I just see a quick show
27 of hands from those who do want to participate? Now, we've clearly got
28 Thurrock. We've clearly got Gravesham. What about Essex and Kent Counties?
29 No. Yes. Sorry, Kent. We do have Kent County, and then we do have the
30 London Borough of Havering. I have one more hand on the virtual room that
31 I'm afraid I'm unable to see the name for. Could one of my case team colleagues
32 assist me, please? We've got Mr Douglas and then we've got one more person,
33 Susan Lindley. Okay. Right. Well, let's probably start in the south. So what
34 I'm going to suggest we do is we go to Kent County Council, then to Gravesham.

1 Then I'll come to Thurrock and then we'll move on in that direction. So Kent
2 County Council, please.

3 MR RATCLIFFE: Thank you, sir. Joseph Ratcliffe, Kent County Council. Is it possible
4 just to put the slide back up for visual reference for each section as you go
5 through? It'll just help. I'll be very brief. Obviously, over the years of design
6 change, we've welcomed the moving of the tunnel portal further the south to
7 protect the village of Chalk, but in doing that, does impact Thong greater. I think
8 that might have been a slight error in the presentation. Green bridges, obviously,
9 we welcome, but we have made some comments on our local impact report and
10 written rep, reference rep 1 243 and 241, that we do not feel that they are
11 adequate and will provide the level of ecological connectivity between different
12 habitats. I note National Highway's response to us on that, which disagrees.
13 That pretty much is the way things are going, isn't it? So I'll just bring up again,
14 and any structures that form part of the local road network, which you require
15 KCC to take on, will need to be funded through commuted sums, as would be
16 the expectation the other way round. I'll leave it there in the interest of time.
17 Thank you.

18 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. So I'll move to Mr Bedford, please, and Gravesham
19 Burrough Council.

20 MR BEDFORD: Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Gravesham Borough Council. So
21 can I just first of all clarify a small point of detail on the way that the agenda is
22 set out? I had read item 6A, first bullet point, as not limiting itself only to, as it
23 were, the north/south corridor between the A2 and the southern portal at Thong,
24 but also including the east/west of the A2/M2.

25 MR SMITH: Absolutely, and I mean, clearly the focus of the applicant is taken and in
26 the interests of proceeding reasonably swiftly in time terms, we've accepted so
27 far there's a focus on the new, but if you do have a relevant point that you want
28 to raise on the existing east/west, A2/M2 corridor, then –

29 MR BEDFORD: Well, absolutely. Albeit that the route, as it were, utilises an existing
30 transport corridor, the nature of the works in that route obviously significantly
31 changes the character of the area, and you will appreciate there is an AONB and
32 aspect to that, as well as there is a green belt aspect, as well as there is a
33 landscape and cultural heritage aspect – all of that – because all of those changes
34 impact on those other areas of the environment. So dealing with the points and

1 trying to keep them as headline as I can, we had understood that the focus of
2 your question, routing directly as you've sourced it in paragraph 4.31 of the
3 National Network's MPS, was really looking at – and since both sides of the
4 equation – in order to understand whether this represents good design in terms
5 of the applicant's proposal, both sides of the equation being obviously, to what
6 extent does it adequately address the identified problems by improving
7 operational conditions? I wasn't going to say anything significant about that this
8 afternoon because that's really more a matter for tomorrow.

9 You're aware, obviously we have concerns about that, but putting that, as
10 it were, just down as a marker, the more important issue for this afternoon is, to
11 what extent has the applicant's approach minimised the adverse impacts which
12 its proposals will result in, and that's across all environmental disciplines, in
13 order for it to represent good design? In other words, has the applicant done as
14 much as it can, properly and realistically, in the context of the constraints – and
15 it's there that we see that we don't answer the question in the way the applicant
16 would. We don't think that what is currently before you represents good design.

17 We set out in the Gravesham local impact report our key concerns on
18 landscape impacts, including the AONB and its setting, cultural heritage
19 impacts, impacts on the openness of the green belt and also the particular details,
20 in terms of structures, the treatment of the green bridges. I don't obviously
21 rehearse all of that, but I draw your attention to those points and so we're not
22 persuaded that the design takes a holistic approach across those environmental
23 disciplines, and so we don't consider that, in this corridor – that's the A2/M2
24 and up to the southern tunnel portal at Thong – we don't consider that represents
25 good design as sought by para 431 of the MPS. We don't think there is sufficient
26 consideration of the adverse impacts or proper amelioration mitigation of them.

27 There's also then a related point, but because it's a different point I'll just
28 identify it specifically. It concerns also an environmental impact, but it's a
29 community impact. It's the impact on the two traveller sites. That's the two
30 traveller sites within Gravesham, on the south side of the A226, in the vicinity
31 of obviously the southern portal, horse show meadow and viewpoint and
32 effectively, we describe and discuss the issues of those at paragraphs 13.46 to
33 13.48 of the local impact report, and effectively the applicant's proposal is to
34 offer no mitigation in relation to the impacts of constructing the project on those

1 two sites, and we consider that is an area where clearly there is a failure of
2 mitigation. So that's a specific point and because it was very localised to that, I
3 thought I'd draw it out as a particular point. So those therefore are our principal
4 submissions on this agenda item.

5 MR SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Bedford. Now, noting that I would
6 normally then move directly to the principal local authorities north of the river,
7 however, we do have Shorne Parish Council Councillor Lindley, and I think
8 before we leave Kent, it's sensible to hear Councillor Lindley certainly.
9 Councillor Lindley.

10 MS LINDLEY: Thank you very much, sir. Good afternoon. Obviously, we support the
11 comments that were just made by Gravesham about the poor ambience of the
12 A2/M2 corridor. Regarding the landscaping between the Lower Thames
13 Crossing, junction two and the portal, which is what you can see on your screens
14 presently, we were quite happy with the original wooded design, and a bit
15 puzzled when it suddenly changed to the open design that you can see there.
16 Although it was said something about there being wooded hilltop on both sides
17 of the LTC line and we can't see that there was one on the west, so we're not
18 quite sure what was meant about that.

19 But our main point really is that we feel that the design should be primarily
20 aimed at protecting the residents locally and providing high ambience with the
21 new footpaths which, given them that they're along the sides of the chasm, aren't
22 going to be necessarily very pleasant. So I'm not convinced that an open vista
23 is in the best interests of the local residents and the future ambience of the area.
24 So that's all we wanted to say really. Thank you.

25 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. In which case, we will pass through the proposed
26 tunnel and come then to Thurrock.

27 MR STRATFORD: Thank you, sir. Chris Stratford, for Thurrock Council. Also in the
28 interest of time – well, firstly, apologies for the conflag going on. It was
29 sometimes not possible to do it electronically in preparation.

30 MR SMITH: I do appreciate it's hard, but it just had reached a point where colleagues
31 were remarking on it and it was becoming distracting, so I think –

32 MR STRATFORD: Okay. Two small points then. Firstly, I take Clare's point about
33 Project Enhance structures not being the only game in town and the fact that
34 there are other concerns, but we have raised the point, probably over two or three

1 years now, that the Tilbury viaduct, which is quite a large structure and it is quite
2 visible over the top of the Tilbury Loop line, it's near future areas of housing
3 and a number of other impacted areas. Not least of which is one of the scheduled
4 monuments, and yet it is not a Project Enhance structure. We have asked and
5 each time it's been refused, and perhaps you could ask.

6 The second point, which we can come to in more detail in our written
7 representation is that we're not entirely certain which of the two levels of
8 guidance might be taking primacy in respect of the WCHs – the walker, cyclist
9 and horse-riding routes. Is it DMRB[?], or is it – we think it should be – [BLTN
10 120?], which is certainly more current? It's more specific and it's run by Active
11 Travel England. It'd be interesting to understand whether they have in fact had
12 any independent design review of the routes and the diversions. It's something
13 we can come to in more detail. We have actually put some information in our
14 LIR – Appendix C, annex two, sub-annex 2.5 – about the 13 bridge crossings in
15 Thurrock, and we have reached a measure of agreement with the applicant, but
16 on a number of occasions we have not, in respect of two routes for buses and a
17 number of widenings of bridges in respect to provision for pedestrians and
18 cyclists, and that's been mentioned many times today anyway – the lack of clear
19 provision. We'll cover it. I just wanted to pick it up now. That was it. Thank
20 you.

21 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, anything further from Thurrock before I
22 proceed further to the north and the London Borough of Havering? I believe we
23 have Mr Douglas.

24 MR DOUGLAS: Good afternoon, sir. Daniel Douglas London Borough of Havering.
25 Before I go through a few points that's I'd like to raise, I just wanted to support
26 Mr Ratcliffe's comment from Kent, regarding commuted sums for assets that
27 local highway authorities are being asked to take over. We have a similar
28 situation in Havering, where the applicant's asking Havering to pick up
29 responsibility for a section of footpath 252, as it goes over the Essex
30 Thames-side line, and the Council just isn't in a position financially to do that.

31 We've now reached a bit of an impasse with the applicant on that particular
32 matter. We've gone into further detail on why we're not in a position to do that
33 in our submission – rep 3186 – where we go into some detail as to how Havering,
34 as a London borough, is at quite a disadvantage compared to local authorities

1 outside of London around highway maintenance funding arrangements. The
2 other points I just wanted to pick up on from Mr Stratford from Thurrock,
3 concerning design standards for foot and cycling bridges. We share the view
4 that the NMU bridges that are proposed should be designed to LTN 120 design
5 standards, and that's certainly the standard that Havering as a local highway
6 authority are expecting to develop its own structures too. So we would expect
7 certainly any structures within our borough to be designed to that standard.

8 The other points I'd just like to pick up on – the new non-motorised user
9 bridge that the applicant's proposing to the west of the M25, junction 29. So
10 that's the bridge that will be a pedestrian cycling and horse-riding bridge, that'll
11 go over the A127 and connect Folkes Lane with Moor Lane in the borough of
12 Havering, just the left of that junction, as you can see on that slide. As a new
13 non-motorised user connection, it's something that we support and we've said
14 so in our previous submissions. The issue that we have got, that I briefly touched
15 upon in the earlier item, is around accessibility to and from it. As it currently
16 stands, non-motorised users are going to have to use Folkes Lane to access
17 Folkes Lane woodland to the north on that slide, and ultimately across to the
18 new community Forest in the borough of Brentwood at Hole Farm.

19 Havering's firmly of the view that that road isn't suitable for a significant
20 increase in non-motorised users. It's a road that currently suffers from issues
21 around speeding. There are lots of businesses down the road with large vehicles
22 and for some time now we've been in discussion with the applicant around
23 whether a suitable alternative non-motorised user route can be provided. That
24 will take NMU users off that road on a separate path to access Folkes Lane
25 woodland, to the east of where the businesses are. Those discussions are
26 ongoing.

27 I think the point I really want to make about that particular matter is,
28 Havering certainly feels that any new NMU route should be secured as part of
29 the project, rather than outside of the LTC process. At the moment, the
30 applicant's position is that any new non-motorised user route that's created will
31 be secured through their designated funds pots. Havering doesn't view that that
32 is acceptable, one main reason being there's a lot of uncertainty at the moment
33 as to whether designated funds are going to be in existence post-March 2025 in

1 order to give Havering the surety that it needs, that that route will be put in place.
2 We feel it's really important for it to be secured through the actual project.

3 The other reason why we're pushing for that route to be secured through
4 the project is because that footbridge that's being created, we would suggest that
5 the Panel, is being created as a mitigation measure. The applicant's already gone
6 into some detail to explain the severance issues that the changes to the southern
7 section of the junction 29 are going to create, which has meant that they've had
8 to put forward new links for non-motorised users to the northern section of
9 junction 29. The footbridge is going to be put in place to provide users with
10 access to those new facilities, so we feel that access to that footbridge should be
11 part of that wider mitigation proposal.

12 The other point I'd finally like to make is in relation to the footbridge that
13 links Folkes Lane woodland with the community woodlands that's going to be
14 produced in Hole Farm. At the moment, that footbridge isn't suitable for
15 non-motorised [inaudible]. Again, we have been working with the applicant to
16 secure improvements to that footbridge and I know the applicant is working on
17 proposals to improve the parapets at that bridge and we'll obviously continue to
18 work with the applicant to hopefully secure the improvements that we need at
19 that site. Thank you.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, is there anybody else who we haven't yet
21 heard from representing a local authority? Yes, I'm coming to the non-statutory
22 parties in a second, Ms Blake. I was sure that you would probably wish to speak
23 for TCAG, but before I leave the local authorities and the statutory parties, I
24 thought I would check. So Essex County Council, please.

25 MR MACDONNELL: Gary MacDonnell, on behalf of Essex County Council. Just very
26 briefly, LTN 120 – we would support the view expressed by Thurrock and by
27 Havering in terms of the design standard should be LTN 120, and certainly what
28 we are designing to within Essex, and that would be our expectation.

29 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Now, moving on briefly with statutory parties, any
30 port authority, etc, who wishes further to speak? I do see Matthew Rheinberg
31 of Transport for London. So just to finish on our statutory parties, could I have
32 Transport for London, please? Mr Rheinberg.

33 MR RHEINBERG: Thank you. Yes, Matthew Rheinberg, Transport for London. I'll be
34 fairly brief because some of what I would have said has already been covered

1 by others. Just starting off on junction 29 of the M25 – just to note that there is
2 some further work that is proposed there as part of the project that wasn't
3 mentioned, but things like widening the circulatory carriageway and fully
4 signalling that junction. The point I really wanted to make was just that, as
5 others have commented, that work really needs to be coordinated with the
6 proposals for Brentwood Enterprise Park, who also would require amendments
7 to that junction. We're regarding the changes to the walking and cycling routes
8 around there. TfL supports that move to the northern route round the junction
9 and the walking, cycling and horse-riding bridge that is proposed to the west of
10 M25, junction 29. We understand the need for that, given the direct route
11 between the northbound M25 and LTC, and the westbound A127 and the level
12 of extra traffic on the A127 that the scheme generates.

13 Regarding the design resolution though, with particular reference to that
14 bridge, that has given us some reasonably significant concerns. We had been
15 hoping we'd be able to get some more development of the design, but we
16 understand the applicant's position, but that won't happen until the contractor
17 develops that further at the detailed design stage. The issue we have with that is
18 that it makes it really difficult for us to understand the maintenance requirements
19 for a structure that we, as the local highway authority there, are being asked to
20 maintain. So from our understanding, the structures plans show that it's
21 illustrative only. We understand, as was mentioned by the applicant, that the
22 structural form, the materials used could change and that can have a fundamental
23 impact on how you maintain that structure, which in turn can impact on the
24 amount of land required around that structure to maintain it, and it is very tight
25 the DCO red line boundary around that structure in at least a couple of places.
26 So that is a concern that we have certainly raised as part of our written
27 representation.

28 Overall, I should say, we are reasonably satisfied that local highway
29 authorities will be consulted on the design of structure, as part of requirement
30 three for the DCO, but we do consider that protected provisions for local
31 highway authorities, such as Transport London, are needed to ensure that we can
32 be fully comfortable with the process that we go through and what we'll be asked
33 to adopt in the future. That does include the need for a commuted sum, as has
34 been mentioned by other parties. So one thing I thought that I might like to

1 suggest to the Panel is whether the need for protected provisions for local
2 highway authorities could be something to cover at issue-specific hearing 7, I
3 think, on Monday.

4 MR SMITH: That is a noted point, Mr Rheinberg. I will review – the agenda for that has
5 been deliberately drafted in a loose fashion to enable matters raising from these
6 hearings to be slotted in and it seems like it would be a sensible matter to slot in.
7 Thank you very much.

8 MR RHEINBERG: Thank you.

9 MR SMITH: I do, I think, see a wish to respond on that point by the applicant, Mr Tate.

10 MR TATE: Sir, I wasn't going to respond on all matters. If I could respond on LTN 1/20,
11 because that was a specific point raised –

12 MR SMITH: Indeed. Well, no, just before you do – if these are remarks in general
13 response, we haven't quite finished the floor and I definitely – Ms Blake has
14 been sitting there for a very long time patiently. Just before, Ms Blake, I ask
15 you to take the floor, can I just check, so that we know the scope of this? Is there
16 anybody else from the interested body party? I see Ms Thakkar[?] and I do see
17 Mr Beard. Yes, sorry, apologies, Mr Beard. So Ms Blake, Ms Thakkar, Mr
18 Beard and then I will come to the applicant, who can respond globally and then
19 finish.

20 MS LAURA BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. Laura Blake, chair of Thames Crossing
21 Action Group – and, yes, you are right. I always have a say on something. Just
22 to cover on these points as quickly as I can – I know there will be a lot of overlap
23 as well on Friday's hearing on environmental matters and mitigation. Just to
24 mention, in the presentation from National Highways on the Ockendon link
25 saying about the wetness of the lands across there, there are concerns over the
26 fog and the winds as well, with it being low lying and open across there, and
27 what impact that might have on the route with the weather impacts.

28 And also, the mention of the water vowel habitat – when we know from
29 research that we've done into other local planning applications that there are
30 mink in that area, which for those that don't know are one of the main predators
31 of water vowels – protected species – so we have concerns on that.

32 I notice that, obviously with the interests of time, a few slides were skipped
33 over. I notice the wilderness was in there. I'd just like to comment on that little
34 section there and say about the fact that North Ockendon is an area of

1 conservation and obviously that will be greatly impacted if the road goes ahead.
2 And with the wilderness, it is our belief that National Highways are trying to
3 avoid going through the landfill, which would be very expensive and time
4 consuming – instead going through the wilderness. But as I say, I know that will
5 come up on Friday as one of the items on the agenda.

6 Regarding the cutting, the level of the cutting by North Road to the north
7 of the route – we know that that has been raised. We believe that is to reduce
8 carbon emissions, but we are also aware that in south of the river in Shorne
9 Country Park the cutting is actually made deeper for the protection of the trees
10 to better reduce the impact of pollution on the trees. So we would question why
11 it's being raised near to a residential area and close to homes.

12 And also, with regard to North Road, when the work is being carried out
13 there and there are road closures along that section, we would just highlight that
14 the diversion would actually push traffic into the ULEZ zone now. So that is
15 something else that we wonder if it has been considered, because obviously
16 those users would have to go through and pay ULEZ zone. So I'll keep it to that
17 for now and pass over to Ms Thakkar, if you'd like. Thank you.

18 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. Ms Thakkar –

19 MS THAKKAR: Just quickly, bearing on something that Laura's just said, have you –
20 can you tell me what measures have been taken in your design with the viaduct
21 over the Mardyke with the exceedingly high wind velocity we get there? Yeah,
22 it's on a regular basis. It isn't just occasionally. The winds whip across there
23 very often and also the marsh fogs. And that's it from me. Thank you.

24 MR SMITH: And then finally Mr Beard –

25 MR BEARD: Robin Beard, local resident. Can I request that the image of the viaduct
26 across the Orsett Fen from the supplemental consultation is put up on screen,
27 please? We heard the applicant talking about how they tried to mitigate the
28 impact of the road by disguising or trying to preserve the long-distance views,
29 like through the legs of the viaduct, but all of that would be unnecessary if the
30 road were to take a slightly different route. If you look at the field at the top of
31 the image there – the one that the viaduct just clips the corner of – that field is
32 several metres higher than the surrounding land. You can't tell just by looking,
33 but if you check a topographical map, it is.

1 They were saying that they were using a landscape-led approach to
2 building the road, but mother nature has given us a readymade embankment right
3 there and the LTC is not using it. Instead, it's going straight across the middle
4 of the Orsett Fen and that obviously requires embankments and viaducts that
5 would not be necessary otherwise. Thank you.

6 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. That I believe brings us to the end of our requests
7 to speak on these items, so it is now the applicant's turn to respond, again,
8 running to matters of detail in writing please, so the highlight matters in oral
9 response please, Mr Tate.

10 MR TATE: Just two points, thank you, sir – the first – LTN 1/20 was mentioned by a
11 number of contributors and the WCH routes are required to be designed in
12 accordance with LTN 1/20, pursuant to the design principles set out in table
13 4.1PO.04. But secondly, Mr Henderson is able to respond to the matter raised
14 by TfL about protected provisions for local highway authorities.

15 MR HENDERSON: Thank you. Tom Henderson for the applicant. I just wanted to
16 respond briefly on the comments that were made about the protected provisions.
17 The applicant has had regard to comments from a number of local highway
18 authorities about this and we will be advancing for deadline for the applicant's
19 preferred set of proposed protected provisions for the drafting of a consent order.
20 So I just wanted to signal that, really to say that we're content for that to be
21 added to the agenda for issue-specific hearing seven, when we can elaborate on
22 what's proposed.

23 MR SMITH: Thank you very much, Mr Henderson. Okay. We've taken a note, so we'll
24 make sure that does come forward, albeit briefly, in issue-specific hearing
25 number seven. So that brings us to the end of agenda item six. As I indicated
26 earlier on in the afternoon when our delivery was disrupted by digital issues, we
27 are holding over agenda item seven to a later hearing to be held in either October
28 or November or more likely a subcomponent of one, because it will not be a full
29 hearing in of itself, which then takes me on to agenda item eight, where simply
30 I will refer to the fact that we have at least 10 actions that have emerged that
31 have been kept through notes by my colleagues as we've moved through the
32 day.

33 We will be publishing an action list in what I hope now is understood as
34 the normal manner, because we have done so with our previous issue-specific

1 hearings, and we will try to have that publication done swiftly as we may, but
2 given that we're in quite a busy week, it may be two or three days before
3 publication actually occurs. I'm not going to work through that action list in
4 detail now.

5 So it then remains only to say that this has been issue-specific hearing
6 number 3 and we have, subject to the caveat that I have reserved on agenda item
7 number 7, completed all of the business in this agenda. Is there anything else
8 that anybody needs to raise relevant to this agenda, in which case hands up now?
9 Alternatively then, it seems that we will close this hearing. I'll remind you that
10 we'll be back in this room, both virtually online and physically, at 10.00 a.m.
11 tomorrow for issue-specific hearing number 4 – traffic and transportation – that
12 my colleague, Mr Young will be leading. And until then, ladies and gentlemen,
13 let me wish you all a good evening and, for those of you that we will be seeing
14 tomorrow, I look forward to seeing you tomorrow, as indeed do my colleagues.

15 That's goodbye from me.

16 MS LAVER: Goodbye from me.

17 MR YOUNG: Goodbye from me.

18 MR TAYLOR: Goodbye from me.

19 MR PRATT: Goodbye, everybody.

20 MR SMITH: Thank you very much. The hearing is now closed.

21
22

(Meeting concluded)