

TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

LOWER THAMES CROSSING – COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS MADE AT DEADLINE 5

DEADLINE 6: 31 OCTOBER 2023

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out comments from Transport for London (TfL) on submissions made at Deadline 5 of the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) Development Consent Order (DCO) examination.
- 1.2 Where TfL has set out its position on a matter in previous submissions, TfL has signposted the relevant parts of those previous submissions rather than repeating its position in detail in this submission. TfL has limited its comments to a small number of submissions made by the Applicant. This document is structured with a section for each relevant submission.

2. Draft Development Consent Order v7.0 (tracked changes) (REP5-025)

- 2.1 In its Deadline 5 submission (REP5-II4 Section 2), TfL welcomed the draft protective provisions for the protection of local highway authorities added to the draft DCO at Deadline 4. These were the Applicant's preferred form of protective provisions and TfL advised that it would provide detailed comments at Deadline 6, once there had been time for a detailed review.
- 2.2 Following TfL's review, it has worked with the other four local highway authorities (Essex County Council, Kent County Council, Thurrock Council and the London Borough of Havering) whose highway network is affected by the Project to develop a joint response, given that the authorities have a common view on changes that are needed. A joint representation is being submitted by the London Borough of Havering at Deadline 6 on behalf of all five local highway authorities. This representation includes marked up and clean versions of the draft protective provisions accompanied by an explanatory note.

3. Framework Construction Travel Plan v3.0 (tracked changes) (REP5-055)

- 3.1 TfL notes the proposed Terms of Reference for the Travel Plan Liaison Group (TPLG) that have been added as Appendix C to this document. TfL welcomes that it is included as a potential member of this group in Paragraph C.3.1 (c).
- 3.2 The Applicant has previously commented that the proposed equivalent of the Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group (STIG), which TfL and other interested parties have recommended is necessary to oversee monitoring and mitigation, would partly duplicate the function of other management groups already committed to operate for the LTC Project (see for example Paragraph I.3.63 of the Applicant's post-event submissions for Issue Specific Hearing 7 (ISH7) (REP4-I83)). For the avoidance of doubt, the Terms of Reference for the TPLG indicate that there would be no duplication between these two proposed groups.

4. Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction v5.0 (tracked changes) (REP5-057)

- 4.1 TfL notes the proposed Terms of Reference for the Traffic Management Forum (TMF) that have been added as Appendix E to this document. TfL welcomes that it is included as a

potential member of this group in Paragraph E.3.1, since this refers to Table 2.1 of the document which lists TfL as a Traffic Management Plan consultee.

- 4.2 The Applicant has previously commented that the proposed equivalent of the STIG, which TfL and other interested parties have recommended is necessary to oversee monitoring and mitigation, would partly duplicate the function of other management groups already committed to operate for the LTC Project (see for example Paragraph I.3.63 of the Applicant's post-event submissions for ISH7 (REP4-I83)). For the avoidance of doubt, the Terms of Reference for the TMF indicate that there would be minimal duplication between these two proposed groups. The only possible duplication would be with monitoring of traffic flows, but for the TMF this would be entirely associated with the construction phase, while for the equivalent of the STIG the focus of monitoring would be on the operational phase.
- 5. Applicant's comments on Interested Party (IP) submissions at Deadlines 1 to 3 (REP5-088)**
- 5.1 The Applicant provides some brief commentary on the local junction modelling undertaken for the London Borough of Havering and TfL in Section 2.2 of this document. However, this focuses on points of detail in the modelling rather than drawing any conclusions. TfL maintains its position that the local junction modelling undertaken by the Applicant is a less robust version as it has not been based on any observed data. Paragraphs 3.23 to 3.29 of TfL's Written Representation (REPI-304) provides a full analysis of the outputs of the local junction modelling and the implications for three of the junctions where TfL asserts that the impacts of the Project on traffic congestion and/or road safety need to be mitigated by the Applicant.
- 6. Applicant's responses to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 4 (REP5-089)**
- 6.1 Section I0.3 of this document sets out the Applicant's response to TfL's representations at Deadline 4 on the need for a commuted sum to be provided to cover TfL's increased maintenance costs resulting from the need to maintain the new walking, cycling and horse riding (WCH) bridge over the A127 west of M25 Junction 29. TfL has provided extensive evidence in Section 3 of its accompanying Deadline 6 submission providing its written submission of oral comments made at Issue Specific Hearing 10. This accompanying submission sets out why a new WCH crossing is required at this location due to severance caused by the Project, using previous statements made by the Applicant, and why the crossing needs to be grade separated based on the appropriate highway standards. TfL has not repeated these points in this submission.