



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

Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) Project Design

Date: 5 Sept 2023

Venue: Orsett Hall Hotel & MS Teams

Action Points

No	Party	Action	Deadline
1	All LPAs, All local highway authorities and TfL, Port of Tilbury London Ltd., DP World London Gateway, Port of London Authority	Reflections on the Applicant's Additional Submissions – Visual Representations of Intersections for ISH3 Pursuant to Procedural Decision 37 by the ExA of 1 September 2023 [PD-033], on 5 September 2023 the Applicant introduced visual representations of the function of the three main proposed intersections A2/ M2/ LTC [AS-145], A13/ A1089/ LTC [AS-146] and M25/ LTC [AS-147]. Detailed written observations on that material is sought by Deadline 4.	D4
2	Applicant	To include Examination Library References in the visual representations referenced in Action 1 above.	D4
3	Applicant	A2/ M2/ LTC Intersection: effect of missed turn to A289 Please clarify the routing and additional distance that will need to be travelled by a vehicle travelling eastbound on the A2 to the A289 (Strood) exit if the intended new A289 lane at the A2 Valley Drive point is missed by a driver.	D4

No	Party	Action	Deadline
4	Applicant	<p>A2/ M2/ LTC Intersection: effect of error turn onto LTC</p> <p>Please clarify the routing and additional distance travelled by a vehicle turning on to the LTC in Kent in error (for example take Valley Drive as the starting point). Where would they have to turn around in Essex, what route and extra distance is required to return to their intended route in Kent?</p>	D4
5	Applicant	<p>A2/ M2/ LTC Intersection: mainline congestion</p> <p>With reference to [AS-145], please provide a description of the effect of the proposed intersection design on running speeds and the potential for congestion through the intersection on the A2/ M2 mainline. Bearing in mind the intended movement of turning traffic flows onto the proposed frontage roads, can a national speed limit design running speed for the junction be sustained in most anticipated operating conditions, or is there any significant likelihood that the proposed intersection design could increase the prospect of slowing and congestion on the mainline through the junction in terms of numbers and/or duration of instances?</p>	D4
6	Kent CC	<p>A2/ M2/ LTC Intersection: mainline congestion and local connections</p> <p>Kent CC is requested to document any remaining concerns that it might have in relation to both mainline congestion and/ or congestion affecting local access from the intersection as it is proposed to be designed. Such concerns should be supported by appropriate evidence.</p>	D5
7	Shorne and Higham PCs	<p>A2/ M2/ LTC Intersection: local connections</p> <p>Are there additional local routes which the applicant has not shown in [AS-145] but which Shorne and Higham residents frequently take? It would be helpful if annotated maps and/or descriptions with road numbers and names were used in the response.</p>	D4

No	Party	Action	Deadline
8	Applicant	<p>A13/ A1089/ LTC Arising from questions raised by Port of Tilbury London Ltd (PoTLL), the Applicant is asked to provide a breakdown of new movement numbers at the Orsett Cock Roundabout necessitated by traffic movements between the LTC and the Port of Tilbury.</p>	D4
9	Applicant	<p>Engineering Drawings in Zoomable Format Interested parties made additional requests for single (or large composite) zoomable Portable Document Format (.pdf) or equivalent engineering drawings, not bound by the format of standard paper sizes.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to examine options that might be technically feasible for hosting and publication within the Examination Library, to discuss and agree a preferred approach with the Planning Inspectorate Case Team and then to submit by Deadline 4 if feasible.</p>	D4 (if feasible)