

Lower Thames Crossing

9.82 Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for CAH2

Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

DATE: September 2023
DEADLINE 4

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032
Examination Document Ref: TR010032/EXAM/9.82

VERSION: 1.0

Lower Thames Crossing

9.82 Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for CAH2

List of contents

| | Page number |
|---|-------------|
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Welcome, introductions, arrangements for the Hearing | 1 |
| 2 Purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing..... | 2 |
| 3 ExA Questions on: Individual Site-Specific Representations | 3 |
| 3.1 Item 3(a) Thurrock Council | 3 |
| 3.2 Item 3(b) Kathryn Homes Ltd, Runwood Homes Ltd and Runwood Properties Ltd re Whitecroft Care Home, Stanford Road, Orsett | 6 |
| 3.3 Item 3(c) Mrs J Carver | 8 |
| 3.4 Item 3(d) Glenroy Estates Ltd | 9 |
| 4 Next Steps and Closing | 11 |
| Glossary | 12 |

1 Introduction

Please note: this document contains the Applicant’s oral summary of evidence and post-hearing comments on submissions made by others at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 held on 15 September 2023.

Where the comment is a post-hearing comment submitted by National Highways, this is indicated. This document uses the headings for each item in the agenda published for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 [[EV-049](#)] on 14 September 2023 by the Examining Authority.

1.1 Welcome, introductions, arrangements for the Hearing

- 1.1.1 National Highways (the Applicant), which is promoting the A122 Lower Thames Crossing (the Project), was represented at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) by Isabella Tafur, of Counsel (IT).
- 1.1.2 The following persons were also introduced to the Examining Authority (ExA):
 - a. Andrew Tait KC (AT)
 - b. Tom Henderson, BDB Pitmans, Partner (TH)

2 Purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing

2.1.1 The Applicant did not make any submissions under this Agenda Item.

3 ExA Questions on: Individual Site-Specific Representations

3.1 Item 3(a) Thurrock Council

Item 3(a)(i)

Scope of objections.

In its LIR [REP1-281] at Chapter 14 and Appendix H [REP1-289], Thurrock Council extensively objects to CA and TP powers. The ExA needs to understand the basis for the objections, as they are partially expressed as objections to compensation, which in principle are not within the scope of an Examination under PA2008.

- 3.1.1 IT noted the concern raised by Thurrock Council (TC) in relation to various parcels which are subject to permanent acquisition, and which are to be returned to TC. TC queried the need for permanent acquisition in these circumstances, and in particular identify particular plots that are of concern in TC's Local Impact Report [REP1-281]. IT clarified that the Applicant does not believe that all of the plots TC identified are subject to permanent acquisition, with subsequent return to the Council. One of the plots, for example, is identified as subject to temporary possession.
- 3.1.2 IT explained that the justification for permanent acquisition in circumstances where plots are to be returned, is that all of the plots that are to be engaged in this way, relate to permanent works to construct highways which will then become the responsibility of the local highways authority pursuant to article 10 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP3-077], which in this instance, is TC. IT added that this has been adjudicated upon by an Examining Authority and then the Secretary of State (SoS) in the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling DCO. In this case, both the Examining Authority and the SoS considered that acquisition of land for works that is to become part of the local highway should be subject to freehold acquisition rather than temporary possession and the acquisition of rights. IT noted therefore that permanent acquisition was considered appropriate in those circumstances.
- 3.1.3 **[Post-hearing note: In particular, the Secretary of State, in making a decision on the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester DCO project, had previously commented that an approach which did not entail the full acquisition of land associated with highways “does not represent best practice nor is it consistent with Government guidance” and was “unprecedented” (paragraph 62 of the decision letter). These statements make clear that either temporary possession, or temporary possession with the acquisition of rights, would not accord with the SoS’ clear view that outright acquisition should be obtained for new highways and public rights of way. In addition, the outright acquisition would enable the ‘cleansing’ of the title to ensure it could function as a public right of way.]**

- 3.1.4 In response to the ExA, IT explained that as a general principle, the Applicant would, where it is effecting fundamental change to the character of the land which is to be permanent, permanently acquire the land, although this will then be designated local highway and will be the responsibility of the local highways authority.
- 3.1.5 **[Post-hearing note: The government guidance (Circular 02/97: Notes on the Preparation, Drafting and Submission of. Compulsory Purchase Orders for Highway Schemes) is relevant to this. The ExA on A303 Sparkford project, with whom the SoS agreed, noted Paragraph 71 of the Circular explains that the kind of rights for which the compulsory acquisition of rights over land by the creation of new rights are designed are in the nature of easements ancillary or appurtenant to the highway, proposed highway or other facility. It is clear that the Circular does not envisage that these powers can be used by highway authorities in cases where the land will form part of the highway or proposed highway or where the Works they wish to carry out will, to all intents and purposes, deprive the landowner permanently of beneficial use of the land.]**
- 3.1.6 IT noted that TC had raised concern that there is no positive obligation on the Applicant to transfer the relevant plots back to TC on completion of the works. IT noted that the Applicant intends on addressing this through protective provisions that it intends on submitting at Deadline 4 (D4). The Applicant is intending on including provision for the Applicant to provide TC with final widths of the highways so that confirmation can be provided as to which plots will be subject to the Council's control once finalised. IT confirmed that the protective provisions provide for a procedure in which the Applicant issues a certificate of completion, at which point the local highway authority then has the opportunity to inspect the works and identify any defects, which the Applicant would have to remedy within a period of 12 months. The local highway authority is then entitled to request that land be transferred to them, which the Applicant would be obliged to comply with. IT also referenced article 10 of the draft DCO [\[REF-077\]](#) (which requires the Applicant to complete the highway works to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority, which the Applicant will of course carry out in respect of the relevant plots).
- 3.1.7 In relation to TC's submissions regarding public open space, IT noted that TC have recognised that sections 131 and 132 are not engaged by temporary possession. In relation to the duration of temporary possession, IT explained that this is controlled by article 35(4) of the draft DCO [\[REP3-077\]](#) which provides that the undertaker may not remain in possession of the land for any more than one year after completion of the relevant part of the authorised development.
- 3.1.8 In relation to the condition of the land, IT noted that article 35(5) provides that before giving up possession, the undertaker must remove all temporary works and restore the land to the reasonable satisfaction of the landowner. Further, the Applicant is required to pay compensation for any loss or damage that is suffered as a result of temporary possession, pursuant to article 35(6).
- 3.1.9 IT explained that the Applicant appreciated that TC has raised concerns, particularly in relation to public open space and the inability to remedy the impacts in compensation. In particular, IT referenced paragraph 14.4.15 of TC's

Local Impact Report (LIR) which identifies a number of areas of public open space which are to be subject to temporary possession, with the potential for this to be for up to eight years. The Applicant's position is that the areas identified by TC are not an accurate depiction of the Project's impacts, as they show the full area of the entire public open space (even where entirely outside of the Order Limits), however, in a number of instances, it is a very small parcel of that space that is to be subject to temporary possession and within the Order Limits. IT gave the example of the Ron Evans Memorial Ground, where TC sets out the whole area of 198,000 square metres, but do not clarify that it is only 6,870 square metres that will be subject to temporary possession.

- 3.1.10 IT explained that the impacts during construction of the temporary possession proposed have been considered in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [APP-151], as well as in the Health and Equality Impact Assessment (HEqIA) [REP3-118], and in Appendices D and G of the Planning Statement [REP3-108 and APP-502].
- 3.1.11 In relation to the Ron Evans Memorial Ground, IT explained that the two parcels that are to be used as replacement land are subject to temporary possession and are used for construction works. The northern parcel is to be used for utilities works and the southern parcel is to be used as a construction compound. IT noted that it is in those circumstances that thereafter, the Applicant is proposing a scheme for the laying out of replacement land to be worked up and the site to be laid out in accordance with that scheme.
- 3.1.12 The Applicant is aware that there is to be a time delay between the impact on the special category land and the replacement becoming available and this temporal aspect is a factor in considering whether the land is no less advantageous, and has been taken into account, both through the provision of a larger area provided than that which is affected, and in terms of the quality of the provision [REP3-108].
- 3.1.13 In response to the ExA, IT explained that it is a case of judgment when taking into account the delay in the reprovision. IT explained that the Applicant has made a judgment as to the best way in which to address this in terms of quantitative and qualitative overprovision, and in taking those factors into consideration, the Applicant has concluded that it is no less advantageous, notwithstanding the delay. In respect of the five year period, the Applicant agreed that it will consider this further [**post-hearing note: the Applicant will provide an update on this issue at Deadline 6**].

Item 3(a)(ii)

Item 3(a)(ii) Non-statutory relief. To the extent that Thurrock Council seeks non statutory relief including a hardship scheme and a need to sell scheme, to what extent and in what circumstances is it seeking such schemes? Does it seek relief for itself or on behalf of CA & TP stakeholders more broadly?

- 3.1.14 IT explained in response to TC, that where land is within the Order Limits and is subject to compulsory acquisition, it is incumbent on the Applicant to seek to acquire land by agreement where possible, which is what the Applicant has been doing. IT noted that there are a number of statutory schemes which makes provision for those who are offline. These include: the Noise Impact

Regulations 1975 relating to those experiencing noise levels above specified levels, outside the Order Limits potentially; section 28 of the Land Compensation Act relating to highway works affecting enjoyment of dwellings adjacent to construction sites; section 246 of the Highways Act 1980, which authorises the highway authority to acquire land by agreement where its enjoyment is seriously affected by works; and sections 10 and 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, which provide for compensation for injurious affection. IT noted that TC have included these provisions in Appendix H of their LIR [REP1-289].

- 3.1.15 IT noted that the Applicant is a government-owned body and pursuant to its operating licence, is obliged to comply with the compensation code. IT confirmed that any payment above the statutory provisions requires authorisation from the Department for Transport. In addition, it required a full business case and justifications as to why it is in the taxpayer's interest to go beyond provisions already in place. The Applicant considers that the appropriate way to deal with those affected, either on or off site, is through the existing statutory provisions and compensation code, which is the approach it has adopted. IT also noted that a number of the provisions under these schemes are specific to highways. The Applicant's position is that it has struck the right balance in prudent use of public funds and providing for those who might experience particular and exceptional hardship.

Item 3(a)(iii)

Item 3(a)(iii) Statutory tests and guidance. To the extent that Thurrock Council asserts that statutory tests and guidance relevant to CA and / or TP has not been followed or are not met, the ExA wishes to test that case.

- 3.1.16 This Agenda Item was addressed under Agenda Item 3(a)(i) and (ii), as directed by the ExA.

3.2 Item 3(b) Kathryn Homes Ltd, Runwood Homes Ltd and Runwood Properties Ltd re Whitecroft Care Home, Stanford Road, Orsett

Item 3(b)(i)

Item 3(b)(i) Scope of objections. At OFH2, Emma Dring of counsel for these IPs [REP1-366] to [REP1-373] raised concerns that the effect of the proposed development on these businesses would be to render them inoperable for a substantial period, and or would lead to unacceptable operating and living conditions for vulnerable care home residents. These are not directly CA objections at present. The ExA will consider whether they should be considered as such or whether any other action outside the CA process could be appropriate.

- 3.2.1 IT noted that the Applicant recognises that the Public Sector Equality Duty is engaged and that the residents of Whitecroft Care Home share protected characteristics, as acknowledged in its HEqIA [REP3-118] and which the Applicant has noted through its engagement with the Whitecroft Care Home prior to submission of the application.

- 3.2.2 IT explained that the Applicant has made several changes to seek to mitigate impacts on the care home, including the relocation of compound CA07 (Stanford Road Compound) further away from the care home, changes to the A13 junction, and enhanced landscaping around the A13 to reduce visual, and to an extent, noise impacts.
- 3.2.3 IT noted that the Applicant understands that the care home still has concerns, despite the measures the Applicant has undertaken and the Applicant is continuing to engage with them. The Applicant conducted a site visit at the end of June 2023 and has had various exchanges of further information. Since then the Applicant has agreed to carry out further noise assessments. The Applicant's position is that the noise assessments carried out to date set appropriate standards for care homes and the guidance followed does specifically refer to the standards for Significant Observed Adverse Noise Level (SOAEL) and Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) being appropriate for health facilities. However, IT noted that the Applicant has recognised in the HEqIA [REP3-118] the potential for residents to be disproportionately affected, and the Applicant has given due regard to this.
- 3.2.4 IT explained that the Applicant has made various offers to Whitecroft Care Home recently, including offers for further ventilation and noise mitigation, to further minimise the impacts on residents, and has tried to open up conversations about potential compensation that could be paid if some of the rooms had to be kept unoccupied for certain periods. IT reconfirmed that the Applicant is willing to engage further through its technical, noise, air quality, landscape and heritage teams to address the concerns raised.
- 3.2.5 The Applicant's position is that it is satisfied that, subject to the best practical means, the impacts on the care home would not be significant adverse, but it understands that the care home may wish to see further commitment to specific measures at this stage, which the Applicant is willing to facilitate in discussion with them, which it hopes can be a means towards at least a narrowing of issues, if not final resolution.
- 3.2.6 In terms of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession, IT confirmed that the land is not required for or to facilitate or as replacement land for the Project. The Applicant does not therefore consider that compulsory acquisition, either permanently or temporarily, of the care home could be justified pursuant to section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). IT noted that there are some plots within the same ownership that are subject to acquisition, which allows the care home, if it can make a case, to apply for compensation for injurious affection, pursuant to section 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965.
- 3.2.7 The Applicant's position is that compensation for injurious affection is potentially available to the care home, and that Whitecroft Care Home's position is correct in terms of the discretionary acquisition it mentioned, but there is provision which is explained in the brochure, that the Applicant can provide noise insulation, secondary glazing, supplementary ventilation, etc., and make noise payments, where there are noise impacts, which would apply to care homes. IT noted that the Applicant understands the concerns of the care home, but there is disagreement between the technical experts of the Applicant and the care home, which the Applicant is very willing to discuss further, in particular with relation to further measures, commitments in the stakeholder's commitment

register [REP1-176], or the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [REP3-104] to attempt to settle construction controls that would provide the care home with some further comfort.

- 3.2.8 IT confirmed that the Applicant would give careful consideration to matters raised by the ExA and that it would continue to engage with Whitecroft Care Home. IT provided two references in the HEqIA [REP3-118], which were construction noise impacts considered at paragraph 7.9.21 and operational noise impacts at paragraph 7.9.51. IT noted that the Applicant does not only consider access arrangements, but also noise impacts.

Item 3(b)(ii)

Item 3(b)(ii) CA and / or TP. Are there any circumstances in which the businesses might be made subject to CA and or TP for the duration of works?

- 3.2.9 This Agenda Item was addressed at Agenda Item 3(b)(i).

Item 3(b)(iii)

Item 3(b)(iii) Non-statutory relief. To the extent that these IPs seek non statutory relief which might including a hardship scheme and / or a need to sell scheme, to what extent and in what circumstances might they seek such schemes?

- 3.2.10 This Agenda Item was addressed at Agenda Item 3(b)(i).

Item 3(b)(iv)

Item 3(b)(iv) Human Rights and Equalities Duty. Are relevant Human Rights Act (ECHR) rights and / or the Public Sector Equalities Duty (PSED) engaged and if so, what are the consequences of that engagement?

- 3.2.11 This Agenda Item was addressed at Agenda Item 3(b)(i).

3.3 Item 3(c) Mrs J Carver

Item 3(c)(i)

Item 3(c)(i) Scope of Objections. Concerns in relation to land take and related questions about mitigation [RR-0753], [REP1-389], [REP1-390], [REP2-107].

- 3.3.1 IT confirmed that the Applicant has responded to the relevant representation submitted on behalf of Mrs Carver in Comments on Written Representations (WRs) Appendix F – Landowners [REP2-051]. In relation to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession matters, Mrs Carver raised a query about the use of the land plot 44-07 to the west of her driveway, which is subject to temporary possession, and the reason for its temporary possession is set out in the Statement of Reasons [REP3-081]. This land relates to work MU83 “to facilitate utility works, and to provide temporary storage, laydown areas and working space.” The Applicant notes that Mrs Carver also raised a concern about the balancing pond (work 9T), shown on sheet 44 of the Works Plans [REP3-039]. IT explained that the Applicant’s position is that the balancing pond is required at that location and the land subject to acquisition is no more than necessary.

- 3.3.2 IT explained that the balancing pond cannot be relocated to the land to the south which is to be used for replacement public open space. If the Applicant relocated the balancing pond in this way, the multi-utility works would have to be moved to the north, closer to residential property, in an area where there is already a lot of utilities infrastructure. The Applicant requires the flexibility set out in the limits of deviation to deliver those works.
- 3.3.3 IT noted that the Applicant has met with Mrs Carver's agents and proposed a commitment in the Stakeholder's Actions and Commitments Register [[REP1-176](#)] to review the design of the pond at detailed design stage, to assess whether the size and land-take can be reduced at the implementation stage of the Project. IT noted that it is not possible for the Applicant to confirm this at this stage of the design, but that the Applicant has committed to taking steps to address the concerns raised at the detailed design stage.
- 3.3.4 The Applicant does not consider it to be appropriate or necessary to address or consider the reconstruction of a barn which has not existed for many years on the site. In relation to the suggestion that access rights should form part of a shared access in order to provide a means of access to the development site that Mrs Carver has aspirations for, IT noted that it seems that the nature of such an access track would be quite different from the access the Applicant requires for infrequent maintenance, and so the Applicant does not see a justification for upgrading the access track so that it provides an improved arrangement for Mrs Carver's proposals.
- 3.3.5 In respect of the acoustic noise barrier, the Applicant predicts that there will be an improvement to the noise levels at Franks Farm during operation and the request to include a permanent noise barrier is not considered by the Applicant to be appropriate.

Item 3(c)(ii)

Item 3(c)(ii) Statutory tests and guidance. To the extent that LPP asserts that statutory tests and guidance relevant to CA and / or TP and Human Rights have not been followed or met, the ExA wishes to explore these.

- 3.3.6 This Agenda Item was addressed at Agenda Item 3(c)(i).

3.4 Item 3(d) Glenroy Estates Ltd

Item 3(d)(i)

Item 3(d)(i) Scope of Objections. Concerns in relation to land take and related questions about mitigation [[REP1-347](#)].

- 3.4.1 IT confirmed that the Applicant has been engaging with Glenroy Estates since 2021, most recently sending them a letter and invitation to negotiate at the end of June 2023. IT noted that the ExA would be aware that Glenroy Estates did not submit a relevant representation, and submitted a very short written representation [[REP1-347](#)]. IT noted that the Applicant was grateful to receive Glenroy Estate's speaking note on 14 September 2023, but the Applicant notes that it includes a number of detailed ecological points that have not previously been raised.

- 3.4.2 IT explained that the Applicant’s approach to ancient woodland compensation planting follows two key principles: i) to create more high quality woodland habitat to offset that which is lost as a result of the Project; and ii) to position this habitat creation to link into existing woodland habitat, to build resilience into the ecological network at a landscape scale. IT noted that the Project will result in the loss of ancient woodland in the Codham Hall Wood west and in order to offset this loss, the Applicant has looked to identify land which adjoins this woodland and offered the opportunity for woodland creation. The Applicant’s position is that this plot of land is ideally located in order to achieve that.
- 3.4.3 IT noted that there is an explanation in the Project Design Report [[APP-510](#)] which discusses the impacts on Codham Hall Wood ancient woodland and the proposed woodland areas which have been designed to further add to the strong wooded character and create a connection to existing woodlands. The Applicant also references the new A127 bridge which is to be softened on its northern axis by this compensation planting on this site.
- 3.4.4 IT referenced the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Forestry Commission [[APP-095](#)] which addresses the compensation strategy, which is that the parties have agreed that “*the ancient woodland compensation design follows Natural England’s advice to strengthen existing ancient woodland and create links between retained woodland blocks.*” IT noted that the SoCG with Natural England [[REP2-008](#)] welcomes the Applicant’s approach to the compensation areas that have been identified with the aim of enhancing resilience of affected sites by strengthening their ecological connectivity.
- 3.4.5 In relation to potential contamination, IT noted that it would be helpful if Glenroy Estates could submit information on the enforcement notices referenced, so that the Applicant is able to consider this information. IT also noted Glenroy Estate’s suggestion in its written representation [[REP1-347](#)] in relation to a potential section 253 agreement, which as the Applicant has previously submitted, does not consider an acceptable option. IT further noted Glenroy Estate’s alternative suggestion of a long lease, which the Applicant has only been made aware of recently and will be happy to discuss and consider further with Glenroy Estates.

Item 3(d)(ii)

Item 3(d)(ii) Statutory tests and guidance. To the extent that NRF/ Centro asserts that statutory tests and guidance relevant to CA and / or TP and Human Rights have not been followed or met, the ExA wishes to explore these.

- 3.4.6 This Agenda Item was addressed at Agenda Item 3(d)(i).

4 Next Steps and Closing

4.1.1 The Applicant did not make any submissions under this Agenda Item.

Glossary

| Term | Abbreviation | Explanation |
|--|----------------|---|
| A122 | | The new A122 trunk road to be constructed as part of the Lower Thames Crossing project, including links, as defined in Part 2, Schedule 5 (Classification of Roads) in the draft DCO (Application Document 3.1) |
| A122 Lower Thames Crossing | Project | A proposed new crossing of the Thames Estuary linking the county of Kent with the county of Essex, at or east of the existing Dartford Crossing. |
| A122 Lower Thames Crossing/M25 junction | | New junction with north-facing slip roads on the M25 between M25 junctions 29 and 30, near North Ockendon. |
| A13/A1089/A122 Lower Thames Crossing junction | | Alteration of the existing junction between the A13 and the A1089, and construction of a new junction between the A122 Lower Thames Crossing and the A13 and A1089, comprising the following link roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved A13 westbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing southbound • Improved A13 westbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing northbound • Improved A13 westbound to A1089 southbound • A122 Lower Thames Crossing southbound to improved A13 eastbound and Orsett Cock roundabout • A122 Lower Thames Crossing northbound to improved A13 eastbound and Orsett Cock roundabout • Orsett Cock roundabout to the improved A13 westbound • Improved A13 eastbound to Orsett Cock roundabout • Improved A1089 northbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing northbound • Improved A1089 northbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing southbound |
| A2 | | A major road in south-east England, connecting London with the English Channel port of Dover in Kent. |
| Application Document | | In the context of the Project, a document submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the application for development consent. |
| Construction | | Activity on and/or offsite required to implement the Project. The construction phase is considered to commence with the first activity on site (e.g. creation of site access), and ends with demobilisation. |
| Design Manual for Roads and Bridges | DMRB | A comprehensive manual containing requirements, advice and other published documents relating to works on motorway and all-purpose trunk roads for which one of the Overseeing Organisations (National Highways, Transport Scotland, the Welsh Government or the Department for Regional Development (Northern Ireland)) is highway authority. For the A122 Lower Thames Crossing the Overseeing Organisation is National Highways. |
| Development Consent Order | DCO | Means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008. |

| Term | Abbreviation | Explanation |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Development Consent Order application | DCO application | The Project Application Documents, collectively known as the 'DCO application'. |
| Environmental Statement | ES | A document produced to support an application for development consent that is subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which sets out the likely impacts on the environment arising from the proposed development. |
| Highways England | | Former name of National Highways. |
| M2 junction 1 | | The M2 will be widened from three lanes to four in both directions through M2 junction 1. |
| M2/A2/Lower Thames Crossing junction | | New junction proposed as part of the Project to the east of Gravesend between the A2 and the new A122 Lower Thames Crossing with connections to the M2. |
| M25 junction 29 | | Improvement works to M25 junction 29 and to the M25 north of junction 29. The M25 through junction 29 will be widened from three lanes to four in both directions with hard shoulders. |
| National Highways | | A UK government-owned company with responsibility for managing the motorways and major roads in England. Formerly known as Highways England. |
| National Planning Policy Framework | NPPF | A framework published in March 2012 by the UK's Department of Communities and Local Government, consolidating previously issued documents called Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Practice Guidance Notes (PPG) for use in England. The NPPF was updated in February 2019 and again in July 2021 by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. |
| National Policy Statement | NPS | Set out UK government policy on different types of national infrastructure development, including energy, transport, water and waste. There are 12 NPS, providing the framework within which Examining Authorities make their recommendations to the Secretary of State. |
| National Policy Statement for National Networks | NPSNN | Sets out the need for, and Government's policies to deliver, development of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) on the national road and rail networks in England. It provides planning guidance for promoters of NSIPs on the road and rail networks, and the basis for the examination by the Examining Authority and decisions by the Secretary of State. |
| Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project | NSIP | Major infrastructure developments in England and Wales, such as proposals for power plants, large renewable energy projects, new airports and airport extensions, major road projects etc that require a development consent under the Planning Act 2008. |
| North Portal | | The North Portal (northern tunnel entrance) would be located to the west of East Tilbury. Emergency access and vehicle turn-around facilities would be provided at the tunnel portal. The tunnel portal structures would accommodate service buildings for control operations, mechanical and electrical equipment, drainage and maintenance operations. |
| Operation | | Describes the operational phase of a completed development and is considered to commence at the end of the construction phase, after demobilisation. |

| Term | Abbreviation | Explanation |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|
| Order Limits | | The outermost extent of the Project, indicated on the Plans by a red line. This is the Limit of Land to be Acquired or Used (LLAU) by the Project. This is the area in which the DCO would apply. |
| Planning Act 2008 | | The primary legislation that establishes the legal framework for applying for, examining and determining Development Consent Order applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. |
| Project road | | The new A122 trunk road, the improved A2 trunk road, and the improved M25 and M2 special roads, as defined in Parts 1 and 2, Schedule 5 (Classification of Roads) in the draft DCO (Application Document 3.1). |
| Project route | | The horizontal and vertical alignment taken by the Project road. |
| South Portal | | The South Portal of the Project (southern tunnel entrance) would be located to the south-east of the village of Chalk. Emergency access and vehicle turn-around facilities would be provided at the tunnel portal. The tunnel portal structures would accommodate service buildings for control operations, mechanical and electrical equipment, drainage and maintenance operations. |
| The tunnel | | Proposed 4.25km (2.5 miles) road tunnel beneath the River Thames, comprising two bores, one for northbound traffic and one for southbound traffic. Cross-passages connecting each bore would be provided for emergency incident response and tunnel user evacuation. Tunnel portal structures would accommodate service buildings for control operations, mechanical and electrical equipment, drainage and maintenance operations. Emergency access and vehicle turn-around facilities would also be provided at the tunnel portals. |

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

© Crown copyright 2023.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

National Highways Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363