

Lower Thames Crossing 9.148 Applicant's Response to Comments Made on Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction

Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

DATE: October 2023
DEADLINE: 6

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032
Examination Document Ref: TR010032/EXAM/9.148

VERSION: 1.0

Lower Thames Crossing

9.148 Applicant's Response to Comments Made on Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction

List of contents

	Page number
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Overview	1
2 Local authorities and TfL comments and Applicant responses	2
2.1 Comments on the oTMPfC and the Applicant responses	2
Glossary	29

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 Local authorities (LAs), Local Highway Authorities (LHA) and Transport for London (TfL) have provided comments on the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [REP5-056].
- 1.1.2 This document collates comments made on the oTMPfC and details the Applicant's response on each of the comments. In some cases, this has resulted in an amendment to the oTMPfC and has been included in the version submitted at Deadline 6. This document has been created to aid stakeholder understanding of the Applicant's responses to comments raised on the oTMPfC.
- 1.1.3 The comments have been collated from the following:
- a. The Examining Authority's (ExA Written Questions, first round question Q4.6.4 was addressed to the LAs ("Q4.6.4 - *Notwithstanding the provisions of various control documents such as the Traffic Management Plan (TMP), is it accepted that it would be impossible to prevent or mitigate all adverse effects on local communities during the construction phase? If that is not accepted, please provide details of what further measures could be incorporated into the oTMPfC at this stage*")
 - b. Comments made at Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4)
 - c. Responses to Submissions received from LAs and TfL at Deadline 4
- 1.1.4 In some cases, the Applicant considers that further work/discussions would be required in order to determine how the comment would be answered. The intention for this document is to simply act as a reference which collates the comments raised on the oTMPfC [REP5-056] in various forums over the course of the Examination thus far to assist the ExA.
- 1.1.5 This document collates and addresses relevant comments on the oTMPfC. The Applicant notes that other comments have been made on construction traffic matters within the Application, such as on the Outline Material Handling Plan or Framework Construction Travel Plan, however these are not addressed in this document.

2 Local authorities and TfL comments and Applicant responses

2.1 Comments on the oTMPfC and the Applicant responses

2.1.1 Table below lists the comments made by the LAs, LHAs and TfL, accompanied by the Applicant's response.

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
1	London Borough of Havering	Q4.6.4 [REP4-314]	The LB Havering position remains as stated in our RR, LIR and WR. The Ockendon Road closure period whilst now capped at 10 months remains a significant concern for LB Havering given the adverse effect upon the Upminster Cemetery and South Essex Crematorium, and bus routes locally. LB Havering has also raised concerns regarding the suitability of proposed diversion routes and has put forward suggested mitigation measures in para 7.2.26 and Tables 6 and 7 of Havering's submitted Local Impact Report [REP1-249] Whilst the suggested mitigation set out may appear detailed from the Panel and Applicant's perspectives, it is essential to note that LB Havering is the local highway authority for the proposed diversion routes. It has a duty of care to all users, including its residents, to ensure that the local network is safe and is able to feasibly accommodate the anticipated volume and type of traffic during the construction phase. During the M25/J28 DCO Examination, Havering raised legitimate concerns about the ability for construction traffic to make certain turning movements on the Transport for London and Havering road network. Following a request from the ExA for the Applicant to undertake Swept Path Analysis, it was subsequently found that such turning movements would not be feasible.	The Applicant has confirmed that the closure of Ockendon Road will be capped at 10 months. This is secured in the oTMPfC, Table 4.2 [REP5-056]. A possible diversion route for the Ockendon Road closure is shown in Plate 4.13 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056]. Table 4.5 of the oTMPfC shows the proposed diversion route information. Diversion routes would be determined through discussions with the local highway authority closer to the time as other factors may need to be taken into account to make the decision. With regard to bus stops, the Applicant has confirmed in its response to paragraphs 7.2.24 to 7.2.26, pages 78 and 79 of the London Borough of Havering Local Impact Report [REP1-249], that Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC sets the minimum requirements the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will address when managing impacts on public transport, including buses. This includes the provision to arrange temporary bus stops and actively engage with operators during the development of the Traffic Management Plans.

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
2	Transport for London	Q4.6.4 [REP4-356]	TfL accepts that it would be impossible to prevent or mitigate all adverse effects. TfL is broadly satisfied that the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction adequately covers the approach to management of traffic during the construction period. However, there are further measures that the Applicant could implement to reduce adverse effects on local communities during construction. In particular, TfL considers that the Applicant should strengthen construction vehicle safety standards across the Project in-line with London standards. TfL maintains that the Direct Vision Standard would be most effective at securing the highest construction vehicle safety standards outside London. The Direct Vision Standard has been proven to reduce collisions where vision is a contributing factor. This would ensure that adverse safety impacts on local communities would be minimised. TfL and the Applicant's positions on this are set out in more detail under issue 2.1.12 of the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and TfL submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 4 (previous version [REP1-108]).	The Applicant has already committed to the Construction Logistics and Community Safety Scheme (CLOCS) and Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) which are national standards for managing sites, fleet vehicles and driving training. Refer to the CoCP Section 6 for further details [REP5-048]. Suppliers within London would comply with TfL requirements. Extending this outside of London could have an impact to the supply network. Implementing a TfL requirement nationwide is not proportionate and could severely impact supply network.
3	Essex County Council	Q4.6.4 [REP4-286]	This is accepted due to the size of the DCO here proposed impact may be required to be monitored as part of the applicants commitment to community liaison and the reporting of unforeseen incidents	No further action - the Council is supportive of the oTMPfC [REP5-056].
	Gravesham Borough Council	ISH4 [REP4-295]	Any dispute or difference arising between the TMF or the local highway authorities and National Highways about whether any proposals made under paragraph 3.3.23 are adequate or reasonable or about whether a proposal has been complied with shall be referred to and determined by an independent person acting as an expert who has been professionally qualified for not less than 10 years and who is also a specialist in relation to such subject matter, such independent person to be agreed between the parties	The Applicant has added wording to the oTMPfC at DL6 to indicate the Traffic Manager would have relevant experience and be sufficiently qualified for the job role (or similar). Refer to Section E.4 of the oTMPfC

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>hereto or failing such agreement to be nominated by the President or Vice-President or other duly authorised officer of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation or the Institution of Civil Engineers as appropriate, on the application of any of the parties to the dispute or difference (after having given written notice to the other).</p>	
4	Gravesham Borough Council	ISH4 [REP4-295]	<p>Gravesham Borough Council [REP4-297] Proposed amendments to Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction in response to Action Point 6 from ExA at ISH4 The extracts below show track changes to the relevant section of the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction in response to Action Point from ExA at ISH4 which was as follows: Please provide suggested wording for changes to the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction [APP-547] to strengthen the Traffic Management Forum's role/influence including dispute resolution procedures.</p> <p>Note 1: The construction traffic management plan for the Sizewell C project was used as a precedent for the proposed changes. The relevant section is 9.5 and can be found at page 160/390 of the Sizewell Deed of Obligation at this link.</p> <p>Note 2: the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction has been updated in [REP3-121] and that version was used as the basis for this document.</p> <p>Note 3: In addition, GBC is also proposing a new requirement in the DCO based on requirement 22 of the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Development Consent Order 2022. This will place a requirement on the Applicant to carry out monitoring of local traffic and produce a construction phase local traffic management scheme which must be implemented. In turn, in the implementation</p>	<p>Most of these requests are covered by the structure of the Traffic Management Forum (TMF) and its terms of reference. See oTMPfC Appendix E [REP5-056]. It is further backed up by the escalation process to the Joint Operations Forum (JOF) as covered in the CoCP [REP5-048]. The Applicant does not have any timings in these processes, apart from the commitment for the TMF to meet monthly (or if required by incidents out in the field). To address the point made on Para 3.3.22, the Applicant acknowledges the request and welcomes discussions to develop the wording to be inserted into the oTMPfC.</p> <p>The items directly copied from a document created from the Sizewell C infrastructure project are not directly relevant to the LTC project.</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>of Black Cat, the scheme provides that if an issue is unresolved and a relationship is established between network performance and the recorded increased traffic on the local road network as result of self-diverting traffic, temporary traffic management measures must be agreed with all parties at the Traffic Management Forum. If this is taken forward on Lower Thames, it is likely that further amendments to those set out in this note will be required to the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction.</p> <p>Suggested Amendments to the Traffic Management Forum section of the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction</p> <p>Traffic Management Forum</p> <p>3.3.15 The TMF would consist of the main works Contractors, utility companies, local authorities and those named in Table 2.1, local highway authorities, public transport operators, emergency services, National Highways maintenance providers and any other affected stakeholders depending on the planned construction phases (see Plate 3.2 for the proposed structure). The TMF will be chaired by the Traffic Manager (appointed by National Highways: see paragraph 3.3.14). The Local Community Leaders of the CLGs (community liaison groups) will be invited to the Traffic Management Forum. Affected businesses would be invited to relevant TMF meetings.</p> <p>3.3.16 Two TMFs would be established (roads in Kent and roads north of the Thames), both chaired by the Traffic Manager, and would have attendees from the roads and tunnels Contractors in each respective area.</p> <p>3.3.17 The TMF would be established following the grant of the DCO or earlier if agreed with all attending stakeholders and meetings would be held monthly.</p>	

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>3.3.18 The TMF would review planned traffic management arrangements and receive comments as to their appropriateness. The TMF would also monitor, review, and provide updates to the TMPs when required. Updates to the TMPs would be consulted upon with the relevant LHA.</p> <p>3.3.19 The TMF would review the performance of implemented traffic management with a focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Direct impacts to the travelling public (including WCH) b. Indirect impacts on the wider network as a result of the implemented traffic management c. Impacts on local businesses and communities d. Reviewing specific traffic management operations such as weekend closures for demolition e. Refer to Appendix D which includes a dynamic road works vision benchmark criteria. The criteria will be used to monitor traffic management measures. <p>Remedial actions</p> <p>3.3.18 National Highways will take all reasonable steps to avoid a breach of the oTMPfC from occurring through the implementation of the management measures set out in this oTMPfC. In addition, actions must be approved by the TMF for the continued implementation of the OTMPFC to meet the requirements.</p> <p>3.3.19 Notwithstanding this, it should be recognised that the Project is a major and complex construction project and if there are breaches of the arrangements set out in this OTMPFC during the construction period, the default procedures are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways must notify the TMF of a breach of the arrangements within 24 hours of when they occur. 	

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways must issue a warning letter to the relevant contractor outlining what action will be taken in the event of a further breach. • National Highways must report the details of the breach and the response to the TMF as part of a monitoring report. <p>3.3.20 Potential corrective actions include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to the communication strategy. • Replace HGV drivers if there are repeat instances of individual HGV drivers diverging from the HGV routes. • Suspend booking delivery slots to contractors that repeatedly miss delivery slots until corrective action is demonstrated. • Provision of additional signage on the HGV routes. <p>3.3.21 Corrective action must be commensurate with the nature of the breach. The approach adopted and potential sanctions in the event of further breaches will be considered by National Highways on a case by case basis depending upon the specific circumstances in question.</p> <p>3.3.22 National Highways must report on breaches, provide information on any corrective action taken and where necessary submit details of proposed further corrective actions to the TMF. The TMF will monitor the default procedure and approve the response to breaches 3 as well as any further actions that may be necessary. National Highways must then implement any approved further corrective actions.</p> <p>3.3.23 If the TMF considers it reasonably necessary that further corrective actions are required to address the breach and these have not been proposed by SZC Co., the TMF will require National Highways to submit</p>	

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>proposals for further corrective actions to the TMF for approval. If National Highways fail to propose the requested proposal, then the TMF will invite one of the local highway authorities or National Highways (as relevant) to submit a reasonable proposal. National Highways must comply with any proposal made by it or a local highway authority.</p> <p>3.3.24 Any TMF member will be able to call an urgent TMF meeting to discuss the urgent matters of concern and agree any action that must be taken by National = Highways.</p> <p>3.3.25 The TMF, the local highway authorities and National Highways shall use all reasonable endeavours to cooperate with each other and to resolve amicably all issues arising between them in about whether any proposals made under paragraph 3.3.23 are adequate or reasonable or about whether a proposal has been complied with without having to invoke the provisions of paragraphs 3.3.26 to 3.3.30.</p> <p>3.3.26 Should the procedure of paragraph 3.3.25 fail to produce agreement then the following provisions apply.</p> <p>3.3.27 Any dispute or difference arising between the TMF or the local highway authorities and National Highways about whether any proposals made under paragraph 3.3.23 are adequate or reasonable or about whether a proposal has been complied with shall be referred to and determined by an independent person acting as an expert who has been professionally qualified for not less than 10 years and who is also a specialist in relation to such subject matter, such independent person to be agreed between the parties hereto or failing such agreement to be nominated by the President or Vice-President or other duly authorised officer of the Chartered Institute of</p>	

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>Highways and Transportation or the Institution of Civil Engineers as appropriate, on the application of any of the parties to the dispute or difference (after having given written notice to the other).</p> <p>3.3.28 Any expert appointed under paragraph 3.3.27 will afford each of the parties an opportunity to make written representations to him or her and also an opportunity to make written counter-representations on any representations made to him or her by the other party, but will not be in any way limited or fettered by such representations and counter representations and will be entitled to rely on his or her own judgement and opinion.</p> <p>3.3.29 If any expert appointed under paragraph 3.3.27 dies, or refuses to act or becomes incapable of acting or if he or she fails to publish his or her determination within three months of the date upon which he or she accepted the appointment either party may apply to either the President or Vice-President or other duly authorised Officer of either the President or Vice-President or other duly authorised officer of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation or the Institution of Civil Engineers, as appropriate, or to discharge such expert and appoint another in his or her place.</p> <p>3.3.30 The cost of the parties in connection with any expert determination shall be borne as such expert shall direct.</p>	
5	Gravesham Borough Council	ISH4 [REP4-295]	<p>Response to ExA Action Point 7 from ISH4 (Traffic and Transportation)</p> <p>The following are extracted from the above document.</p> <p>2.4.5 It is acknowledged that the impacts on communities from measures required to ensure the delivery of the</p>	<p>The wording proposed by Gravesham emphasises the commitment the Applicant has already made to reduce / minimise / remove any impacts. However, these can only be worked up as the design progresses. The oTMPfC [REP5-056] sets out the procedures to be followed by the Contractors to create Traffic</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>Project, should be kept to a minimum as much as is reasonably practicable.</p> <p>2.4.6 The specific restrictions and general approach required to mitigate or otherwise minimise the impacts would be developed in discussions undertaken with the relevant authorities and would be set out in the TMP and implemented in accordance with requirement 10 (traffic management) of the Development Consent Order. Table 2.3 below has been produced to set out the overarching considerations.</p> <p>Proposed changes to Table 2.3 Stakeholder consideration from oTMPfC [REP5-056]</p> <p>The proposed changes are to add statements to reduce or minimise road closure and durations of diversion routes to the table under requirements and how the TMP would address the impacts of any extent and duration of diversions.</p>	<p>Management Plans (TMP) for agreements prior to any works being carried out. As the design develops these TMP's will be created, refined and agreed.</p>
6	Kent County Council	ISH4 [REP4-308]	<p>It would be helpful to be able to monitor the impact of construction on local rat runs to see whether general traffic has increased to avoid the LTC construction works. If so, the Traffic Management Forum could put measures in place to reduce the impact. Plate 2.4 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [REP3-120] shows the proposed monitoring locations, the objectives of which is to "to provide a baseline and construction period monitoring at the agreed monitoring locations during the construction period for the project by construction and workforce vehicles and by other traffic rerouting as a result of the project construction works and traffic management". However, the plan only shows sites in Thurrock, not Kent. It would be helpful if the Applicant could produce a similar map covering monitoring of key routes, junctions and communities in Kent.</p>	<p>What's set out in plate 2.4 of the oTMPfC is a reflection of monitoring locations agreed at this stage for further development during the development of the Traffic Management Plan. Paragraph 2.4.8 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states the commitment to monitor traffic: "<i>Actual monitoring to be implemented would be selected as part of the TMP on a case-by-case basis, by type of works (e.g. early utility works), road or section.</i>" Paragraph 2.4.9 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states the commitment for the Main Works Contractor (MWC) to produce a co-ordinated monitoring proposals as part of their Traffic Management Plans (TMP). Which will be aligned across all contracts for the project.</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				<p>Paragraphs 2.4.15 and 2.4.16 sets out the monitoring regime. The Applicant acknowledges the request and welcomes discussions to develop the wording should to be inserted into the oTMPfC.</p>
7	Kent County Council	ISH4 [REP4-308]	<p>Paragraph 2.4.21 of the oTMPfC [REP3-120] relates to "Key outcomes required from monitoring". In KCC's view these proposals seem adequate; however, paragraph 2.4.24 states "Where requests for traffic measures to be modified arise during feedback from the TMF, National Highways would give due consideration to any such request, and where necessary, obtain appropriate approvals for any modifications". KCC is concerned this arrangement could see requests from Local Highway Authorities get refused by National Highways. Clarity needs to be provided as to how agreement would be sought on the mitigation measures to be implemented.</p>	<p>The oTMPfC [REP5-056] document sets out the review and escalation process for all elements of the Traffic Management Forum (TMF) engagement and co-ordination processes. Appendix E of the above document sets out the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the TMF. The Council, and other local highways authorities would all be active participants of the TMF structure.</p>
8	Kent County Council	ISH4 [REP4-308]	<p>Table 4.4 of the oTMPfC [REP3-120] sets out route restrictions for HGVs and includes parts of Thong Lane and Brewers Road and all of Castle Lane, The Street and Lower Higham Road (the latter for deliveries and earthworks associated with main works). KCC has previously requested for the proposed the ban be extended to include the roads listed below; however, at the very least the below roads should be monitored for inappropriate use by LTC HGVs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Farm Lane to be prohibited for all construction related vehicles due to its unsuitability to cater for large volumes of traffic. 	<p>These roads are not listed as construction access routes. The TMF process of reviewing proposed TM plans would enable discussion and review of any possible impacts on these roads. Pear Tree Lane is included in the HGV ban as set out in Table 4.4 line 2 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056]. Green Farm Lane and Church Lane are adjacent to the proposed route of the new road alignment and are therefore unlikely to be routes for HGVs as the contractor would use the trace for preferred access. The oTMPfC [REP5-056] process requires the Main Works Contractor (MWC) to set out their proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Lane to be prohibited for all construction related vehicles due to its unsuitability to cater for large vehicles. • Pear Tree Lane, The Ridgeway and Brewers Road between the A226 in the east and Park Pale in the west, to be prohibited for all construction related HGVs due to its unsuitability to cater for additional large vehicles and its adverse impact on local villages. • Sole Street to be prohibited for all construction related vehicles due to adverse impact on local villages, including increase in congestion, rat running and potential damage to rural roads. • Wrotham Road to be prohibited for all construction related HGVs due to its unsuitability to cater for additional large vehicles and its adverse impact on local villages. • Cobhambury Road to be prohibited for construction related HGVs due to its unsuitability to cater for an increase in HGVs. • Lower Higham Road, east of the construction access, for all construction related trips. 	<p>discussion and agreement with all parties, prior to implementation. Any impacts can be discussed and agreed as part of the TMF process. This will include monitoring procedures to ensure compliance.</p>
9	Kent County Council	ISH4 [REP4-308]	<p>National Highways provided KCC with GIS files to analyse construction related traffic impacts. These show there are a significant number of drivers who re-route along the rural roads during the peak hours, seeking alternatives to avoid the congestion caused by the construction works. A number of the routes are close to capacity. Whilst National Highways are proposing most works will not take place during the peak hours (they have assumed so to see the worst-case scenario), given the congestion, KCC has requested that construction related vehicles (e.g. staff and</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.4.8 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states that construction HGV movements to compounds would be controlled to avoid peak hours as far as reasonably practicable. There is a requirement for a traffic management plan to be approved by the Secretary of State under Schedule 2, Requirement 10 of the draft DCO, [REP3-077] following consultation with bodies such as Kent County Council. See paragraph 1.1.6 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056]. This ensures there is a process in place to manage</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>HGVs, etc) should not be permitted to access / egress from the site compounds during the network peak hours.</p>	<p>impacts on the road network at the relevant time, which the Applicant considers to be more appropriate than imposing restrictions now.</p> <p>The standard working hours for the Project are listed in Table 6.1 in Environmental Statement Appendices Appendix 2.2 – Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan [REP5-048] which are 07:00 to 19:00 weekdays and 07:00 to 16:00 Saturday. In addition, up to one hour before and/or after for mobilisation (start-up and close down) procedures. This is clarified further in section 5.4.4 (Workforce shift arrangements) in Framework Construction Travel Plan [REP5-054].which indicates a standard shift of 08:00 to 18:00 with an arrival peak between 07:00 and 08:00 and a departing peak between 18:00 and 19:00, which are therefore outside of the network peak hours referred to by KCC</p> <p>In regard to restrictions on the workforce commuting during peak hours, the Applicant considers the enforcement of restrictions on the use of local road network is not proportionate for this stage of the project. At the current time, the precise origin of workforce commuter trips is unknown. It is likely that some workers will need to use the LRN to travel to and from site. The Applicant's approach to minimising disruption and traffic impacts on local highways caused by worker and visitor travel will be achieved via establishing a framework that promotes reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips and sustainable and active modes of travel. The detail of this</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				<p>framework is set out in the Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) [REP5-054].which aims to establish a comprehensive framework for managing personnel travel to and from construction worksites, compounds, and Utility Logistic Hubs (ULHs) during the construction phase of the Project. This includes exploring potential changes in travel behaviours to optimise efficiency and minimise the distance and necessity of travel. Travel plans for each stage of the authorised development will need to be approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with relevant highway authorities, under Schedule 2 Requirement 11 of the draft DCO [REP5-024]. Those plans must be substantially in accordance with the FCTP. The Applicant has set out the rationale for its approach within the Statement of Common Ground between National Highways and Kent County Council [REP1-103], under Item: 2.1.13, 2.1.98, 2.1.103, 2.1.104 & 2.1.105</p> <p>In regards to restriction of heavy goods vehicles (HGV) the Applicant confirms in the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC), [REP5-056] paragraph 2.4.8, that HGV movements to compounds will be controlled to avoid peak hours as far as reasonably practicable.</p>
10	Kent County Council	ISH4 [REP4-308]	KCC welcomes the establishment of a Traffic Management Plan/Forum; however, there does not currently seem to be any allocated funding for this plan/forum. This would make it difficult to implement required mitigation measures quickly. Therefore, the	Detail on funding is provided in the Terms of Reference for the TMF, submitted at Deadline 5 as set out in paragraph E.4.25 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056].'

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			Applicant should be required to allocate a sufficient amount of funding for the implementation of traffic management measures identified through the Traffic Management Plan/Forum.	The TMF is a commitment set out in the oTMPfC therefore adequate funding would be available to ensure the TMF runs as intended.
11	Kent County Council	ISH4 [REP4-308]	KCC's Public Transport team are concerned about the impacts on buses during construction and want to secure funds to counter the negative impacts (£80k for mitigation during construction plus £80k for potential temporary works to be used only if required). The oTMPfC [REP3-120] fails to address the adverse impacts of construction on existing bus services. National Highways need to ensure appropriate mitigation is provided to ensure residents who rely on local bus services are not prohibited from travelling due to the impact of constructing the LTC. Furthermore, KCC would still like to see bus priority measures where possible	Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states the commitment to maintain public transport routes and services. Public transport operators would be a key member of the TMF and therefore part of any proposed solution, if an impact is identified.
12	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The changes made to the oTMPfC [REP3-121] comprise minor editing and formatting updates and therefore there are no substantive comments from the Council regarding the updated NH submission	The Applicant notes these comments. No action.
13	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The oTMPfC focuses heavily on the management of the temporary traffic control measures and delays the consideration of the construction logistics planning until after any DCO grant (CoCP Section 6). The two topics must be aligned and given clear leadership by the applicant. Those processes then have to co-ordinate with the movement of people and plant, material and equipment, i.e. the FCTP, the oMHP and the oSWMP.	The ToR has been added to the oTMPfC [REP5-056] at Deadline 5 (within Appendix E) which covers the relationship between the other relevant control documents. ToRs have also been developed for the Travel Plan Liaison Group and Workers Accommodation Working Group, which are set out in the Framework Construction Travel Plan [REP5-054].
14	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The document should set out the full constitution of the TMF and stipulate that the client Traffic Manager (TM) must have a minimum specification of a Chartered Engineer or equivalent to give the gravitas to the role.	The Applicant has added wording to the oTMPfC [REP5-056] to indicate the Traffic Manager would have relevant experience and be sufficiently

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			Similarly, the Contractor's TM must be equally as competent and subcontractor with 25 staff or more must provide a suitably competent TM. The LHA representative on the TMF must be empowered within the constitution to be able to require resolution of issues to be escalated to the JOF and the ability to then represent that issue at the JOF.	qualified for the role (or similar). Refer to Appendix E in the oTMPfC.
15	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The oTMPfC must specific clearly that access by construction related traffic and workforce traffic will use the routes to the compounds shown within the access plans and that the use of those routes will not exceed the peak period modelling	The routes set out are illustrative. The Applicant has included restricted routes in the oTMPfC [REP5-056] to prohibit the use of these routes by construction-related HGVs. Restricting staff travel would not be sensible as their route would be dependent on the initial location. The Applicant has designed the access points to the compounds to minimise unsuitable routes.
16	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	Paragraph 1.1.6 needs to be amended to align with the DCO, i.e. 'No part of the authorised development is to commence until a traffic management plan for the construction of that part.' The current wording does not have that specification.	The Applicant has amended wording in the oTMPfC [REP5-056] to this effect.
17	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	Paragraph 1.1.7 must set out how the TMPs will be co-ordinated across the project to maximise management and mitigation of the effects. The current document does not describe that.	The Applicant considers that this is covered in the oTMPfC [REP5-056] sufficiently at this stage. A ToR was included in the oTMPfC at Deadline L5. Refer to Appendix E in the oTMPfC.
18	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	It must be specified within the oTMPfC that road closures and temporary traffic management must substantially accord with the programmed periods set out in the approved TMP for that part of the project which must be broadly in line with the oTMPfC. The oTMPfC must further state that Contractors must justify to the TMF any extensions to programme or coverage no less than two weeks prior to the required extension.	The Applicant has added wording to the oTMPfC] to reflect this suggestion at DL6. Refer to Section 4.4 in the oTMPfC.

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
19	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	At paragraph 2.1.2 and other points in the document the text should be adjusted to show that there will be a series of TMPs all of which will need to be kept up to date in accordance with the specifications provided within the revised CoCP (i.e. to reflect programme slippage; phase changes, process changes.). The oTMPfC must also state that the TMPs are owned by the Contractors but overseen and co-ordinated by NH Traffic Manager.	The Applicant considers that this is covered in the oTMPfC [REP5-056] sufficiently at this stage. A ToR was included in the oTMPfC at Deadline L5. Refer to Appendix E in the oTMPfC.
20	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	Paragraph 2.3.1 must explicitly confirm that the TMPs must include enabling, site establishment and demobilisation and commissioning works for all compounds, working areas and new infrastructure	This has be inserted into the oTMPfC at DL6.
21	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>Within Table 2.2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the text to state that the NH and its Contractors must appoint and maintain Traffic Managers throughout the mobilisation, construction, demobilisation and commissioning periods. This requirement should also be added to paragraph 3.3.14. State that the TMFs must be established at least three months before construction to allow for the collaborative drafting of the TMPs prior to submission for agreement with the local authorities. The applicant must confirm how construction HGV bans will be introduced and enforced within the Order Limits and on routes outside of its control. In the 'West Tilbury' section replace 'avoid Gunn Hill...' with 'exclude Gunn Hill....' 	<p>The proposed text has been inserted into the oTMPfC to address point 1 at DL6.</p> <p>The ToR was included in the oTMPfC at DL5 which addresses point 2.</p> <p>The Applicant believes the monitoring proposals set out in the oTMPfC cover point 3. Refer to Section 2.4 in the oTMPfC [REP5-056], namely paragraphs 2.4.8 – 2.4.10 and E.2.1, d.</p> <p>The text in the oTMPfC has been amended to address point 4 at DL6.</p>
22	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The OTMPfC must stipulate at paragraph 2.4.8 the base line that is to be monitored, measured, managed and mitigated. There is currently no base line other than stated at Paragraph 2.4.22 that monitoring will commence a year before start of construction – that period must be set as	The Applicant considers that the monitoring proposals set out in the oTMPfC [REP5-056] are detailed and robust. The Baseline monitoring proposals set out in the oTMPfC, namely para 2.4.22: Baseline monitoring will need to

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>the start of first construction within the northern contracts. If the baseline is to be established from observed background flows prior to construction plus an up-lift for construction activities then the contractor must reference that position relative to the Transport Assessment and the construction period modelling. The construction period modelling must be corrected prior to the end of the Examination to reflect the accurate assignment of worker traffic to the agreed routes. That revised modelling will then be updated at the time of preparing the TMPs to reflect the changes in programme, phasing and alignment across the contracts. The mechanism for apportioning ownership of the monitoring and effects across the contract must be set out in the oTMPfC.</p>	<p>commence at least one year ahead of works commencing and monitoring should cover the full period of construction works including any advanced enabling/utility works, decommissioning of compounds and diversions etc – unless otherwise agreed by the TMF is standard practice and allows for all seasons to be captured within the baseline data.</p> <p>The oTMPfC does not specify routes for worker traffic as this would not be appropriate as the exact start locations are not known (i.e. home location of workforce), except for the specific access point to compounds, which has been modelled correctly, hence the Applicant considers that no change to the modelling is required. The modelling does not prescribe workforce routes and thereby represents a reasonable worst case scenario.</p>
23	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>The terms of reference for the TMF / TMFs must stipulate how concerns will be considered and resolved by the responsible contractor/s and how escalated unresolved items will be determined and reported back to the TMF.</p>	<p>The ToR for the TMF has been added within Appendix E of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] at Deadline 5, which the Applicant considers addresses these comments.</p>
24	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>It is insufficient to leave the determination of junction modelling to the contractors to decide – as is suggested at paragraph 2.4.20 of the oTMPfC. Rather than leaving the determination of which location could be modelled, as at paragraph 2.4.20, the oTMPfC must stipulate the junctions to be modelled when preparing the TMPs that must include but not necessarily be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A13/Sifford interchange and adjacent North Road / Stifford Clays junction 	<p>The Applicant considers that it would not be appropriate to specify junctions to be modelled at this stage given that the construction assessment represents a construction scenario. The Applicant considers that the monitoring, as secured in Section 2.4 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056], and the detailed construction planning that would be undertaken by the Contractor would enable the identification of locations that required further investigation.</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A126 Marshfoot Road priority junction leading to A1089 link road <p>A13 / Orsett Cock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1089 / Asda Roundabout • A1013 junction with Gammonfields Way • A1013 junction with Baker Street • The Cross Keys junction. • The Contractor must then be required to mitigate forecast impacts. 	<p>If deemed appropriate, junction modelling could be carried out prior to the works. The TMP would list the junctions to be modelled where require. Junction modelling requirements would be discussed at the TMF.</p>
25	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>Within Table 2.3 'Local business and residents' the applicant must add that Contractors must ensure no workforce parking within communities around the compounds and act to resolve problems that arise through direct and/or indirect engagement with those workers causing the disturbance.</p>	<p>The TMF would be the appropriate place to discuss location-specific matters such as parking on the road network around compounds. A blanket statement may cause inadvertent constraints for all parties involved, therefore the Applicant considers these should be discussed on a case-by-case basis. For example, in some cases workforce would need to access the worksites and park within the worksites/TM areas e.g. utility works which are away from the compound areas.</p> <p>In regards to the comments made on problems of disturbance arising from workforce behaviours, the Applicant has committed to the Considerate Constructors Scheme as stated in the CoCP [REP5-048] Section 2.5. This provides that Constructors must "manage their impact on their neighbours and the public to support a positive experience, by ensuring courteous and respectful language and appropriate behaviour in and around the construction activity; and providing a safer environment, preventing unnecessary disturbance, and reducing nuisance for the</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				community from their activities. Proactively maintaining effective engagement with the community to deliver meaningful positive impacts”.
26	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	Paragraph 3.1.4 must be adjusted to state that the Council can impose a moratorium in the instance of an emergency	The Detailed local operating agreement/ local operating agreement (DLOA/LOA) would cover responsibilities for the Contractor and the local highway authorities where the Project has an interface with the Local Road Network. See Paragraph 3.2.2 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] which also includes emergency works.
27	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	In paragraph 3.2.1 the text should be adjusted to note that the Council will only be able to manage its network outwith the Order Limits during the works. As stipulated within the dDCO the ability to influence the management of its network within the Order Limits will be the duty of the applicant during the life of the DCO construction period.	The DLOA would cover roles and responsibilities for the Contractor and the local highway authority to the A13. LOA's would apply to areas adjacent to site accesses. See Section 3 in the oTMPfC for details. It should be noted, the role of the TM within the TMF would be to ensure the road network and Project works are coordinated.
28	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The DLOA (supported by an improved Side Agreement or Protective Provisions) as referenced in Paragraph 3.2.2 must set out which body will manage the applications for permits by third parties for works within the Order Limits and where those works cross the Order Limits.	The DLOA would cover roles and responsibilities for the Contractor and the local highway authority to the A13. LOA's would apply to areas adjacent to site accesses. See Section 3 in the oTMPfC for details. Outside of the 'Works Zone', permitting responsibilities will be as defined in the oTMPfC [REP5-056]. In effect the DLOA will be the same as the oTMPfC [REP5-056].
29	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The role of the Traffic Manager set at 3.3.14 f must also be responsible for the assimilation, co-ordination, analysing, sharing and reporting the data to the TMF members.	Paragraph E.4.21, Appendix E of the oTMPfC [REP5-056], submitted at DL5. contains the responsibility of the Traffic Manager, while sub-paragraph j requires the Traffic Manager to

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				'oversee the performance, coordination, planning and delivery of the traffic management on the SRN and LRN.' The Secretariat of the TMF would be responsible for sharing the data among other responsibilities under paragraph E.4.22.
30	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The process table at Plate 3.3 must also show that updates to the TMPs can be requested by other members of the TMF, including the Council.	Plate 3.3 secures the TMF which in turn secures ongoing engagement and the ability to vary the TMP or measures secured under it. Additionally paragraph 3.3.23 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states that 'Where a measure identified as part of the "delivery stage" in Plate 3.3 does not fall within the scope of a TMP approved by the Secretary of State, National Highways would apply to the Secretary of State for a variation to the Traffic Management Plan, following consultation in accordance with Requirement 10.' The Council, or other members of the TMF, could raise an instance/instances where measures do not fall within the scope of a TMP at the TMF and request an update to the TMP.
31	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	Paragraph 3.4.2 does not use the formal term of Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL). There must not the opportunity to interpret this statement as allowing abnormal traffic movements, i.e. unusual volumes or types, outside of standard hours. The statement should also be corrected to state that it is the duty of the haulier to make the AIL Movement Order submissions.	The Applicant has made the necessary changes and use the formal term AIL in paragraph 3.4.2 of the oTMPfC for DL6.
32	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The agreed Access Routes as set out at Section 4.1 must clearly include the restriction of access for workers and other construction related traffic. It should be noted within the oTMPfC that some routes identified for use to access the compounds lie outside the Order Limits and so would not be controlled by the DCO	The restriction of access for workers and other construction related traffic for agreed access routes is a matter to be developed during the production of the TMP's.

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				<p>The Council's point on access routes outside of the Order Limits is noted, however, no works are proposed outside of the Order Limits, this is only for access and egress. Principles for management of the movement of workers can be found in the Framework Construction Travel Plan [REP5-054].</p>
33	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>The modelling of construction traffic included in the DCO evidence has not used the controls on routing that have been proposed, i.e. construction deliveries and workforce traffic has been allowed to freely assign across the LTAM cordon, which disguises the level of impact on the network. This does not allow for accurate assessment of impacts and does not permit robust monitoring during construction against the evidence.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that this is only partially correct. Construction-related HGV traffic in the Project's transport model (the Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM)) can be assigned freely but must also adhere to specific construction traffic HGV bans which have been identified through discussion with local authorities. These HGV bans are described in Table 4.4 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] and have been coded into the LTAM. HGVs in the LTAM also have specific designated access points to the compounds which are consistent with the access points described in the oTMPfC. The imposition of HGV bans and specific access points ensures that, in practice, the routes chosen in the LTAM are in accordance with the oTMPfC and representative of a reasonable worst-case scenario.</p>
34	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>The Council has repeatedly questioned the assumptions of access to the compounds and has been assured by the applicant that the use of the LRN would be minimised (as referenced in paragraph 4.1.2d) and that the LTAM strategic modelling has assigned construction traffic to the agreed routing. Contrary to those assurances, inspection of the construction period models has shown that workforce traffic does not adhere to the agreed routes and, by way of example and in the instance of the North</p>	<p>The oTMPfC [REP5-056] does not specify access routes for workers, only access points. In the specific North Portal example, the route via the A1089 ASDA roundabout is used, but in very small numbers compared to other routes. That is consistent with the oTMPfC which only specifies access routes for HGVs, not workers.</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<p>Portal compound, workers vehicles are assigned across a number of routes leading to access to the compound from Station Road having travelled through Linford and Chadwell St Mary. The route via Asda Roundabout and St Andrews Road is not used. The assertion made in the oTMPfC and the modelled effects are not accurate or aligned. This must be rectified and reflected through the evidence and updated oTMPfC and associated control documents.</p>	
35	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>The oTMPfC should include caps for the vehicle movements to each compound which align with the 11 modelled scenarios. This will allow compliance checking to be carried out and encourage innovation by the contractor. Where a variation from those profiles is required, the contractor will need to set out its justification and report that through the TMF and include that within the TMP. Furthermore, paragraph 4.1.7d does not stipulate a frequency and quantum of use of the 'secondary' routes. A cap on their use must be assigned and agreed with the Council.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the movement of construction vehicles along primary and secondary routes accessing compounds and ULHs should not be restricted by a vehicle cap, but rather the impact it has on the road network. The Applicant has committed to implementing a monitoring system that would establish a baseline position a year in advance of works commencing (para 2.4.22 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056]) and would inform the monitoring report shared with stakeholders, detailing the main traffic effects of the Project during its construction period, through comparison with the baseline collected prior to commencement (para 2.4.21 of the oTMPfC). The appointed Contractor would also be required to manage deliveries to compounds using vehicle booking systems (paragraph 3.5.11 of the outline Materials handling Plan [REP5-050]). The Contractor would also monitor vehicle movements on the road network to and from compounds to promote improvements in road safety and to minimise Project-related construction traffic and environmental impacts on the road network and local communities. The</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				<p>Applicant believes that imposing a vehicle cap would be ineffective and constrain the ability to adapt to changes that would minimise impacts of construction traffic. For instance, short-term higher impacts could in some cases be preferable to longer-term, lower impacts, e.g. bringing in material in a short preferred window during a period when the road network is shown to be at a reduced capacity, rather than a constrained number of deliveries over several weeks.</p>
36	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>Table 4.1 states that Stifford Clays Road (East and West), Medebridge Road and the Mardyke compounds are to be accessed via the private Medebridge Road. This is contrary to statements made by the applicant and so modelling of the A13/North Stifford/North Road and Stifford Clays Road must be carried out to demonstrate the effects of those movements on that interchange.</p>	<p>To clarify, Medebridge Road (Veolia link) would be used to access some compounds north of the A13 as outlined in the oTMPfC [REP5-056].</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken assessment to show the forecast impacts on the road network using the Project's transport model. This model includes the A13 Stifford Interchange, so changes as a result of the forecast Project-related construction traffic and temporary traffic management measures are shown. The Council has been provided GIS shapefiles and cordon models of each construction traffic modelling phase which allows them to interrogate the forecast impacts in detail.</p> <p>The Applicant has previously set out that the construction traffic assessment reflects a reasonable worst case and provides a proportionate assessment of the selected construction scenario, and further details are set out in Annex C.2 of Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for ISH4 [REP4-180].</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				<p>The Applicant considers that it would not be appropriate to specify junctions to be modelled at this stage given that the construction assessment represents a construction scenario. The Applicant considers that the monitoring, as secured in Section 2.4 of the oTMPfC, and the detailed construction planning that would be undertaken by the Contractor would enable the identification of locations that required further investigation.</p> <p>If deemed appropriate, junction modelling could be carried out prior to the works. The TMP would list the junctions to be modelled where required. Junction modelling requirements would be discussed at the TMF.</p>
37	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	It must be clarified how access to the Long Lane Compounds is to be achieved and maintained and the effect on the LRN at A1013. HGVs turning at that location will cause significant disruption to the operation and safety of A1013, particularly reflecting the proposals for new traffic signals in the vicinity.	There is currently an existing dedicated right turn lane off the A1013 and onto Gammonfields Way. The Contractor, as with all other access points, would need to assess and manage construction traffic to minimise impacts to the road network as far as reasonably practicable.
38	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	In defining the roles to be recruited and maintained as part of the projects traffic management resources, the oTMPfC must specify the accreditation and training requirements for on-site traffic management staff including Traffic Marshals, Banksmen, and gate-line staff. Those roles must be each given clear specification to their duties and lines of reporting. The accreditation of Traffic Management team leaders must be specified to LANTRA or equivalent minima for the duties to be undertaken and accord with the roles and responsibilities set out in Safety at Street Works and Road Works – A Code of Practice (the Red Book). The gate line and traffic management teams must be empowered and, through the Contractors'	<p>The Project would employ competent Contractors to deliver the works. The Project will not dictate the competencies of the Contractor's employees and where there is a requirement for an employee to hold certain accreditation this will be a matter between the Applicant and the Contractor. The Applicant is well experienced in delivering Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, and no further measures are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.4.13 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states how vehicles would be refused entry if they do not comply with standards. Paragraph 2.4.13</p>

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			Traffic Managers, enforce the requirements of the approved TMPs. That function could include over-ruling worksite requests where those requests do not adhere to the TMP – such as rejecting un-booked and non-compliant deliveries. A safe mechanism for rejecting vehicles must be set out within the oTMPfC for each compound	of the oTMPfC [REP5-054] states how vehicles would be refused entry if they do not comply with standards. The mechanism and empowerment to implementing this would form part of the TMP to which contractors and any workforce associated with the delivery of the project must adhere to.
39	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The mechanisms for informing the supply chain of the EMP2, TMP and CLP requirements must be set out in the oTMPfC, such that Contractors adopt that into the TMPs and co-ordinate that information across contracts	The management of sub-contractors and the broader supply chain by the relevant Contractor falls within the realm of contractual obligations and is not a matter of the DCO. All contractors, including those in the wider supply chain, must comply with the requirements outlined in the TMP and EMP2. Paragraph 4.2.1 of the CoCP [REP5-048] clarifies that "National Highways is responsible for the delivery of the Project and its implementation. However, National Highways will appoint Contractors to implement the Project, including a Project Manager/Director as well as additional specialist consultants to supervise, monitor or check the Contractors' environmental procedures. These bodies will take on day-to-day responsibility for managing the commitments in this document."
40	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	No localised modelling of the construction period has been provided to the Examination for this location. The oTMPfC identifies a traffic management scheme at that junction, as RNTM13, but does not specify what that might be. The Council has not seen or agreed any works at that point on its road network and has no certainty as to the impacts to expect at that point	The exact requirements for specific temporary traffic management measures have not yet been detailed and would be determined once the Contractor has been appointed and has developed its proposals. This would be appropriately set out and managed in accordance with the TMP, which is consulted upon and then approved by the Secretary of State (and thereafter subject to ongoing monitoring and

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
				<p>management, and engagement with the TMF). The traffic management measures have been listed to install traffic measures to manage construction vehicle access at RNTM13. The Applicant considers that it would not be appropriate to specify junctions to be modelled at this stage given that the construction assessment represents a construction scenario. The Applicant considers that the monitoring, as secured in Section 2.4 of the oTMPfC, and the detailed construction planning that would be undertaken by the Contractor would enable the identification of locations that required further investigation. If deemed appropriate, junction modelling could be carried out prior to the works. The TMP would list the junctions to be modelled where required. Junction modelling requirements would be discussed at the TMF..</p>
41	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The oTMPfC does not stipulate whether a single TMP is to be prepared (e.g. oTMPfC Sections 2.1.4, 2.3.2, 2.4.6) or a co-ordinated set of TMPs to be developed by each contractor and maintained in line with changes during the construction period (e.g. oTMPfC Sections 2.4.9, 2.4.15).	Paragraph 2.3.1 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] states that ' <i>A TMP may relate to part of the Project, so for example, there may be separate TMPs for different stages or areas of the Project...</i> '. The Traffic Manager then has the responsibility to plan, deliver and manage the TMPs as described in the ToR in paragraph E.4.21 of the oTMPfC.
42	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	<p>It is the Council's strong view that the applicant must revise the oTMPfC to strengthen the framework and provide clear leadership on such aspects as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the contractor's fleet will be monitored and managed with caps on movements to and from compounds; 	Paragraph 2.4.8 of the oTMPfC [REP5-056] describes the monitoring system the Contractor is required to provide and this would capture real-time data to monitor fleet movements. Vehicle caps have not been introduced; instead it is proposed to manage vehicle movements and restrict them where required based on the impact

ID	LA/LPA/LHA	Source	LA/LPA/LHA comment	Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How non-compliance will be dealt with, when updates of the TMPs will be required; • How the TMF will be constituted and voting managed; • How innovation by the contractors will be actively encouraged where it brings about a reduction in impact and improvements on the environment; and, • How mitigation will be introduced during the construction period reflecting the changing nature of the works. 	<p>on the road network. Non-compliance will be dealt with by corrective measures and or changes in the TMPs. This will be a matter for discussion and action in the TMF. The ToR for the TMF, Appendix E of the oTMPfC, clarifies that the Traffic Manager will have decision-making authority, but will have due regard for views and information provided by all parties before making a decision. The Project actively encourages reduction in impacts and improvements to the environment. The Carbon and Energy Management Plan [APP-552] is one such document which contains commitments to manage and minimise carbon emissions. Mitigation to reflect the changing nature of the works will be introduced via changes forecasted, monitored and then reported at the TMF. This forum will then allow the necessary discussions for stakeholders and the Applicant to ensure the Contractor introduces mitigation where it is required.</p>
43	Thurrock Council	Responses to Submissions at D4 [REP4-352]	The oTMPfC must clearly state how the TMF will be governed and how disagreements will be resolved and how escalation to the Joint Operating Forum will allow acceptable resolution, given that the Council and other stakeholders are not represented on that Forum.	These matters are now covered under Appendix E of the oTMPfC [REP5-056], Traffic Management Forum Terms of Reference.

Glossary

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

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

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

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

© Crown copyright 2023.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

National Highways Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363