

# Lower Thames Crossing

## **5.4.1.3 Final Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways and (2) Historic England (Clean version)**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications:  
Prescribed Forms and Procedure)  
Regulations 2009

Volume 5

**DATE: October 2023  
DEADLINE: 5**

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032  
Application Document Ref: TR010032/APP/5.4.1.3

**VERSION: 3.0**

## Revision history

Version	Date	Submitted at
1.0	31 October 2022	DCO Application
2.0	18 July 2023	Deadline 1
3.0	3 October 2023	Deadline 5

## Status of the Statement of Common Ground

This is the Final Statement of Common Ground with no matters outstanding.

### On behalf of the Applicant

Name	[REDACTED]
Position	[REDACTED]
Organisation	National Highways
Signature	[REDACTED]

### On behalf of Historic England

Name	[REDACTED]
Position	[REDACTED]
Organisation	Historic England
Signature	[REDACTED]

A high-level overview of the engagement undertaken since the DCO application was submitted on 31 October 2022 is summarised in Table A.1 in Appendix A.

## Lower Thames Crossing

### 5.4.1.3 Final Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways and (2) Historic England (Clean version)

#### List of contents

	Page number
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground.....	1
1.2 Principal Areas of Disagreement .....	1
1.3 Terminology .....	1
<b>2 Matters</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1 Movement of outstanding matters.....	2
<b>Appendix A Engagement activity</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix B Glossary</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>Appendix C Documents considered within this Statement of Common Ground</b> .....	<b>55</b>

#### List of tables

	Page number
Table 2.1 Matters.....	3
Table A.1 Engagement activities between the Applicant and Historic England since the DCO Application was submitted on 31 October 2022.....	44
Table A.2 Summary of engagement activities between the Applicant and Historic England which took place prior to DCO Application submission on 31 October 2022 .....	44
Table A.3 Detailed record of engagement activities between the Applicant and Historic England which took place prior to DCO Application submission on 31 October 2022 .....	45

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the proposed A122 Lower Thames Crossing (the Project) made by National Highways Limited (the Applicant) to the Secretary of State for Transport (Secretary of State) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 on 31 October 2022.
- 1.1.2 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the Applicant and Historic England.
- 1.1.3 This version of the SoCG has been submitted at Examination Deadline 5.

## 1.2 Principal Areas of Disagreement

- 1.2.1 On 19 December 2022 the Examining Authority made some early procedural decisions to assist the Applicant, potential Interested Parties and themselves to prepare for the Examination of the DCO application.
- 1.2.2 One of these procedural decisions was to use a tracker recording Principal Areas of Disagreement in Summary (PADS).
- 1.2.3 The PADS Tracker would provide a record of those principal matters of disagreement emerging from the SoCG and should be updated alongside the SoCG as appropriate throughout the Examination with the expectation that a revised PADS Tracker should be submitted at every Examination deadline.
- 1.2.4 Historic England elected not to produce a PADS Tracker at pre-examination stage, indicating to the Applicant that they were content that the number of outstanding matters within the SoCG was insufficient to warrant the exercise.

## 1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the matters table in Section 2 of this SoCG, “Matter not agreed” indicates agreement on the matter could not be reached following significant engagement, and “Matter under discussion” where these points will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties. “Matter agreed” indicates where the issue has now been resolved.

## 2 Matters

### 2.1 Movement of outstanding matters

- 2.1.1 Following submission of the previous version of this SoCG between the Applicant and Historic England at Examination Deadline 1, further discussions on the outstanding matters have taken place. These discussions are summarised in Table A.1 in Appendix A and the outcome of these discussions is summarised below.
- 2.1.2 Since Examination Deadline 1, the following three matters have moved from 'Matter Under Discussion' to 'Matter Agreed':
- a. Item 2.1.22
  - b. Item 2.1.42 (ED1)
  - c. Item 2.1.43 (ED1)
- 2.1.3 Further to the matters raised in the original SoCG and the version submitted at Examination Deadline 1, Historic England requested the inclusion of two new matters in Table 2.1. The new matters are:
- a. Item 2.1.44 (ED5)
  - b. Item 2.1.45 (ED5)
- 2.1.4 Table 2.1 details and presents the matters which have been agreed between (1) the Applicant and (2) Historic England.
- 2.1.5 In the column 'Item No' in Table 2.1, 'RRE' indicates an existing SoCG matter that was also raised in the Relevant Representation and 'DLX' indicates a new matter added during Examination at that deadline.
- 2.1.6 At Examination Deadline 5, all 45 matters are now agreed.

**Table 2.1 Matters**

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
<b>Cultural heritage</b>					
<b>Overview</b>					
General	2.1.1	<p>The River Thames and its estuary has formed the most important artery in the development of settlement, trade and invasion and defence of England since early prehistory; a role which assumed even greater significance after the establishment of London as the capital in the early Roman period. Its pre-eminence has shaped the history, form and density of the settlement, industrial and military landscape which continues to this day. As a result, the landscape through which the proposed road would be built is one which is of great importance for the Nation’s story, the significance of which must be fully identified, assessed and explained in the forthcoming Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Historic England’s response to the Scoping Report stressed the need for an EIA in which of the assessment methodology contained within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 is accompanied by a narrative informed by national and regional research frameworks which fully explains ‘what is important and why’. (2018)</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees with Historic England’s comments regarding the importance of heritage. The Applicant has undertaken an EIA in accordance with DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (Highways England, 2020), and the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) (Department for Transport, 2014) paragraphs 5.126 and 5.127.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement (ES)                      Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b></p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
	2.1.2	<p>Historic England remain concerned that the level of information provided within the supplementary consultation remains superficial. The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) report, even with the supplementary information lacks the necessary detail to provide a comprehensive assessment of the level of harm to the historic environment caused by the changes to the proposals. Approaching an examination with insufficient information on the level of harm in relation to the historic environment would be of significant concern to Historic England. (2020)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that a sufficient level of information has been shared (2022).</p>	<p>Since Supplementary Consultation, the Applicant has prepared a number of additional reports to develop both the baseline and the assessment. These comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ES Appendix 6.1: Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.2: Aerial Investigation and Mapping Report</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.3: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of 20th Century Military Archaeology</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.4: Coastal Fortifications Statements of Significance</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.6: Lower Thames Crossing: Standalone Palaeolithic Archaeological Assessment and Research Framework (SPAA-&amp;-RF)</li> </ul>	<p>ES Appendix 6.1: Cultural Heritage Desk-based Assessment [<a href="#">APP-351</a> to <a href="#">APP-354</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.2: Aerial Investigation and Mapping Report [<a href="#">APP-355</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.3: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of 20th Century Military Archaeology [<a href="#">APP-356</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.4: Coastal Fortifications Statements of Significance [<a href="#">APP-357</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.5: PQDM and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential [<a href="#">APP-358</a>]</p>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ES Appendix 6.7: Geophysical Survey Reports</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing</li> <li>• ES Appendix 6.16: Historic Buildings Recording</li> </ul>	<p>ES Appendix 6.6: SPAA-&amp;-RF [<a href="#">APP-359</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.7: Geophysical Survey Reports [<a href="#">AS-051</a> and <a href="#">APP-361</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports [<a href="#">APP-362</a> to <a href="#">APP-366</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing [<a href="#">APP-371</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.16: Historic Buildings Recording [<a href="#">APP-374</a>]</p>	
Approach to identifying and assessing significance	2.1.3	Historic England would expect all matters to be discussed in far greater detail in the forthcoming Environmental Statement (ES), both in terms of the significance of individuals assets and their wider context	Matters relating to the identification and assessment of significance are covered in detail in the ES. The draft ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage was shared with Historic England.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [ <b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b> ]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		set against national and regional research. (2018) Historic England is now satisfied that the appropriate level of information has been shared (2022).			
Scope of assessment	2.1.4	Historic environment may need to also be crossed reference into 6.11 Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) (Code of Construction Practice, June 2021).	The impact on UXO is assessed in ES Appendix 10.10: UXO Desk Study and Risk Assessment, and is referenced in the Draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (AMS-OWSI) (as detailed in ES Appendix 6.9).	ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI <a href="#">[APP-367]</a> ES Appendix 10.10: UXO Desk Study and Risk Assessment <a href="#">[APP-433]</a>	Matter Agreed
<b>Archaeology remains</b>					
Methodology and documentation	2.1.5	It is likely that the greatest direct impact of the scheme on Cultural Heritage, numerically (and potentially in terms of significance) would arise from the disturbance of buried archaeological remains, both designated, undesignated, and as yet unidentified. It is essential that the ES, in addition to enumerating the individual archaeological sites which will be affected and the impact of the scheme upon them, gives proper consideration to their significance on a landscape scale in the context of national and regional research frameworks. This will be essential to ensure that the assessment and mitigation strategies contained in the ES are in line	The Applicant agrees with this statement and has considered all heritage assets at an appropriate scale and in context with national and regional research frameworks in the ES. This includes DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (Highways England, 2020) and NPSNN (Department for Transport, 2014) paragraphs 5.126 and 5.127. The Applicant has also undertaken archaeological trial trenching (ATT) to identify “as yet unidentified” archaeological remains as reported	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b> ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports <a href="#">[APP-362]</a> to <a href="#">APP-366]</a>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		with policy on the treatment of the historic environment in the National Planning Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). (2018)	in ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports.		
	2.1.6	Chapter 7 on Landscape and Visual reviews baseline information and sets out further information which will be included in addition to a desk-based assessment to support the ES. It is stated in section 7.5.7 of the PEIR that <i>'the project will seek to agree the scope of all surveys and assessments with stakeholders'</i> , and in section 7.6.2 that <i>'a fully detailed assessment will be undertaken before the DCO application which will identify that mitigation requirements and this will be set in the ES.'</i> (2018)	Noted. In 2019, a programme of archaeology assessment, including trial trenching, was agreed with key stakeholders (including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities). The assessment was undertaken between 2019-2022 and written schemes of investigation for the work are detailed in ES Appendices 6.11 and 6.12. The results are presented in ES Appendix 6.8. This information was used to inform the assessment in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b> ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports <a href="#">[APP-362 to APP-366]</a> ES Appendix 6.11: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching south of the River Thames <a href="#">[APP-369]</a> ES Appendix 6.12: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching north of the River Thames <a href="#">[APP-370]</a>	Matter Agreed
	2.1.7	Historic England was concerned that they had not been consulted on the following draft methodologies which were due to be	The Applicant shared the technical notes as requested. They have now been accepted by Historic England	ES Appendix 6.3: Archaeological Desk-Based	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>sent for review in October/November 2018: Technical note on Geophysical Team, Evaluation Strategy, Palaeolithic Specialist, Specification, Paleoenvironmental/geoarchaeologist Specification and Military Archaeologist Specification. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England has now reviewed and is satisfied with the documents (2022).</p>	<p>and are detailed in ES Appendices 6.3 to 6.7, 6.11 and 6.12.</p>	<p>Assessment of 20th Century Military Archaeology  <a href="#">[APP-356]</a>                      ES Appendix 6.4: Coastal Fortifications Statements of Significance  <a href="#">[APP-357]</a>                      ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential  <a href="#">[APP-358]</a>                      ES Appendix 6.6: SPAA-&amp;-RF  <a href="#">[APP-359]</a>                      ES Appendix 6.7: Geophysical Survey Reports  <a href="#">[AS-051]</a> and <a href="#">APP-361]</a></p>	

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
				ES Appendix 6.11: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching south of the River Thames [ <a href="#">APP-369</a> ] ES Appendix 6.12: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching north of the River Thames [ <a href="#">APP-370</a> ]	
Assessment	2.1.8	It is noted that a Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) will be prepared in advance of works to ensure that remains are investigated and recorded appropriately. It is not clear at this stage what this will entail, and more detail is required in terms of mitigation strategies that will be employed. Historic England would also recommend that any remains are assessed in terms of their condition utilising approaches discussed in the Historic England guidance 'Preserving Archaeological Remains' (2016). This will help clarify what is understood about the preservation of any surviving archaeology on the site and its vulnerability to changes	In response to stakeholder comments, including those from Historic England, in 2019, a programme of archaeological assessment, including trial trenching, was agreed with key stakeholders (including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities). The assessment was undertaken between 2019-2022 and written schemes of investigation for the work are detailed in ES Appendices 6.11 and 6.12. The results are presented in ES Appendix 6.8. This information was used to inform the	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [ <b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b> ] ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports [ <a href="#">APP-362</a> to <a href="#">APP-366</a> ] ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [ <a href="#">APP-367</a> ] ES Appendix 6.11: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>that may occur due to the proposed development. (2018).</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied with the methodology regarding baseline development, assessment and mitigation (2022).</p> <p>Historic England confirmed in their Written Representations that the baseline data provided by the Applicant was “adequate for the purposes of assessment and for presentation at examination” (2023).</p>	<p>assessment in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced a draft AMS-OWSI (ES Appendix 6.9) which takes into account likely levels of preservation.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged in extensive discussions with Historic England over the potential for waterlogged deposits of national importance. The archaeological trial trenching has not revealed any significant non-designated organic deposits of possible national importance and the activities of the Project are not likely to cause any dewatering.</p> <p>Historic England has not requested hydrological monitoring or modelling on the Project and has stated that they did not consider it to be necessary in this case.</p>	<p>Trial Trenching south of the River Thames [<a href="#">APP-369</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.12: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching north of the River Thames [<a href="#">APP-370</a>]</p>	
	2.1.9	<p>It is stated that bentonite slurry may be used as part of the drilling process needed to excavate the tunnel; Historic England asked that the potential impact that bentonite slurry outbreak could have on any archaeological remains being considered, but this not been discussed within the PEIR. (2018)</p>	<p>An assessment of the risk of slurry blow-out has been carried out for the Project in accordance with full review by industry experts. Based on current ground information a slurry blow-out should not occur. The tunnelling machines will have a suite of technical measures and controls,</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [<b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [<a href="#">APP-367</a>]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		Historic England is satisfied with the proposed mitigation (2022).	continually operating, which monitor and limit pressure below that which would result in slurry loss. A number of control measures to mitigate the risk of slurry blow-out have been identified and will be communicated to the relevant contractor. It is the Applicant's view that this is appropriate mitigation.		
	2.1.10	Historic England would recommend that the impact that contamination may have on archaeological deposits should also be considered, with reference to Historic England's 2017 'Land Contamination and Archaeology' good practice guide (2018).	The Applicant has taken this into account during any fieldwork to date and is incorporated in the archaeology mitigation strategy for future works (ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI).	ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI <a href="#">[APP-367]</a>	Matter Agreed
	2.1.11	The scope of field survey (7.5.7) at this stage should explicitly reflect policy aims over describing significance and establishing harm to that significance. In relation to trial trenching where other methods of prospection might show as false positives or false negatives (7.5.6.d), Historic England recommend that the approach should set out with over-arching research aims and objectives, building on the HLC work which is proposed in (7.5.6 e). Historic England have commented above (5.12) on the work required to assess potential for the Palaeolithic (7.5.6 f). (2018)	The scope of the field survey was agreed with key stakeholders including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities, taking into account these concerns in 2019.	ES Appendix 6.11: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching south of the River Thames <a href="#">[APP-369]</a> ES Appendix 6.12: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching north of the River Thames <a href="#">[APP-370]</a>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
	2.1.12	Historic England notes that Table 7.2 in the PEIR states the methodology for field evaluation will be agreed with stakeholders and that 'the information regarding heritage assets generated by evaluation will be assessed in the ES' which will include 'the results of suitable field evaluation'. This is further underlined in 5.142 where it is stated that 'the potential for undiscovered heritage assets will be identified in the Desk based Assessment and through field survey and assessed in the ES.' (2018)	Noted. The scope of the field survey was agreed with key stakeholders including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities and is set out in ES Appendices 6.11 and 6.12. The cultural heritage assessment is detailed in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.	ES Appendix 6.11: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching south of the River Thames [ <a href="#">APP-369</a> ] ES Appendix 6.12: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching north of the River Thames [ <a href="#">APP-370</a> ] ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [ <b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b> ]	Matter Agreed
	2.1.13	Given that it is stated that access to carry out trial trenching is subject to agreement with landowners (7.5.6.d) and the extent of the scheme, Historic England is concerned that an appropriate level of archaeological evaluation over the areas of proposed land-take might not have been completed before the submission of the ES (or indeed the commencement of enabling works) and that without this information there might be a risk to the programming and resourcing of	In 2019, a programme of archaeology assessment, including ATT, was agreed with key stakeholders including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities. A programme of over 4,500 ATT trenches was completed in 2022 and covers approximately 5% of the Order Limits. The results have been incorporated in the ES.	ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports [ <a href="#">APP-362</a> to <a href="#">APP-366</a> ] ES Appendix 6.11: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching south of the River Thames [ <a href="#">APP-369</a> ]	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		archaeological mitigation strategies within the construction programme. (2018). Historic England is now satisfied that the ATT is complete (2022).		ES Appendix 6.12: Scheme-wide Written Scheme of Investigation for Trial Trenching north of the River Thames [ <a href="#">APP-370</a> ]	
Approach to the scheduled monument	2.1.14 <b>RRE</b>	One of the areas of multi-period settlement, revealed by aerial photography at Orsett is designated as a scheduled monument. The impact of the scheme would result in substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. Historic England believe that this should be acknowledged within the Cultural Heritage chapter (un-numbered paragraph on p.154: Potential nature of Impact), rather than the current working ('this would have a negative effect on the asset, which would be significant'), which Historic England consider downplays the inevitable harm. In terms of sustaining its archaeological interest, the reconfigured road junction would result in its total destruction, for which a comprehensive mitigation strategy would need to be developed. However, given the demonstrable potential of this wider landscape to contain nationally important archaeological remains, it is to be expected that the landscape archaeology over the course of the route may very well include a	Since 2018, the Applicant has fully acknowledged the impact of the Project on the scheduled monument at Orsett. This has been identified in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage as substantial harm and is specifically referred to in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) within the Code of Construction Practice, as Commitment CH001 'Physical damage to heritage assets'.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [ <b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b> ] ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [ <a href="#">REP3-104</a> ]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>number of other sites of comparable significance. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England also queried the land use post construction for the Orsett Scheduled Monument, with reference to environmental mitigation. (2021)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied and have welcomed National Highways' approach of identifying substantial harm and is satisfied with the REAC commitment CH001. They are also now satisfied with the land use around the Orsett Scheduled Monument (2022).</p>			
Justification for the substantial harm or total loss of significance	2.1.15 <b>RRE</b>	Historic England has concerns regarding the substantial harm or total loss of significant heritage assets which may occur over the course of the construction of the Lower Thames Crossing.	The Applicant acknowledges that substantial harm will take place on four designated assets. This is essential to the construction of the Project. The impact is assessed in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage, and the justification is set out in the Planning Statement.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)] Planning Statement [APP-495]	Matter Agreed
<b>Historic buildings</b>					
Assessment	2.1.16	Historic England considers that comprehensive assessment of the impacts of the scheme on the setting of important designated historic military installations on both the north and south bank of the river is required, in particular Tilbury Fort, whose seventeenth century defences are of	The Applicant agrees with Historic England's comments about the historic military installations and has commissioned two assessments of military remains, a Coastal Fortifications Statement of	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)] ES Appendix 6.3: Archaeological	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>international importance, Coalhouse Fort which Historic England considers nationally to be the pre-eminent exemplar of a Victorian casemated fort, and the battery at Bowaters Farm, all of which are scheduled monuments. The ES should fully assess the significance of these assets individually and their contribution to national defence, acting with other fortifications within the study area (2018)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that these have been assessed in the environmental statement (2022).</p>	<p>Significance and an assessment of 20th century military remains.</p> <p>The Applicant is not directly impacting any of these assets, as they are located outside of the Order Limits. The impact on the setting of these assets has been assessed in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage. Tilbury Fort and Coalhouse Fort have both been assessed as having a slight adverse effect during construction, and a neutral effect during operation. Bowaters Battery has been assessed as having a slight adverse effect during both construction and operation.</p> <p>This information has been incorporated into ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage, and its appendices.</p>	<p>Desk-Based Assessment of 20th Century Military Archaeology [APP-356]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.4: Coastal Fortifications Statements of Significance [APP-357]</p>	
Approach to designated assets	2.1.17 RRE	<p>North of the Thames in Essex, the scheme would result in the total demolition of Thatched Cottage, 1 &amp; 2 Grays Corner Cottages and Murrells Cottage, all Grade II listed buildings. The total loss of a listed building would represent substantial harm to the individual assets, and the Cultural Heritage section should be amended to reflect this. Historic England believe that this be acknowledged within the Cultural</p>	<p>It is agreed that the demolition of these buildings will result in substantial harm, and this is reflected in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage, however this is essential for the Project.</p> <p>The justification for the substantial harm to the listed buildings is detailed in the Planning Statement</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [APP-367]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		Heritage chapter (un-numbered paragraph on p.154: Potential nature on Impact), rather than the current working ('this would have a negative effect on the asset, which would be significant'), which Historic England consider downplays the inevitable harm of total demolition. (2018)	<p>Chapters 4, 6 and 7. The Applicant's view is that the NPSNN test has been met.</p> <p>While acknowledging that this will not reduce the substantial harm, the Applicant proposes to carry out Level 4 Historic Building Surveys, as detailed in ES Appendix 6.9: draft AMS-OWSI and committed to in REAC Commitment CH004 (ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP).</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [<a href="#">REP3-104</a>]                      Planning Statement [<a href="#">APP-495</a>]</p>	
	2.1.18 <b>RRE</b>	The green bridge over the LTC has been increased in width to provide access for non-vehicle users to Shorne Wood and the AONB. The Environmental Impacts Update states that this would likely provide better screening of the LTC from Thong Conservation Area. Photomontages and detailed designs have not been provided at this stage and Historic England is unable to assess in detail the level of impact, whether positive or negative on the conservation area. It is likely that greater screening would provide a small reduction in the adverse effects caused to the character and appearance of the conservation area by the LTC through changes in its setting. However, Historic England note that several buildings are indicated as requiring demolition, including buildings relating to the smallholdings set up by London County	<p>The assessment of the Project on Thong Conservation area is detailed in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>Acknowledging Historic England's concerns regarding 'Homes for Heroes', the Applicant can confirm it no longer proposes to demolish them. The 'Homes for Heroes' have been removed from the Order Limits.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b></p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Council in the early 1920s for returning World War One soldiers ('Homes for Heroes'). These smallholdings were created with each having a distinctive cottage and small 'barn' or workshop/store. This development pattern and buildings remain and could be deemed undesignated heritage assets; the barns are particularly interesting as they are unusual for the area. The land use plans provided indicate that the northernmost cottages and barn/store would be demolished in this plan. Total loss of an important but non-designated heritage asset would potentially represent a very high degree of harm. Furthermore, demolition of these would potentially cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Further assessment of the significance of the buildings at this location is required and Historic England recommends further discussion are undertaken with relevant stakeholders including ourselves prior to the submission of the DCO. (March 2020)</p> <p>Historic England welcomes the removal of the buildings from the Order Limits and is satisfied that they will no longer be directly impacted (2022).</p>			
	<p>2.1.19  <b>RRE</b></p>	<p>Historic England note that the demolition of two grade II buildings is proposed (LEN 1111644 known as the 'Thatched Cottage'</p>	<p>Any factual errors have been corrected. Assessment of each of these listed buildings is detailed, and</p>	<p>Planning Statement [<a href="#">APP-495</a>]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>and 1337056 known as 1 &amp; 2 Grays Corner). The total loss of a listed building would represent substantial harm to the individual assets, and the Cultural Heritage section should be amended to reflect this. Further justification for the harm is needed and any proposed mitigation needs to be established prior to the publication of the ES.</p> <p>Historic England also note that the proposed includes the demolition of the Grade II listed Murrells Cottage. This asset has not been correctly identified as a designated asset on the map books in the Supplementary Consultation and this is clearly an error. As discussed, the total loss of a listed building would represent substantial harm to the individual assets. The true of nature of the harm needs to be acknowledged within the Cultural Heritage chapter rather than the current wording. Having looked at the amended plans, Historic England would also been keen to understand why the road alignment cannot be achieved here without the need to demolish the building and without causing substantial harm to a designated asset. Significant justification would be required, and Historic England would welcome a review of the design at this location to see whether the demolition of this asset can be</p>	<p>the demolition of the three Grade II listed buildings: 1 and 2 Grays Corner Cottages, Thatched Cottage and Murrells Cottages has been assessed, in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage. The conclusion is the effect will be substantial harm. This is specifically referred to within REAC Commitment CH004 'Grade II listed buildings'.</p> <p>The justification for the substantial harm to the listed buildings is detailed in the Planning Statement Chapters 4, 6 and 7. The Applicant's view is that the NPSNN test has been met.</p> <p>The Applicant expects this matter to be agreed once Historic England has reviewed the Planning Statement in the DCO application.</p>	<p>Planning Statement Appendix A: National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) Accordance Table <a href="#">[APP-496]</a></p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a></p> <p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage: <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b></p>	

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		avoided through design changes. Historic England would also like to have further discussion about this asset prior to the submission of the ES (March 2020).			
	2.1.20	<p>LTC/M25 junction:</p> <p>No specific comments on the changes here. Historic England note that concerns have been raised about the potential impact of the scheme upon the significance of the Grade I listed church and conservation area during the construction phase - this is the location of the works compound in the vicinity of the church and the use of Church lane for access. Assessment of the impact and potential harm needs to take the historic environment and designated heritage assets into consideration. (August 2020)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that the impact to the Grade I listed Church is assessed in the ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (2022).</p>	<p>Access to the construction compound has never been proposed through the conservation area along Church Lane. The Order Limits extend into the conservation area along Church Lane only for the purposes of a new bridleway.</p> <p>The impact of construction, including the siting of any compound, on the Grade I listed church and conservation area has been assessed within ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b></p>	Matter Agreed
	2.1.21	<p>Historic England queried the requirement for a potential bund in front of, or adjacent to the Baker Street Windmill Grade II Listed Building (2021).</p> <p>Historic England also requested further assessment of the impact on the setting of the listed building and is now satisfied that this is detailed in ES Appendix 6.16 (2022).</p>	<p>A bund is no longer proposed in front of, or adjacent to the Baker Street Windmill.</p> <p>The impact to the Baker Street Windmill is assessed in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage, and the Applicant commissioned Oxford Archaeology to prepare an</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b>                      ES Appendix 6.16: Historic Buildings</p>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			assessment of the setting of the listed building as detailed in ES Appendix 6.16: Historic Buildings Recording.	Recording <a href="#">[APP-374]</a>	
Justification for the substantial harm or total loss of significance of 'Thatched Cottage'	2.1.22 <b>RRE</b>	<p>A13/A10089 Junction changes (sheet 12-14) Historic England is particularly disappointed to see that the Grade II Listed 'Thatched Cottage' (LEN 111644) within the main junction complex is indicated as requiring demolition. Justification for major adverse impacts would be needed within the ES. Any proposed mitigation also needs to be established prior to its publication. (August 2020).</p> <p>Historic England attended a meeting on 04.05.2022 and is content that recording is an appropriate level of mitigation as detailed in REAC Commitment CH004 (Requirement 9) 'Grade II Listed Buildings'. (2022).</p> <p>Historic England will continue constructive discussions on this matter following their submission of Written Representations.</p> <p>Historic England attended a technical meeting on 25.08.2023 and confirmed that following ongoing discussions with the Applicant, and having now reviewed the REAC and Code of Construction Practice, this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>REAC Commitment CH004 (Requirement 9) 'Grade II listed buildings' details the requirement for recording the listed buildings prior to and during demolition.</p> <p>The justification for the substantial harm to the listed buildings is detailed in the Planning Statement Chapters 4, 6 and 7. The Applicant's view is that the NPSNN test has been met.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that in their Deadline 1 Submission - Written Representation (WR), Historic England confirmed that they do not object in principle to the demolition of Thatched Cottage and, following a technical meeting on 25 August 2023, agreed that historic buildings recording was appropriate mitigation for the loss of the listed building and that the SoCG should be updated accordingly.</p> <p>While planning policy does not require relocation of the cottage, the Applicant is involved in discussions</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a></p> <p>Planning Statement <a href="#">[APP-495]</a></p> <p>Historic England Deadline 1 Submission - Written Representation (WR) <a href="#">[REP1-240]</a></p>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			with Essex Place Services and Historic England over the potential for a suitable alternative location.		
Justification for the substantial harm or total loss of significance of '1 & 2 Grays Corner'	2.1.42 (ED1) RRE	<p>A13/A10089 Junction changes (sheet 12-14) Historic England is particularly disappointed to see that the Grade II Listed '1 &amp; 2 Grays Corner' (LEN 1337056) within the main junction complex is indicated as requiring demolition. Justification for major adverse impacts would be needed within the ES. Any proposed mitigation also needs to be established prior to its publication. (August 2020).</p> <p>Historic England attended a meeting on 04.05.2022 and is content that recording is an appropriate level of mitigation as detailed in REAC Commitment CH004 (Requirement 9) 'Grade II Listed Buildings'. (2022).</p> <p>Historic England will continue constructive discussions on this matter following their submission of Written Representations.</p> <p>Historic England attended a technical meeting on 25.08.2023 and confirmed that following ongoing discussions with the Applicant, and having now reviewed the REAC and Code of Construction Practice, this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>REAC Commitment CH004 (Requirement 9) 'Grade II listed buildings' details the requirement for recording the listed buildings prior to and during demolition.</p> <p>The justification for the substantial harm to the listed buildings is detailed in the Planning Statement Chapters 4, 6 and 7. The Applicant's view is that the NPSNN test has been met.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that in their Deadline 1 Submission - Written Representation (WR), Historic England confirmed that they do not object in principle to the demolition of 1 &amp; 2 Grays Corner and, following a technical meeting on the 25 August 2023, agreed that historic buildings recording was appropriate mitigation for the loss of the listed building and that the SoCG should be updated accordingly.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a></p> <p>Planning Statement <a href="#">[APP-495]</a></p> <p>Historic England Deadline 1 Submission - Written Representation (WR) <a href="#">[REP1-240]</a></p>	Matter Agreed
Justification for the substantial	2.1.43 (ED1)	A13/A10089 Junction changes (sheet 12-14) Historic England is particularly disappointed to see that the Grade II Listed	REAC Commitment CH004 (Requirement 9) 'Grade II listed buildings' details the requirement for	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
harm or total loss of significance of 'Murrells Cottage'	RRE	<p>'Murrells Cottage' on the junction's eastern approach is indicated as requiring demolition. Justification for major adverse impacts would be needed within the ES. Any proposed mitigation also needs to be established prior to its publication. (August 2020).</p> <p>Historic England attended a meeting on 04.05.2022 and is content that recording is an appropriate level of mitigation as detailed in REAC Commitment CH004 (Requirement 9) 'Grade II Listed Buildings'. (2022).</p> <p>Historic England will continue constructive discussions on this matter following their submission of Written Representations.</p> <p>Historic England attended a technical meeting on 25.08.2023 and confirmed that following ongoing discussions with the Applicant, and having now reviewed the REAC and Code of Construction Practice, this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>recording the listed buildings prior to and during demolition.</p> <p>The justification for the substantial harm to the listed buildings is detailed in the Planning Statement Chapters 4, 6 and 7. The Applicant's view is that the NPSNN test has been met.</p> <p>The heritage significance of Murrells Cottage derives in part from the extensive documentary information available from around 1840 which provides a well-documented history of the site and its occupants.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that in their Deadline 1 Submission - Written Representation (WR), and during a technical meeting on 25 August 2023, Historic England agreed that Level 4 recording of Murrells Cottage is an appropriate level of mitigation for this asset.</p> <p>This recording will include further archival research which would increase understanding of the significance of the asset's site and past occupancy, in accordance with paragraph 5.140 of the NPSNN.</p>	<p>Planning Statement [<a href="#">APP-495</a>]</p> <p>Historic England Deadline 1 Submission - Written Representation (WR) [<a href="#">REP1-240</a>]</p>	
Undesignated heritage	2.1.44 (ED5)	Historic England disagrees with the assessment of the significance set out in the	The Applicant notes Historic England's comments and welcomes	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [ <a href="#">REP3-104</a> ]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
assets at Ockenden Road		<p>ES for a group of undesignated heritage assets at Ockenden Road.</p> <p>Historic England would like to see Project IDs 4153, 4154, 4155, 4156, 4157, 4775 and 4776 (Estate House, 1-4 Bridge Cottages, Larwood Cottage, and The Rosery) reassessed as a group, rather than individually, with a view to securing a higher level of recording as mitigation for the impacts on the assets, given their high value when considered as a group.</p> <p>Historic England notes that 1-2 Cherry Orchard Cottages also form part of this group but are not assessed as part of the ES and do not have an asset number.</p> <p>Historic England confirmed at a technical meeting on 25.08.2023 that it is content with the approach to reassessment and is satisfied that Level 4 recording is an appropriate level of mitigation. As such this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>the constructive engagement on this matter to date.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes Historic England's identification of 1-2 Cherry Orchard Cottages and will update the ES to ensure these assets are included within the assessments.</p> <p>The Applicant understands Historic England's concerns around group value, and agrees to reassess so as to consider the value of these assets as a group.</p> <p>The Applicant has developed an approach in consultation with Historic England whereby the Applicant proposes to carry out Level 4 recording of these assets. Unlike the Level 3 recording previously proposed, this increased level of recording would treat the assets as a group and provide additional documentary research to enable greater understanding of their origins.</p>	<p>Planning Statement <a href="#">[APP-495]</a></p>	
Undesignated heritage assets at Thong (Homes for Heroes)	2.1.45 (ED5)	<p>Historic England disagrees with the assessment of the significance set out for Project IDs 1561, 4401-4403, 4597-4600 (Homes for Heroes) at Thong.</p> <p>Historic England requests that these assets be reassessed as a group, rather than</p>	<p>The Applicant notes Historic England's comments and welcomes the constructive engagement on this matter to date.</p> <p>The Homes for Heroes properties were not designed as a group, but</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a></p> <p>Planning Statement <a href="#">[APP-495]</a></p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>individually, as the Project's impact on these assets, and thus the level of harm, could be higher than reported.</p> <p>Historic England confirmed at a technical meeting on 25.08.2023 that this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>rather were developed as individual plots, meaning there was no functional inter-dependency between the properties.</p> <p>Having consulted with Historic England, the Applicant accepts the concerns raised around group value but continues to contend that the dwellings have been significantly altered, extended, and assimilated into neighbouring farms and the local village as a whole, in effect losing their original context.</p> <p>This is in line with the Thong Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Documents, (prepared by Gravesham Borough Council), which states that "<i>in many respects the semis are not unlike the more common rural council houses of the inter-war period</i>".</p>		
<b>Historic landscape</b>					
Overall approach	2.1.23	<p>It is now proposed that all vegetation will be removed from the A2/M2 central reservation. The Environmental Impacts Updates document provided in the supplementary consultation rightly states that this is likely to cause additional adverse effects to the significance of the Grade II</p>	<p>Representative viewpoints for the assessment have been agreed with key stakeholders including Historic England.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided the representative viewpoints in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and the</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b></p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Cobham Hall Registered Park and Garden (RPG) due to changes within its setting.</p> <p>It is likely that the A2/M2 will become more visible from within the park, although it is unclear at this stage how harmful this would be. The other location where there is likely to be a slight increase in visibility is adjacent to Brewers Road bridge (east side, near the proposed WCH ramp).</p> <p>Historic England notes that a full assessment of the effect as well as photomontages would be included in the Environmental Statement, and that mitigation proposals include woodland mitigation planting to replace trees and provide screening.</p> <p>Historic England would welcome further discussion with regards to the viewpoints chosen to illustrate this aspect of the LVIA and would encourage LTC to circulate these documents as soon as possible so that the level of harm caused by the removal of the vegetation can be fully assessed against the mitigation proposed.</p> <p>Historic England confirmed on 14.03.2023 that, having reviewed the DCO application, this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>LVIA (ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual).</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that, following review of the DCO application by Historic England, this matter has now been agreed.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual <a href="#">[APP-145]</a></p> <p>ES Figure 6.5 Location of Representative Heritage Viewpoints <a href="#">[APP-191]</a></p>	
Relationship to the other chapters	2.1.24	As advised in our Scoping Report, the Cultural Heritage and Landscape and Visual Chapters should present and draw a fully	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in ES Chapter 7 includes HLC as it considers key	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage <b>[Document]</b>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>integrated and cross-referenced understanding of the landscape history; the way in which land use and settlement patterns have evolved, their historical significance and their contribution to historic character. There is no cross referencing between the Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) work in [Chapter 6] and [Chapter 7] Landscape where this would help to inform landscape mitigation options. HLC will identify important historic land use, landscape grain and features that may often merit preservation and enhancement. Historic England consider failing to recognise the contribution of HLC in this chapter would be a missed opportunity and should be addressed. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England confirmed on 14.03.2023 that, having reviewed the DCO application, this matter can now be agreed.</p>	<p>heritage assets in the assessment of the landscape value of local landscape character areas and their susceptibility to the changes likely to be brought about by the Project. An HLC study has also been undertaken and is presented in full in ES Appendix 6.1: Desk Based Assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that, following review of the DCO application by Historic England, this matter has now been agreed.</p>	<p><b>Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b>                      ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [<a href="#">APP-145</a>]                      ES Appendix 6.1: Cultural Heritage Desk-based Assessment [<a href="#">APP-351</a> to <a href="#">APP-354</a>]</p>	
<b>Marine archaeology</b>					
Marine and foreshore surveys	2.1.25	<p>A number of geophysics techniques will be employed to survey the marine and foreshore areas (Section 6.9.8), including side-scan sonar, multi-beam echo sounder, sub-bottom profiling, magnetic gradiometer and ultra-high-resolution seismic survey. It may be necessary to consider additional techniques that are suitable in the foreshore</p>	<p>The Project would not have any impacts on marine archaeology. The Applicant has therefore not engaged with a specialist marine archaeologist, but the team's archaeologists have the relevant expertise to assess the foreshore area.</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>and intertidal zones, such as electrical resistivity imaging or electromagnetic ground conductivity, and that can investigate deposits to depths over 20m depending on the set-up of the equipment. Historic England would recommend that the strategies used to survey the proposed development areas should be carefully considered, such as the line spacings that are used, as this can impact on the ability to identify and resolve archaeological features of interest. Historic England would therefore recommend that the Historic England 'Marine Geophysics' (2013) guidance be considered. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that no material changes are anticipated and therefore no assessment will be undertaken. (March 2020)</p>			
<b>Geoarchaeology and palaeolithic archaeology</b>					
Deposit models	2.1.26 <b>RRE</b>	<p>Section 6.7 discusses the preparation of deposit models, which is good to see but Historic England would expect to see greater detail in the specification document mentioned in Section 6.8.8 in terms of how this will be carried out. In addition, it is stated that an impact assessment will be carried out, but Historic England would recommend that the potential and the limitations of the existing information should</p>	<p>Palaeolithic and Holocene deposit models have been produced and results incorporated into ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and presented in ES Appendices 6.5 and 6.13.</p> <p>Palaeolithic and Holocene deposit models and ES Appendices 6.5 and 6.13 have been shared with Historic England.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b>                      ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit</p>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>be state. This would highlight where gaps exist in our understanding and therefore what is needed to improve the situation so that impacts of the proposed development can be fully assessed. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England has now received and is satisfied with the deposit models (2022).</p>		<p>Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential  <a href="#">[APP-358]</a>                      ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing  <a href="#">[APP-371]</a></p>	
Use of specialists	2.1.27	<p>At the Scoping Stage, Historic England recommended that a number of Palaeolithic projects/reports be included in this baseline assessment, such as the English Rivers Palaeolithic Survey, the Southern Rivers Palaeolithic Project, as well as relevant Quaternary Research association Field Guides. These have not been mentioned in the PEIR, and Historic England would also recommend that the Palaeolithic sections of the relevant Regional Research Frameworks documents are included in the assessment of Palaeolithic and Holocene sequences, such as the nationally significant sites of Purfleet, Aveley, Swanscombe and Tilbury, but these have not been discussed as part of the PEIR. The</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered Historic England's comments and in 2019 appointed two specialist academics with extensive experience of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) to advise on Palaeolithic and Holocene archaeology. The Applicant has produced a range of assessment documents (ES Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.13) and has shared these with Historic England. The results have been incorporated in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <a href="#">[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</a>                      ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential  <a href="#">[APP-358]</a></p>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>alluvial and peat sequences recorded at Tilbury have been discussed in Section 7.4.24 in terms of potential for waterlogged archaeological evidence dating from the Mesolithic onwards to be recovered as well as the potential for Palaeolithic remains from the gravel terraces. However, Historic England would expect a more detailed discussion of the archaeological potential of these areas within the Desk Based Assessment and the Environmental Statement. (2018)</p> <p>Since the appointment of the University of Southampton and the University of Wales, Trinity St. Davids, to provide expert advice on palaeolithic and Holocene archaeology, Historic England is now satisfied with the approach to the assessment (2022).</p>		<p>ES Appendix 6.6: SPAA-&amp;-RF  <a href="#">[APP-359]</a></p> <p>ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing  <a href="#">[APP-371]</a></p>	
	2.1.28	<p>Section 8.3 states the specialists will be involved in the assessment of palaeoenvironment and geomorphology of the project area, which is good to see, but additional detail is required to define how this will be achieved. A scope of works for the geoarchaeologist is set out in a document (Section 8.3.2), but Historic England have yet to see this. A Palaeolithic specialist will be used to investigate the potential of the development area (Section 8.5), which is good to see. Historic England would recommend that the</p>	<p>The Applicant has appointed the University of Southampton and the University of Wales, Trinity St. Davids, to provide expert advice on palaeolithic and Holocene archaeology. They have produced a number of reports (ES Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.13), and Historic England is now satisfied with the approach to the assessment.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential  <a href="#">[APP-358]</a></p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>geoarchaeological and Palaeolithic specialists collaborate and communicate as their findings will be benefit each research area. (2018)</p> <p>Since the appointment of the University of Southampton and the University of Wales, Trinity St. Davids, to provide expert advice on palaeolithic and Holocene archaeology, Historic England is now satisfied with the approach to the assessment (2022).</p>		<p>ES Appendix 6.6: SPAA-&amp;-RF  <a href="#">[APP-359]</a></p> <p>ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing  <a href="#">[APP-371]</a></p>	
	2.1.29	<p>A series of ground investigation works need to be carried out as part of the assessment works, which will include a number of intrusive surveys being carried out (Section 11.5.3). The information obtained through this work is likely to be of value to the archaeological assessment and so it would be efficient to include a geoarchaeologist in the planning stages to ensure that opportunities are maximised to understand the archaeological potential of an area, and the risks that may need to be addressed, such as the archaeological preservation and condition of remains, compression of deposits or the presence of archaeologically sterile areas. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied with the Ground Investigation undertaken by National Highways (2022).</p>	<p>All relevant ground investigation (GI) works were completed between 2018-2022 and were archeologically monitored as part of the GI contract. The reports on the archaeological monitoring for GI have been shared with Historic England, and results incorporated in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and used to inform ES Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.13.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b></p> <p>ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential  <a href="#">[APP-358]</a></p> <p>ES Appendix 6.6: SPAA-&amp;-RF  <a href="#">[APP-359]</a></p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
				ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing [ <a href="#">APP-371</a> ]	
Strategy and future work	2.1.30	<p>Historic England is conscious of the potential for the recovery of deposits of geological and anthropogenic interest, as well as the possibility of deeply buried archaeology at both the locations of the north and south portals. It would therefore be extremely useful in geology and soils section (for example GS00210 – North Portal) to make reference to the historic environment potential and the deep buried Holocene sequences on both North and South side. Historic England has discussed a specific historic environment ‘strategy’ type document and cross reference to the historic environmental section and the strategy documents for handling archaeology at depth would be required in the CoCP/REAC. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied with National Highways’ approach to the assessment of deep buried Holocene sequences (2022).</p>	<p>A Palaeolithic and Holocene desk-based assessment, and review of relevant fieldwork, including GI has been carried out and is reported in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and ES Appendices 6.5, 6.6 and 6.13. Methodologies and WSIs for further Palaeolithic investigation across the Project have been developed and include a scheme-wide Palaeolithic WSI that Historic England has provided comments on (ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI).</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [<b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.5: Lower Thames Crossing: Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Desk-based Assessment of Palaeolithic Potential [<a href="#">APP-358</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.6: SPAA-&amp;-RF [<a href="#">APP-359</a>]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [<a href="#">APP-367</a>]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
				ES Appendix 6.13: Holocene Geoarchaeological Desk-based Assessment of the Route of the Lower Thames Crossing <a href="#">[APP-371]</a> ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a>	
<b>Cultural heritage and utilities</b>					
Specific examples	2.1.31	<p>The supplementary consultation indicates a number of potential diversion routes for utilities. One option, if neither the northern nor southern routes for gas diversions are feasible, is for a diversion through Jeskyns Community Woodland/County Park. Part of this potential diversion would be through the Grade II Cobham Hall Registered Park and Garden, and one of the proposed service routes would also pass immediately adjacent to a scheduled Bronze Age bowl barrow which sits on a prominent ridge within Ashenbank Wood.</p> <p>Historic England has concerns regarding this option and the lack of information provided regarding it. It is likely that there would be some harm to the significance of the park, possibly not only in the construction phase, but potentially also</p>	<p>The utilities diversions are now proposed to remain to the north of the M2/A2 corridor as detailed in ES Chapter 2: Project Description, and therefore do not impact on the Grade II Cobham Hall Registered Park and Garden and the scheduled Bronze Age bowl barrow which sits on a prominent ridge within Ashenbank Wood.</p>	ES Chapter 2: Project Description <a href="#">[APP-140]</a>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>through maintenance clearance as the works have the potential to impact upon the wooded character of this part of the park would be affected. The scheduled barrow may also be affected through changes in its setting and potentially by disturbance of any previously unidentified archaeological remains that may be associated with it. If remains are found of a similar date and period, it is likely that they would have an equivalent significance to the scheduled monument and further consideration given to the need to undertake works so close to a scheduled monument.</p> <p>The Utilities Update document does not provide adequate information on the type of trenching or the number of receptor pits required in this option. It does not explicitly state the location or number of trees that would have to be felled. It states that 'the level of compensatory tree planting required for the loss of any areas of ancient woodland' would be agreed with statutory stakeholders. However, the level to which the woodland would be impacted and where and how compensatory tree planting would occur to mitigate the impact is unclear.</p> <p>In addition, the specific effects on the setting of the scheduled barrow and any associated archaeological remains (through clearance or development activities), have</p>			

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>not been sufficiently described or considered. It is therefore difficult to assess the level of harm to designated heritage assets either in the construction or operation phase. Historic England thinks that this should be clearly addressed before a decision on which diversion option is chosen, and Historic England would welcome a further detailed discussion about this issue prior to the submission of the DCO. (March 2020).</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that the utilities diversions will not impact Grade II Cobham Hall Registered Park and Garden, or the scheduled Bronze Age bowl barrow which sits on a prominent ridge within Ashenbank Wood (2022).</p>			
	2.1.32	<p>Historic England note that under Chapter 4 EIA Methodology (utility proposals around A13/A1089 Junction (east) on page 110 of the LTC Environmental Impacts Assessment Update 2020 mentions two options Option 1 would have an increased adverse impact upon the scheduled monument known as the 'Springfield style enclosures and Iron age enclosures south of Hill House, Baker Street (LEN 1009287) and Option 2 would have an increased adverse impact upon the scheduled monument known as the Causewayed Enclosure and Anglo-Saxon cemetery 500m</p>	<p>The Applicant has worked closely with Historic England and National Grid to ensure that there are no longer any impacts on either Springfield or the Causewayed enclosure.</p> <p>Originally, a significant impact was caused by the Cadent Gas Diversion HP8 which was designed to include part of the designated area of the scheduled monument, Springfield Style Enclosure and Iron Age Enclosures. A meeting between the Applicant, Cadent Gas and Historic</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>EN of Heath Place (LEN: 1009287) to have been plotted on the map books (its absent from sheet 14a) as it would have been easier to directly visualise the potential impact. However, it is clear from our analysis that Option 1 would mean the utility diversion would go through the middle of the scheduled monument. This would have an unacceptably high adverse impact upon the monument and would have a major adverse effect upon it. It is likely Historic England would view this as a high to substantial level of harm. Option 2 may be the preferred choice however both options raise considerable concerns.</p> <p>In relation to Option 2, Historic England note (Sheet 13) the close proximity of the redline boundary to the scheduled monument (Causewayed Enclosure and Anglo-Saxon cemetery 500m EN of Heath Place LEN: 1009286). A long projection of land comes towards the monument and Historic England have concerns in terms of the accuracy if the information that has led to the designation and then protecting the asset from harm during the works. If remains are found a similar date and period, it is likely that they would have an equivalent significance to the scheduled monument. Further consideration needs given to the need to undertake works so</p>	<p>England was held on 26 March 2021, which led to a design change that moved the diversion slightly to the east and reduced the working area near the scheduled monument which removed the direct physical impact.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>close to a scheduled monument and whether further design changes could be developed that avoid impacts to either monument.</p> <p>Historic England is pleased that the D-Con mapping shows no impact upon the latter monument and the clarification is welcome (Causewayed Enclosure and Anglo-Saxon cemetery 500 m EN of Heath Place). The maps do however show that part of the scheduled monument known as the 'Springfield style enclosures and Iron age enclosures south of Hill House, Baker Street' remains within the order limits. The nature of this impact needs to be established and clarified in writing with Historic England prior to the publication of the ES. (August 2020).</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that the 'Springfield style enclosures and Iron age enclosures south of Hill House, Baker Street' Scheduled Monument is no longer located within the Order Limits (2022).</p>			
Impacts upon Cropmark Complex at Orsett	2.1.33 <b>RRE</b>	Historic England also note that no additional impact upon the larger scheduled monument known as the Cropmark Complex at Orsett (LEN 1002134) is anticipated from the construction but is noted for the utility works.	A coherent and joined up strategy for the scheduled monument at Orsett is included within ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI and within the Project design for archaeological excavation of the monument.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b>	Matter Agreed



Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Impacts on this monument are unavoidable and have been previously confirmed.</p> <p>Historic England is however concerned to note that Map Book 1 (sheet 14) earmarks part of the scheduled monument here as 'Potential replacement land for special category land (including open space). Further information is required about what this might be used for, what impact this is likely to have upon the scheduled monument and to what extent this also need to be mitigated.</p> <p>A coherent and joined up strategy for mitigating the high level of harm to this monument is needed and anticipated in the ES. As discussed once the work here is completed the scheduled monument would not in our view be sustainable as a designation, and therefore land use maybe acceptable provided sufficient mitigation has been agreed and undertaken. Historic England would therefore welcome further discussion about this asset and whether the demolition of this asset be avoided through design changes prior to the submission of the ES. (March 2020).</p> <p>Historic England is now content that proposed land use around the cropmarks at Orsett is acceptable (2022).</p>	<p>REAC Commitment CH003 (Schedule 2, Requirement 9 of the draft DCO) 'Cropmark complex scheduled monument at Orsett' states:</p> <p><i>'The Contractors shall follow the Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE) procedural model (Historic England, 2015) to prepare a detailed project design for the archaeological investigation of the cropmark complex at Orsett (SM1). This design will inform the WSI and the development of archaeological mitigation. After completion of the archaeological works, as specified in the WSI, the relevant archaeological contractor shall apply to Historic England for removal of the site from the official list of protected historic sites.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the land use for the extant areas of the scheduled monument will not be harmful. Details will be included within the ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI <a href="#">[APP-367]</a></p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP <a href="#">[REP3-104]</a></p>	

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Utilities works around Ockendon	2.1.34	<p>Utilities Works around Ockendon (Sheet 16) Historic England note that the order limits still include the scheduled monument known as the 'gate house and moat of South Ockendon Old Hall (LEN 1002155), and the Grade II listed gatehouse and bridge. Clarity was requested regarding whether the translocation site would require any works for which scheduled monument consent would be required. (August 2020).</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied that consent is not required as no works will be undertaken on the Scheduled Monument (2022).</p>	<p>The area of the South Ockendon Old Hall Scheduled Monument is in the Project's Order Limits to provide a suitable location for essential ecological mitigation in the form of bat boxes on the trees on the island in the middle of the moat as detailed in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity.</p> <p>Access to the island is required which is why the gatehouse/bridge are also included within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The Applicant would not be proposing to fix bat boxes to any listed structures/elements of the scheduled monument. The type of boxes the Applicant will install require minimum maintenance – they are designed to last 20-25yrs.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage  <b>[Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)]</b>                      ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity  <a href="#">[APP-146]</a></p>	Matter Agreed
<b>Environmental mitigation</b>					
Methodology and documentation	2.1.35	<p>The identification of archaeological sensitivity and the need for mitigation by excavation, and its programming is particularly important given the use of the Rochdale envelope. Off-site habitat creation works as ecological mitigation will also need to be assessed and evaluated as appropriate within the archaeological</p>	<p>The assessment of the Project, both desk-based and field assessment (including ATT where any below ground impacts had the potential to affect unknown buried archaeological remains), has included areas of habitat creation and other environmental mitigation,</p>	<p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI  <a href="#">[APP-367]</a></p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>programme. No timetable has yet been given for the implementation of a programme of archaeological field evaluation, but the expectation must be that a project of this size traversing the Thames terrace would result in the identification of a considerable number of important archaeological sites and it will be important that sufficient work has been undertaken in order that the ES can demonstrate that the archaeological impacts of the scheme have been fully identified and assessed. (2018). Timescales for undertaking ATT were agreed with Historic England. ATT has now been undertaken and the results shared with Historic England. Historic England agree that the assessment is adequate (2022).</p>	<p>with the exception of recently identified nitrogen deposition compensation sites. Nitrogen deposition compensation sites have been assessed using readily available desk-based sources. A programme of geophysical survey and potential ATT will be agreed with key stakeholders including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities, and will be carried out to inform detailed design, as detailed in ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI.</p>		
<b>Heritage mitigation</b>					
CoCP, REAC and AMS-OWSI	2.1.36 <b>RRE</b>	Historic England is pleased to see the commitment at 1.4.10 to 'avoiding, reducing or compensating for, as far as reasonably practicable, the adverse effects of the construction and operational activities of the Project' and that this includes the historic environment (Code of Construction Practice, June 2021).	Noted. This commitment is included in ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP.	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [ <a href="#">REP3-104</a> ]	Matter Agreed
	2.1.37 <b>RRE</b>	Historic England is pleased to see reference to Historic England at 2.3.1 in Table 2.1 and	Noted. This commitment is included in ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP.	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [ <a href="#">REP3-104</a> ]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		again in Table 4.1 (Code of Construction Practice, June 2021).			
	2.1.38 <b>RRE</b>	At 7.3 (REAC table) and in particular Table 7.1 (Pre-Commencement REAC Table) Historic England is pleased to see the Cultural Heritage Topics (CH001 to CH008). In particular, Historic England has noted a significant improvement in format, and also improved working with regards to the Historic Environment. Specifically, noting CH003 with regards to the cropmark at Orsett Scheduled Monument, CH004 listed buildings.	Noted. This commitment is included in ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP.	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [ <a href="#">REP3-104</a> ]	Matter Agreed
Principles of mitigation	2.1.39	Following on from evaluation, the process of decision making on managing significant remains is not spelt out very clearly in 7.6.2, being postponed to ES production itself. It is stated that the tabulated effects and mitigation (Table 7.6) are based on existing information (7.6.1), however there is no reason at this point not to reflect national policy, as set out in the NPSNN, with regard to processes followed and the options available to manage archaeological heritage in major schemes. Local archaeological curators should at the very least be consulted on interim results and offered the opportunity to provide guidance on managing significance in the cases of major finds. If WSIs for archaeological mitigation	The assessment within the ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage follows national policy and guidance (NPSNN, EN-1, EN-4, EN-5 and NPPF), and Historic England's 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning' guidance on the process of decision making on managing significant remains.  In 2019, a programme of archaeology assessment, including ATT, was agreed with key stakeholders including Historic England and archaeological advisors to the local planning authorities to identify unknown archaeological remains. This has been implemented	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [ <b>Document Reference 6.1 Chapter 6 (3)</b> ] ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports [ <a href="#">APP-362</a> to <a href="#">APP-366</a> ]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>are to be prepared in advance of enabling works and the construction programme then, Historic England reiterates that evaluation must be proceed in a timely fashion so that results can be fed into the WSIs. (2018)</p> <p>Historic England has now received the final ATT reports and is satisfied that the results have been used to inform the mitigation strategy (2022).</p>	<p>and results incorporated in the ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage. The results of the ATT have also been considered by the Applicant.</p> <p>Interim reports on the fieldwork were provided to Historic England and the local authority cultural heritage advisors. They have since received all of the final ATT reports. Their comments and the results of the reports have been used to inform the mitigation strategy (ES Appendix 6.8).</p>		
Mitigation strategies	2.1.40	<p>The apparent blanket approach of preferring preservation by record (Table 7.6) should be reconsidered. Although the road line itself may prove to be immutable, consideration should be given to design changes for the ancillary works (road re-alignments, services re-alignments, compounds, earthworks, planting etc) where this could secure preservation in situ (or even public presentation) of any remains that evaluation shows to be of high archaeological importance. There is no reason to exclude these options at this stage, particularly since preservation is proposed for key landscape features in Chapter 8. For example, within Havering certain opposed (Bug Farm, Strawberry Farm) are located close to reduce</p>	<p>This approach was first presented in 2018 and has been significantly refined in consultation with Historic England.</p> <p>The first principle of mitigation is avoidance and there are examples across the Project where designs have been changed to avoid impacts on heritage assets, for example, the redesign of the balancing ponds south of the A226, which have been moved to avoid buried Mesolithic archaeology.</p> <p>The revised archaeological mitigation strategy has been developed in consultation with Historic England at cultural heritage</p>	ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI <a href="#">[APP-367]</a>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>archaeological impact. It would be good to have more detail on the individual proposed uses for these compounds and to have a GIS shapefile of them. For example, Strawberry Farm has extent ridge and furrow marked on the GLHER. This is a site where an overhead lines compound is proposed. Yet, a neighbouring field is historic landfill and could be used without damaging the heritage asset. (2018).</p> <p>Historic England is now satisfied with the proposals set out in the draft mitigation strategy (2022).</p>	<p>progress meetings. Historic England is satisfied with the approach set out in ES Appendix 6.9: draft AMS-OWSI.</p>		
<b>Legacy and benefits issues</b>					
Overall approach	2.1.41	<p>Historic England would also like to see consideration of how public benefit through interpretation and outreach could be applied to better reveal the significance of affected assets and thus improve the mitigation response and result in positive measures which would contribute to the Project Legacy agenda. For example, proposed land acquisition in East Tilbury runs right up to the eastern boundary of the East Tilbury battery (scheduled monument). Additional acquisition of the battery itself would provide an opportunity for this heritage asset to be beneficially managed for its historical interest as a community asset as a northern extension to Coalhouse Park. (2018)</p>	<p>Historic England chairs a quarterly heritage legacy working group with local authorities, charities and the Project's Legacy and Benefits team. Such projects are discussed and developed at these meetings.</p> <p>The Applicant does not propose to include the East Tilbury Battery within the Order Limits; however, the Applicant is supportive of Historic England's efforts to bring the monument under more suitable management. This is being investigated with partners through the heritage legacy working group.</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Historic England Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		Historic England accepts that East Tilbury Battery will not be included within the Order limits and are working with the heritage legacy working group to investigate alternative management regimes (2022).			



## Appendix A Engagement activity

**Table A.1 Engagement activities between the Applicant and Historic England since the DCO Application was submitted on 31 October 2022**

Date	Overview of Engagement Activities
25 November 2022	Historic England attended the Project's Biodiversity and Ecology Briefing.
15 December 2022	Meeting to discuss matters under discussion in Historic England's SoCG.
14 March 2023	Meeting to discuss matters under discussion in Historic England's SoCG.
20 April 2023	Historic England attended a Project site visit to Coalhouse Point to discuss water supply to proposed wetland habitat creation.
02 May 2023	Historic England attended Stakeholder Landscape and Ecology Working Group workshop session.
17 May 2023	Historic England attended a stakeholder briefing on the public consultation material.
25 August 2023	Meeting to discuss matters under discussion in Historic England's SoCG, and matters raised in their Written Representations.

**Table A.2 Summary of engagement activities between the Applicant and Historic England which took place prior to DCO Application submission on 31 October 2022**

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
2015 – 2022	Public consultations	Historic England has been consulted on all of the Project's public consultations.
2015 – 2022	Workshops with Statutory Environmental Bodies (SEBs)	Regular workshops to report Project updates, develop design and accept feedback from SEBs.
2019 – 2021	Monthly Progress Meeting	Monthly progress meetings to provide Project updates to Historic England and local authority cultural heritage advisors.
2021 – 2022	Bi-monthly Progress Meeting	Bi-monthly progress meetings to provide Project updates to Historic England and local authority cultural heritage advisors.
2020 – 2022	Quarterly benefits steering group	Quarterly meetings attended by the leads of each of the legacy working groups and directors of local authorities.
2021 – 2022	Quarterly heritage legacy working group	Quarterly meetings to progress heritage focussed legacy projects. The meeting is chaired by Historic England and attended by local authorities and charities.



**Table A.3 Detailed record of engagement activities between the Applicant and Historic England which took place prior to DCO Application submission on 31 October 2022**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of contact / correspondence</b>	<b>Key topics discussed and key outcomes</b>
January 2015	Joint Meeting with Environment Agency, Historic England, Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Natural England	Workshop to present emerging thinking regarding route options and draft approach to environmental appraisal.
March 2015	Workshop with SEBs	Presentation of long list of route options and update on progress regarding development of environmental appraisal, details of crossing options and request for formal feedback on environmental appraisal findings.
June 2015	Workshop with SEBs	Workshop to obtain feedback on the draft shortlist and rejected options of route locations; the detailed assessment of the shortlist; proposed methodology and survey work; update on the crossing types.
November 2015	Workshop with SEBs	Workshop to present Project update including the final shortlist and gain feedback on initial environmental appraisal.
January – March 2016	Options Phase Consultation	Non-statutory public consultation on option locations for the Project
February 2016	Workshop with SEBs	Workshop to discuss the Project public consultation materials, with a view to answering any questions about the proposals now that the materials are available.
July 2016	Workshop with SEBs	Workshop to update the attendees on the Project post-consultation, and next steps. It was also an opportunity to discuss SEB consultation responses and to clarify any issues.
18 May 2017	Joint Meeting with Environment Agency, Historic England, MMO, Natural England	Walkthrough of the preferred route of the Project.
12 October 2017	Meeting	Programme of engagement, terrestrial and marine archaeology, historic buildings and pre-DCO consents briefing
24 October 2017	Joint Meeting with Environment Agency, MMO and Historic England	Meeting to give a Project update and present the revised Order Limits and to discuss Project vision and strategic goals, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report and DCO.

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
12 December 2017	Meeting	Framework of regular engagement, escalation of issues, governance structure, invoicing policy
12 December 2017	EIA Scoping Report	The Scoping Report was issued to all SEBs for comment.
22 March 2018	Joint meeting with Historic England, Natural England, Environment Agency and MMO.	Meeting to provide the SEBs with an update on the Project, the EIA Scoping Opinion, Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), mitigation approach, and legacy and benefits. The approach to watercourse crossings and diversions were also discussed and key principles linked to provision of compensatory flood storage agreed.
31 August 2018	Meeting	Project update, development boundary and land use
25 September 2018	Joint meeting with Historic England, Environment Agency, Natural England, MMO and Kent Downs AONB Unit.	Meeting to provide an overview to the information which will be presented at Statutory Consultation, including highways alignment design, PEIR, key public-facing and technical materials, and to provide an opportunity for the SEBs to ask questions.
05 October 2018	Meeting	Cultural Heritage Assessments: Draft Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) and ES, archaeological investigation and mitigation
October to December 2018	Statutory Consultation	Consultation response received from Historic England.
18 February 2019	Site visit	To agree the key areas of addressing setting issues and to raise any concerns regarding the Project's design near specific heritage assets.
14 March 2019	Meeting	Analysis of aerial photography and archaeological investigations
25 April 2019	Design Development Workshop, South of the River Thames	Meeting to update key stakeholders on the latest thinking on the Project's design development and seek initial feedback and further suggestions for improving the design.
08 May 2019	Meeting	Agree viewpoints from a heritage perspective and reference to landscape viewpoints. Agree the viewpoints list and images.
22 October 2019	Document issue	Issue of the following documents for Historic England's review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20th Century Military Archaeology DBA Methodology</li> <li>• Scheduled Monument Statements of Significance Methodology</li> </ul>

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
07 November 2019	Design Development Workshop (South)	Design Development Workshop with host local authorities and SEBs to update on supplementary consultation delivery, pre-enabling works, design refinement and development boundary.
13 November 2019	Design Development Workshop (North)	Technical Design Workshop with local authorities and SEBs to update on supplementary consultation delivery, pre-enabling works, design refinement and development boundary.
03 December 2019	Site visit	Site visit at church of St Mary Magdalene in Cobham.
03 December 2019 and 04 December 2019	Utilities Diversion Workshops (north and south)	Utility Diversion Workshop to update on utilities design and its potential impact on environmental designations and development boundary.
06 December 2019	Monthly progress meeting	Introduce Project archaeology specialists, update on development boundary and cover outstanding archaeological matters.
January to March 2020	Supplementary Consultation	Consultation response received from Historic England.
06 February 2020	Construction Impacts workshop	Construction Impacts Workshop with local authorities and SEBs to provide an update of likely construction impacts (as a follow up to the workshop on 04/12/2019) and updates on construction traffic modelling and potential utility diversions.
07 March 2020	Monthly progress meeting	Brief on supplementary consultation, DBA update, present North and South Portal landscape proposals, update on utility diversion proposals (particularly around A13 and Ashenbank Woods), discuss initial result and assessment of priority archaeological trial trenching surveys, Palaeolithic and geo-archaeological update and ES assessment update.
03 April 2020	Monthly progress meeting	Progress meeting – Project update on COVID-19 and supplementary consultation deadline extension, overall Project timeline, cultural heritage assessment update, update on trial trenching, and Palaeolithic & geoarchaeological work.
03 April 2020	Document issue	Issue of the following documents for Historic England's review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DBA</li> </ul>

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Palaeolithic and Quaternary Deposit Model (PQDM) and Preliminary Assessment of Archaeological Potential</li> <li>• Draft Green Belt Purpose 4 Methodology Assessment</li> </ul>
09 April 2020	Built Heritage Meeting	Provide update on Project progress on built heritage assessment, specifically listing proposed building demolition, methodology, mitigation and future work
21 April 2020	Document feedback	Received feedback on PQDM and Assessment Report from Historic England
21 April 2020	Environmental Impacts & Mitigation Workshop (north)	<p>This workshop was to discuss EIA impacts and mitigation, for local authorities and SEBs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update to the Project's approach to assessing potential effects, significance of effects and mitigation</li> <li>• Introducing the Control Plan</li> <li>• Providing an update on the progress of Environmental Masterplan and the technical chapters of the ES</li> <li>• Providing a forum for open discussion and ideas around mitigation</li> </ul>
22 April 2020	Environmental Impacts & Mitigation Workshop (south)	<p>This workshop was to discuss EIA impacts and mitigation, for local authorities and SEBs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update to the Project's approach to assessing potential effects, significance of effects and mitigation</li> <li>• Introducing the Control Plan</li> <li>• Providing an update on the progress of Environmental Masterplan and the technical chapters of the ES</li> <li>• Providing a forum for open discussion and ideas around mitigation</li> </ul>
21 May 2020	Key Elements of the DCO Workshop	<p>Workshop to discuss key elements of the draft DCO including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order Limits update</li> <li>• Further consultation (Design Refinement Consultation)</li> <li>• Lower Thames Crossing 'Digital First' Consultation and Electronic Submission</li> <li>• DCO process – Key Stages</li> <li>• DCO application documentation</li> <li>• Control Plan</li> </ul>

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft DCO and Schedules</li> <li>• Requirement, Secondary Consents and Permits</li> <li>• Book of Plans</li> <li>• SoCGs – Purpose, Content, Principles and Preparation</li> </ul>
05 June 2020	Monthly progress meeting	Progress meeting - Project update on design refinement consultation, a review of engagement including the issue of relevant ES chapters (in phased approach), issue of draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), discussion on DBA and update on surveys, including trial trenching, Palaeolithic surveys, geophysical surveys and built heritage.
05 June 2020	Document feedback	Received feedback on cultural heritage draft DBA from Historic England
10 June 2020	Document feedback	Received feedback on Draft 20th Century Military DBA from Historic England
15 June 2020	Teleconference	Briefed and agreed with Historic England the revised structure and approach to the DBA, including discussion of the purpose of DBA, use of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 106 (Cultural Heritage Assessment), assessment work within the Order Limits and assessment structure.
17 June 2020	Teleconference	Discussed DBA approach to build heritage assessment.
23 June 2020	Environmental Impacts and Mitigation and CoCP Review – Part 1	Meeting to provide an update on the Project, recap on the approach to Environmental Assessment and Mitigation for ES topics as well as review the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) and receive feedback from stakeholders on items discussed at workshop.
25 June 2020	Environmental Impacts and Mitigation and CoCP Review – Part 2	Meeting to provide an update on the Project, recap on the approach to Environmental Assessment and Mitigation for ES topics as well as review the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) and receive feedback from stakeholders on items discussed at workshop.
29 June 2020	Issue of draft (DCO)	Issue of draft DCO
03 July 2020	Monthly progress meeting	Briefed on upcoming Design Refinement Consultation, update on DCO process, update

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		on landscape viewpoints, cultural heritage assessment and mitigation.
July to August 2020	Design Refinement Consultation	Consultation on the design refinements for the Project.
07 August 2020	Monthly progress meeting	Briefed on Design Refinement Consultation closing dates, update on SoCG and ES chapters.
20 August 2020	Built Heritage Meeting	Meeting that focused on approach to mitigation, rather than the principle of demolition.
21 September 2020	North Portal Landscape Design Meeting	The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the north portal landscape proposals relative to cultural heritage considerations and for the Applicant to hear stakeholder feedback on the proposals.
06 October 2020	Benefits Steering Group	Meeting to provide a strategic oversight and make key decisions that support the shared ambition to maximise the wider benefits of the Project by working in partnership with others.
09 October 2020	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Briefed on DCO update, update on mitigation strategy and environmental strategy.
20 October 2020	Enhanced Statement of Significant Buildings Meeting	Purpose of the meeting is to agree on structure and outline of the Statement of Significance for buildings.
06 November 2020	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Progress meeting to go through action tracker, DCO submission update and assessment update.
11 November 2020	Holocene and Quaternary Discussion	Meeting to agree format of Holocene report (yet to commence), and the fieldworks going forward in the next few months.
13 January 2021	Heritage legacy working group	Meeting to develop and deliver a programme of activities that protect and enhance our heritage through interpretation and technology as well as improving access and connectivity to archaeological finds and assets.
05 February 2021	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Progress meeting regarding the Applicant's decision to withdraw DCO application and advice received from the Planning Inspectorate on improving the application. Resubmission update and new road opening date.
10 February 2021	Heritage legacy working group	Meeting to develop and deliver a programme of activities that protect and enhance our heritage through interpretation and technology as well as improving access and connectivity to archaeological finds and assets.



<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of contact / correspondence</b>	<b>Key topics discussed and key outcomes</b>
25 March 2021	Historic England and Cadent Gas – Utilities Solution to Avoid Scheduled Monument meeting	To present proposal from Cadent on solution in avoiding the Scheduled Monument (SM) – Springfield style enclosure and Iron Age enclosures south of Hill House, Baker Street.
06 April 2021	Cultural heritage impacts – South Portal	To discuss cultural heritage impacts around the South Portal and potential mitigation techniques.
07 April 2021	Cultural heritage impacts – North Portal	To discuss cultural heritage impacts around the North Portal and potential mitigation techniques.
10 June 2021	Heritage legacy working group	Meeting to develop and deliver a programme of activities that protect and enhance our heritage through interpretation and technology as well as improving access and connectivity to archaeological finds and assets.
23 June 2021	Benefits Steering Group	Meeting to provide a strategic oversight and make key decisions that support the shared ambition to maximise the wider benefits of the Project by working in partnership with others.
10 September 2021	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Update on community impacts consultation, Palaeolithic Assessment update and trial trenching.
27 September 2021	Benefits Steering Group	Meeting to provide a strategic oversight and make key decisions that support the shared ambition to maximise the wider benefits of the Project by working in partnership with others.
05 November 2021	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Update on Project, stakeholder meetings, survey and buildings assessment and mitigation progress.
12 November 2021	Heritage legacy working group	Meeting to develop and deliver a programme of activities that protect and enhance our heritage through interpretation and technology as well as improving access and connectivity to archaeological finds and assets.
14 January 2022	Mitigation Meeting Cultural Heritage Orsett – Scheduled Monument	Meeting with Richard Havis and Will Fletcher to discuss scheduled monument mitigation at A13 junction.
04 February 2022	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Update on Project, specifically scope of upcoming public consultation, stakeholder meetings, survey assessment and data refresh.
01 April 2022	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Update on upcoming public consultation, nitrogen deposition, design changes and mitigation, cultural heritage assessment (data

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		refresh and assessment progress) and legacy and benefits.
26 April 2022	Heritage legacy working group	Meeting to develop and deliver a programme of activities that protect and enhance our heritage through interpretation and technology as well as improving access and connectivity to archaeological finds and assets.
28 April 2022	Design changes and mitigation meeting	Meeting with Adam Single to design changes and mitigation with the London Borough of Havering and agree an approach.
29 April 2022	Benefits Steering Group	Meeting to provide a strategic oversight and make key decisions that support the shared ambition to maximise the wider benefits of the Project by working in partnership with others.
04 May 2022	Listed Buildings Workshop	Meeting to discuss the assessment and mitigation of the listed buildings (Murrells Cottage, Thatched Cottage and 1&2 Grays Cottage)
06 May 2022	Palaeolithic Workshop	Update on Project-wide WSI, review of the ATT reports from a Palaeolithic and Quaternary geoarchaeological perspective, GI monitoring results, staged Palaeolithic field work, research potential, update to Site Specific Palaeolithic Research Framework and seminar.
17 May 2022	ES Workshop (South)	Update on methodology of asset assessments and showing examples of current assessments in the south of the Project.
24 May 2022	ES Workshop (North)	Update on methodology of asset assessments and showing examples of current assessments in the north of the Project.
07 July 2022	Cultural Heritage Monthly Progress Meeting	Update on the Project and public consultation as well as an update to the current assessment methodology and legacy and benefits.



## Appendix B Glossary

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	AONB	Statutory designation intended to conserve and enhance the ecology, natural heritage and landscape value of an area of countryside.
Archaeological trial trenching	ATT	A methodology outlined in ES Appendix 6.8 [ <a href="#">APP-362</a> to <a href="#">APP-366</a> ].
Code of Construction Practice	CoCP	Contains control measures and standards to be implemented by the Project, including those to avoid or reduce environmental effects.
Development Consent Order	DCO	Means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008.
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.
Environmental Impact Assessment	EIA	A process by which information about environmental effects of a proposed development is collected, assessed and used to inform decision making. For certain projects, EIA is a statutory requirement, reported in an Environmental Statement.
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.
Ground investigation	GI	Several levels of investigation, from desk-based research to onsite sampling to evaluate challenges related to soil/ground.
Historic Landscape Characterisation	HLC	The identification and interpretation of the history of the present-day landscape or townscape within a given area.
The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England	HBMCE	Another term for Historic England.
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	LVIA	An impact assessment based on the impact of the Project on sensitive visual receptors.
Management of Research	MoRPHE	Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment

<b>Term</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Projects in the Historic Environment		
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.
Preliminary Environmental Information Report	PEIR	An early output of the EIA process, and part of the DCO application process.
Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments	REAC	The REAC identifies the environmental commitments that would be implemented during the construction and operational phases of the Project if the Development Consent Order is granted, and forms part of the Code of Construction Practice.
Statutory Environmental Body	SEB	Any principal council as defined in subsection (1) of section 270 of the Local Government Act 1982 for the area where the land is situated. Where the land is situated in England; Natural England, Historic England, the Environment Agency, Natural Resources Wales and the National Assembly for Wales where, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, the land is sufficiently near to Wales to be of interest to them and any other public authority which has environmental responsibilities and which the Secretary of State considers likely to have an interest in the Project.
Written Scheme of Investigation	WSI	Sets out the scope, guiding principles and methods for the planning and implementation of archaeological assessment.

## Appendix C Documents considered within this Statement of Common Ground

- C.1.1 The following documents, outside of the DCO Application Documents, were considered in the development of this SoCG:
- a. National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014)
  - b. Historic England Statutory Consultation Response (2018)
  - c. Land Contamination and Archaeology good practice guide (2017)
  - d. Preliminary Environmental Information Report (2018)
  - e. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: Sections LA104 & LA106 (2019)
  - f. Historic England Supplementary Consultation Response (2020)
  - g. Historic England Design Refinement Consultation Response (2020)
  - h. Historic England Community Impact Consultation Response (2021)
  - i. Historic England Local Refinement Consultation Response (2022)
  - j. National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

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/](http://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](mailto: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](mailto: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