

## Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement

### Lower Thames Crossing – TR010032

[London Borough of Havering]

Number		SoCG reference	The brief concern held by Havering which will be reported on in full in the WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
1	Local Resident Discount Scheme (LRDS)	2.1.31	Concern that the LRDS is not available to Havering residents.	Havering needs to be referred to in the draft DCO as a Local Authority whose residents will be eligible for the LRDS.	Low
2	Section 106	2.1.81, 2.1.24, 2.1.78, 2.1.85, 2.1.43, 2.1.84, 2.1.96, 2.1.58, 2.1.82, 2.1.80, 2.1.83 (order of appearance in the Statement of Common Ground)	S106 offers very little recompense to Havering residents for the disruption during construction.	Community Fund needs to be substantially increased for Havering. Severance issues around schools needs to be addressed through mitigation. SEE strategy needs to include specific targets for Havering residents of apprenticeships etc. Officer support contributions are not yet agreed. Specific contributions need to be identified.	Low

				Contributions to meeting carbon targets in Havering's Climate Change Action Plan are required. Mitigation for severe adverse noise impacts during construction are required.	
3	Upminster Cemetery	2.1.21	Severe adverse impacts have been identified by Havering on this facility and surrounding businesses during the 10 month closure of Ockendon Road.	Compensation for the disruption is required. Diversion routes need to be made resilient to ensure journey time reliability for trips to the cemetery.	Low
4	Draft Development Consent Order	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.6.	Removal of the words "reasonable" and "best endeavours" in line with consented M25 J28 DCO required for the revisions of all control documents. Protective Provisions for LHA vehicular and non-vehicular networks required. Deemed consent required to be extended to 42 days in line with	Redrafting required.	Medium

			consented M25 J28 DCO required.		
5	Mitigation	2.1.15, 2.1.21, 2.1.24, 2.1.39, 2.1.43, 2.1.44, 2.1.45, 2.1.48,	The ES and Planning Statement defines the impacts of the scheme extensively but mitigation is not provided on the basis of the national need for the scheme. This is considered unacceptable by Havering, particularly where severe adverse impacts are identified.	Clear mitigation interventions need to be agreed with Havering	Low
6	Wider Network Impacts	2.1.39, 2.1.41	The proposed Wider Network Monitoring and Management Plan provides no mechanism for funding any necessary mitigation for Havering. There are insufficient monitoring points in Havering. The decision making mechanism for the provision of mitigation is insufficient.	WNMMP requires redrafting in consultation and agreement with Havering.	Low
7	Non- Motorised Users benefits	2.1.70	The connectivity of proposed green infrastructure is lacking.	Redesign of onward connections for WCH required.	Low

			Safe onward links to Folkes Lane and Moor Lane need to be designed and agreed with Havering.		
--	--	--	--	--	--