

LEIGH HUGHES LTC-AP546

ANTONY HUGHES LTC-AP238

D7 SUBMISSION HUGHES FAMILY

We would just like to bring to the attention to ExA that though we have been in correspondence by email with the applicant as per section 4 of REP5-086, please find attached below the email chain. We would like to point out that though our written questions have been answered to a point that in some instances the applicant has guided us to references and pages that has nothing to do with our questions, meaning they have not read or interpreted our questions properly so answers have been inadequate. Though we had already submitted these concerns, with many others in our written Compulsory Acquisition Hearing submission the applicant asked for some of our main concerns which was time consuming and we thought pointless as they had been already submitted and published for the applicant to read.

I have also had in person conversations with Sarah Colins (at Orsett Hall hearing) and Mr Roberts (at the site visit to the Wilderness) that it would be arranged for a face-to-face meeting with them and the contractors but this has not materialised.

We would like ExA to review our situation as there is very little time left in the DCO process for our questions to be answered by the 20<sup>th</sup> December. Surely this cannot be acceptable and cannot be considered as meaningful engagement particularly when we are an effected party.

Below is the email correspondence that we have had with the applicant:

**From:** Tony Hughes [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2023 3:01 PM  
**To:** Eva Simunovic [REDACTED] @lowerthamescrossing.co.uk>  
**Subject:** Written Response Questions

Hi Eva

Hope you are well

Please find enclosed below the outlined questions that I would like clarity and answers to that your colleague Mike Roberts asked me to email. All questions are in my written rep so please read for more detail because it will help so that there is no misunderstanding.

B186 North Road Green Bridge flooding issues

I appreciate. I did sit down with you and the utility guy on this subject but the conversation was only verbal and as this project is design and build, I would like to be reassured with written confirmation that this would be the case.

The footpath across the road opposite my property and access.

The raising of the road in this area. Why is the depth not acceptable for Shorne Park but ok for Ockendon Residents.

The service access road next to my property.

UXOs knowing that they are here.

Rolling traffic lights, what are they?

There is one that was not in my written rep. I would like it confirmed that the utility hub that was being considered next to 3 Townfield is or not now being placed there?

As I have conveyed above, please look at my in-depth written response which goes into more detail. I did get the standard answers for my technical questions I would appreciate not to be guided to hundreds of pages to read through and just for someone to look at my concerns. As we have said the DCO process is very quick pace and demanding and unfortunately my health in the last couple of weeks as been suffering due to this, so any straight to the point answers would be much appreciated and if there are some questions you are not able to assist me with at this time then please just say so.

Kind Regards

Leigh

Eva Simunovic [REDACTED]@lowerthamescrossing.co.uk>

Thu, Oct 5,  
3:49 PM

to me

Hi Leigh,

All good my side thanks, I hope you are keeping well.

Thank you for the questions below, I am currently working with the relevant teams to provide you with responses which I hopefully will be able to get back to you next week.

Kind regards  
Eva

Eva Simunovic

Oct 17, 2023,  
6:09 PM

to me

Good evening Leigh,

I hope you are well.

Apologies for the delay in reply, please find responses below to your key concerns from your email of 29 September and as detailed in your written rep:

**B186 North Road Green Bridge flooding issues**

As communicated previously, the project is committed to and bound by National Planning Policy to ensure not to increase flood risk to third parties.

There are key commitments in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) within 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices Appendix 2.2 – Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan [REP5-048](#) to manage flood risk and drainage during construction:

**P92 RDWE001** - The contractor shall prepare a construction phase flood risk assessment (FRA). The scope of the construction phase FRA shall consider all construction phase activities and temporary works necessary to deliver the Project. The construction phase FRA shall consider on-site and off-site flood risk and include climate change allowances. The construction phase FRA and construction site drainage systems would be subject to SoS approval following consultation with the relevant planning authorities.

**P92 RDWE006** - The Contractor shall develop a construction phase drainage plan. The plan shall demonstrate how the Contractor would manage surface water runoff across the worksite, including details of how offsite impacts would be prevented. The construction phase drainage plan would be subject to SoS approval, following consultation with the relevant planning authorities.

**P92 - RDWE002** - Work site drainage systems would be inspected and maintained to ensure they continue to operate to their design standard.

During the operation stage, the drainage system is designed to accommodate runoff from the highway in storm events up to and including the 1% annual chance, with allowance for climate change, and that discharges from the system into receiving watercourses would be made at rates that match the pre-development rates. We have commitments to maintenance (P93 - RDWE012) and can confirm that the ditch alongside your property is not proposed to receive or convey any runoff collected by the highway drainage system.

The footpath across the road opposite your property and access.

There are currently no proposals to provide a formal crossing on North Road near to Townfield Cottages to connect to the proposed north-south off-carriageway track for Walkers, Cyclists and Horseriders (WCH). This proposed off-carriageway track for WCH along North Road aims to connect into the existing public rights of way network (PRoW) either side of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing. To the south, the route connects to the existing footway into South Ockenden via a short section of new bridleway and to the north connecting with the proposed redesignation of footpath 151 to bridleway. To the south of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing the Project would provide a new bridleway adjacent to Dennis Road which then provides a connection to the proposed diversion of footpath 252, which would be redesignated to bridleway, crossing over the railway and the Lower Thames Crossing. This bridleway will then connect to Church Lane and footpaths 254 and 151 both of which will be redesignated as bridleway, with the latter connecting back to North Road and a proposed Pegasus crossing. We consider the proposed WCH routes and bridge crossings will provide users with safe connections to the existing public rights of way network.

The raising of the road in this area. Why is the depth not acceptable for Shorne Park but ok for Ockendon Residents.

The project presented a change to the road alignment at the Local Refinement Consultation in May 2022. The depth of cutting was maintained at North Road through the use of 'false cuttings'. By raising the road in this location the amount of excavated material being removed by road would be reduced. There would be no significant change in noise and visual impacts during construction and operation for nearby communities.

The project has not reduced the level of the A2 corridor in its proposals, which will remain the same level as the existing.

The service access road next to your property.

In response that the service access road in the vicinity of your property would enable lorries carrying people to let them out and that your property would be their first port of call, the Lower Thames Crossing will be fully covered by a network of CCTV cameras linked to the National Highways Regional Operations Centre (ROC). Any suspicious activities will be reported to the Police so that they can provide an appropriate response. In addition, the Project will be patrolled 24/7 by National Highways Traffic Officers who would also alert the ROC if they spot any suspicious activities.

UXOs knowing that they are here.

I do appreciate your ongoing concerns regarding UXOs but in line with the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP5-048](#), the Contractors will carry out pre-construction risk assessments and prepare and implement an emergency response procedure. This includes commitments and timings of evacuation plans, the authorities/services who should be notified/consulted in respect of the response procedures; and notification/ consultation commitments for the emergency procedures with the authorities. Please refer to paragraphs 6.9.1; 6.9.4; 6.11.1 and 6.11.2.

Rolling traffic lights, what are they?

Rolling traffic lights are traffic lights that gradually move down the road as works are completed.

I assume this is in relation to your concerns regarding access to your property and services being maintained during construction, and as communicated previously, the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (OTMPfC) [APP-547](#) provides an overview of the approach that will be followed when undertaking temporary traffic management for the safe construction of the Lower Thames Crossing. This document will be used to inform the Traffic Management Plan for Construction (TMP), a document which National Highways will have to submit to the Secretary of State for approval before commencing the relevant part of the project if the Development Consent Order is granted.

It is acknowledged that the impacts on communities from measures required to ensure the safe delivery of the project should be to be kept to a minimum as much as is reasonably practicable. The specific restrictions 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 Traffic Management Plan (TMP). For Local Businesses and residents we have listed the following as requirements on p20:

- Public and staff access
- Access for deliveries
- Waste collection
- Emergency service access
- Postal deliveries (including Royal Mail collection)
- Appropriate diversion routes

How the TMP would take these into account

- Access and egress to be maintained throughout the construction period with the exception of night-time and weekend closures when required for specific planned works
- Regular communication to inform changes and scheme progress
- Include temporary advance warning signs on approaches at appropriate locations to inform road users to use appropriate diversions put in place

Utility hub that was being considered next to 3 Townfield

**As communicated previously, the proposed substation at North Road has been removed and will not be relocated elsewhere. This was presented as a minor localised change in May 2022 as part of the Local Refinement Consultation.**

**I hope you find these responses helpful, please contact me if you have any further queries.**

**On a final note, I just want to say that I appreciate you taking the time to raise your concerns and hope to continue having an open dialogue and engaging with you further both before and into the next phase, subject to the DCO being granted consent.**

**Kind regards**

**Eva**

**Lower Thames Crossing - Community Engagement**



**Working on behalf of**

**National Highways**

We are concerned that despite us being told that written submissions hold as much weight as in person oral representations, we submitted our Compulsory Acquisition Hearing written submission at Deadline 5 and to date the applicant have not responded to it. We also note that in the D6 submissions the applicant has in Deadline 6 Submission - 9.129 Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for CAH3 [REP6-087] commented in paragraph 3.11.1 that "Submissions were not made at the hearing and instead were to be submitted in writing for Deadline 6. The Applicant will respond to those submissions, if necessary, at Deadline 7." We do not consider it acceptable that the applicant has apparently not considered it 'necessary' to respond to our comments, as it is highly unlikely that they wouldn't have passed any comment if we had instead made our comments orally in front of the ExA at a hearing.

The ExA will probably be aware that the Wilderness has been given ancient woodland/Long established status by Natural England. Due to this new status, this land should now be protected from this proposed scheme, will alterations be considered e.g. moving closer to the landfill and investigating nitrogen disposition.

We are concerned that the applicant's desk top surveys are not fit for purpose, and that it took the research of part-time local historians and TCAG to help bring this Ancient Woodland to the attention of Natural England.

This is proof that the applicant's desk top surveys are inaccurate and unreliable, what assurances can be made that similar mistakes have not occurred on other surveys, is not adequate in a major infrastructure project which not only effects the residents/businesses throughout the proposed route but also outside the development boundary too.

We have had serious concerns about UXOs since this proposed route was chosen. And during the ground investigation works we made it clear to the applicant that local knowledge and historians had stipulated their concerns of the unexploded UXOS in the vicinity. The applicant is adamant that a desk top survey is not only sufficient, in our area but the whole proposed route and outside the order limits. If one bomb explodes it could cause a chain reaction in and out of the development boundary, we cannot put into words our concerns on this subject.

Will ExA now be asking the applicant to submit and carry out more intensive investigations where only desk top study information has been submitted, it would be irresponsible for the applicant to not reinvestigate matters like UXOS, flooding etc.

We are concerned and surprised that looking at the future ISH timetable a number of subjects have not been included to be debated on, such as carbon admissions, air pollution and flooding. Climate change is a serious issue as the news has shown in the last couple of weeks properties that in the past, have had no flooding issues have been affected due to housing developments being built recently on the flood plains. A debate on how a concrete viaduct being built on the fens where a desk top survey has only been submitted should be considered, as the proposed road would cause not only localised flooding to properties in South Ockendon but also to areas such as Bulphan, Havering which are out of the development boundary.

Thank you for your time and we hope you consider the issues we have raised in our D7 response.

