

**Application by National Highways for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Lower Thames Crossing**

**Issue Specific Hearing 13 (ISH13)**  
Traffic & Transportation

**Date:** 27 November 2023

**Venue:** Hilton London Tower Bridge Hotel & MS Teams

**Action Points**

No	Party	Action	Deadline
1	Applicant Thurrock Council	<p><b>Orsett Cock: Additional weave length and General Arrangement Plans</b> Please submit a drawing demonstrating the proposition that relevant additional weave length can be provided without a requirement for additional land and within the limits of deviation.</p> <p>Please provide an amendment to the General Arrangement Plans Vol C [REP7-028/029] to show this change.</p> <p>Thurrock Council may comment at D9.</p>	D8
2	Thurrock Council	<p><b>Orsett Cock: modelling parameters: driver behaviour</b> Please confirm the extent to which Thurrock Council and the Applicant are in agreement, or not in agreement (and why), in relation to the driver behaviour assumptions employed in the modelling. To the extent not done so in the hearing, please explain any differences between model versions 3.6 and 3.6T.</p>	D8

No	Party	Action	Deadline
3	Applicant	<p><b>Orsett Cock: roundabout route and lane name convention (diagram)</b> Please provide an intersection route and lane diagram or diagrams, with the individual lanes and the entrance and exit routes and paths named – consistently with the approach taken in analysing model outputs. Please include WCH provision in the response to this action.</p> <p>Other IPs referring to Orsett Cock are requested to adopt these usages in responding submissions at D9.</p>	D8
4	Applicant	<p><b>Orsett Cock: roundabout route modelling assumptions</b> Please use versions of the diagrams referred to in Action 3 to illustrate the differences between Applicant v3.6 modelling and the Thurrock Council v3.6T modelling assumptions. Further to discussion at ISH13, this should be taken as an opportunity to explain the modelling that is already before the ExA, but not to amend it. Thurrock Council may comment in responding submissions at D9.</p>	D8
5	Thurrock Council	<p><b>Orsett Cock: Identification of deemed unacceptable impacts by Thurrock Council</b> Thurrock Council is requested to identify all instances of what it deems to be unacceptable impacts at Orsett Cock (plus definitions of the relevant terms describing impacts), emerging from the Applicant's version 3.6 modelling (noting that modelling is not agreed between Thurrock Council and the Applicant).</p>	D8
6	Applicant	<p><b>Orsett Cock: model 3.6T</b> Provide commentary as to whether, in the Applicant's view, model 3.6T reflects realistic driver behaviour.</p> <p>Thurrock Council may respond at D9.</p>	D8

No	Party	Action	Deadline
7	The Applicant Thames Freeport (Port of Tilbury, DP World London Gateway, Thurrock Council)	<p><b>Thames Freeport (Ports and Thurrock Council): Collaborative development of draft Requirement 18</b></p> <p>By Deadline 9, please engage to seek a further revised draft of Requirement 18 in which the objectives to be met and definitions of terms and outcomes sought to secure the proper functionality of the Orsett Cock are (as far as possible) agreed. Provide a draft that sets out all matters agreed. If necessary, provide reservations and statements of individual or group positions on matters not agreed.</p>	D9
8	Port of Tilbury DP World London Gateway	<p><b>Continued ‘in principle’ support for the Proposed Development</b></p> <p>Having regard to progress on Action 7, If the adverse effects of the Proposed Development at the Orsett Cock cannot in your opinion reasonably be mitigated by Requirement 18 as proposed to be drafted by the Applicant, what would you say the consequences should be for the scheme as a whole?</p>	D9
9	Kent County Council	<p><b>Blue Bell Hill: Local Plan Allocations and Major Planning Applications in Kent</b></p> <p>Provide details of responses from National Highways, in its function of providing consultation responses for local plan allocations and major planning applications, where matters relating to the capacity of and required improvements to the Blue Bell Hill junction have been raised by NH.</p>	D9