

# Lower Thames Crossing

## 9.195 Applicant's comments on Interested Parties' submissions at D6A

Infrastructure Planning (Examination  
Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

**DATE: December 2023**  
**DEADLINE: 8**

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032  
Examination Document Ref: TR010032/EXAM/9.195

**VERSION: 1.0**

## Lower Thames Crossing

### 9.195 Applicant's comments on Interested Parties' submissions at D6A

#### List of contents

	Page number
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Applicant's response to submissions made by Gravesham Borough Council ...</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3 Applicant's response to submissions made by Medway Council .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4 Applicant's response to submissions made by Thurrock Council.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5 Applicant's response to submissions made by John Elliott.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6 Applicant's response to submissions made by Port of Tilbury London Limited</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7 Applicant's response to submissions made by Morzine Limited and Thames Enterprise Park Limited .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## List of tables

	<b>Page number</b>
Table 2.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Gravesham Borough Council.....	2
Table 3.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Medway Council .....	3
Table 4.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Thurrock Council .....	4
Table 5.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by John Elliott .....	7
Table 6.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Port of Tilbury London Limited ....	8
Table 7.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Thames Enterprise Park Limited .....	10

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document provides the Applicant's comments on Interested Parties' submissions at Deadline 6A.
- 1.1.2 The documents that are responded to in this document are:
- a. Gravesham Borough Council: Submission of comments on topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-010](#)]
  - b. Medway Council: Submission of comments on topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-012](#)]
  - c. Thurrock Council: Submission of comments by Local Highway Authorities, Ports and other IPs engaged in traffic and transportation topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-013](#)]
  - d. John Elliott: Supplementary Evidence from John Elliott following hearing ISH10 on 24th October in time for Deadline 6A on 14th November [[REP6A-015](#)]
  - e. Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL): Submission of comments by Local Highway Authorities, Ports and other IPs engaged in traffic and transportation topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-016](#)]
  - f. Morzine Limited: Applicant's submission of responses to traffic modelling materials submitted at D6 arising from ISH4 or ISH10 and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-020](#)]
  - g. Thames Enterprise Park Limited (TEP): Submission of comments on topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-022](#)]

## 2 Applicant's response to submissions made by Gravesham Borough Council

2.1.1 At Deadline 6A, Gravesham Borough Council submitted Submission of comments on topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-010](#)]. The Applicant's response to some of the matters raised by the Council is set out in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Gravesham Borough Council**

Section no.	Gravesham Borough Council's comments	Applicant's response
3	<p>The Council has raised a number of issues about the overall modelling including the lack of a sensitivity test using development quantities which reflect the housing projections derived from using the DLUHC standard method. Nowhere has the Applicant provided a specific response to this request or explained why it is robust to place wholesale reliance on data that is used in NTEM which is demonstrably out of date in the local context due to the age of the local plans and monitoring reports that were used to inform the NTEM projections. The assertion that the 'wider benefits' justify negative impacts does not stand up to analysis where (a) it is not apparent that the negative impacts have been identified using the most up to date information on levels of expected housing growth and (b) it results in local planning authorities being unable to meet the expectations placed upon them by Central Government because the local road network will not have the capacity to cope with the required scale of growth. In the Borough Council's view the Applicant's approach is the antithesis of joined up planning and does not present a comprehensive or robust picture of the overall transport impacts of the scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided a response to this issue on page 27 of Comments on LIRs - Appendix D - Gravesham Borough Council [<a href="#">REP2-058</a>]. In this response the Applicant stated "<i>The Applicant has followed DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) when developing the future year levels of traffic demand in the area. TAG obliges the control of traffic growth in an area to the projections set out in the DfT's national Trip End Model (NTEM), as set out in Section 6.3 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report [APP-518]</i>"</p> <p>As such the Applicant considers that its assessments within the Application are correct as they have been conducted in line with the relevant government guidance. The Applicant further notes paragraph 4.6 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) (Department for Transport (DfT), 2014)) in this context: "<i>The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State do not need to be concerned with the national methodology and national assumptions around the key drivers of transport demand.</i>".</p>

### 3 Applicant's response to submissions made by Medway Council

3.1.1 At Deadline 6A, Medway Council submitted Submission of comments on topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-012](#)]. The Applicant's response to some of the matters raised by the Council is set out in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Medway Council**

Section no.	Medway Council's comments	Applicant's response
-	<p>During the same meeting on 8 November, Medway Council advised that relevant planned development at Kingsnorth and the Isle of Grain in Medway Council's LIR [REP1-258] is subject to change. This is set out in a contractor's draft 'Forecasting Methodology Technical Note' for traffic modelling to inform a new local plan. The Forecasting Methodology Technical Note is to be reviewed by National Highways.</p>	<p>At the meeting of 8 November 2023, the Applicant's recollection of the conversation relating to this matter and the Council's Forecasting Methodology Technical Note was that the Council was proposing to treat the MedwayOne (MC/21/0979) and Kingsnorth Power Station (MC/09/1628) sites as allocations in their forthcoming modelling work (i.e. they would not be included in the Do Minimum scenario), other than including a certain amount of trips (60 for MedwayOne).</p> <p>As such, the Applicant considers that the Council's position on these matters has changed and is now closer to the position taken by the Applicant, particularly with regard to MedwayOne.</p>

## 4 Applicant's response to submissions made by Thurrock Council

4.1.1 At Deadline 6A, Thurrock Council submitted Submission of comments by Local Highway Authorities, Ports and other IPs engaged in traffic and transportation topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [[REP6A-013](#)]. The Applicant's response to some of the matters raised by PoTLL is contained in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Thurrock Council**

Section no.	Thurrock Council's comments	Applicant's response
<b>Section 2 – Orsett Cock: Summary of Council's Position</b>		
2.2.20	The Council is particularly concerned that the forecast delays at Orsett Cock junction will result in traffic reassigning through Orsett village. Given the narrow nature of the road network in this semi-rural village area and its residential nature, makes this impact unacceptable to the Council. The test undertaken by the applicant to input VISSIM delays into LTAM demonstrates that this is a justified concern and that increased delays at Orsett Cock in LTAM would result in traffic re-routing through Orsett village, as well as other local routes. This likelihood of this happening is demonstrated by Figure 2.3 below (which represents Figure 2.1 of the Council's Local Impact Report (REP1-281) and shows that delays at the Orsett Cock junction will likely cause traffic to divert through the nearby Orsett Village.	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made by the Council which resulted from the various tests undertaken by the Applicant as set out in the Joint Position Statement: Orsett Cock junction [<a href="#">REP5-084</a>].</p> <p>While the Applicant agrees that the tests reported in Appendix N of Localised Traffic Modelling [<a href="#">REP6A-004</a>] do show increases in traffic through Orsett village, the Applicant considers that this is unrepresentative, as such a scenario would not account for the unbalanced model effect that would arise because of the delays seen at the Orsett Cock junction in the VISSIM Do Minimum model.</p>
2.2.44	The evidence submitted by the applicant shows that the forecast delays at Orsett Cock junction will result in traffic reassigning through Orsett Village at a level that is considered unacceptable. Therefore, mitigation should not only focus on Orsett Cock junction, but also include sufficient measures to control and manage traffic to prevent it from routing through Orsett village.	<p>The Applicant considers that a comparison of the manipulated Do Something scenario (as presented in Appendix N of Localised Traffic Modelling) with a manipulated Do Minimum would show a much lesser change, and it is highly likely that the beneficial effects arising from the Project, seen in the Core Scenario modelling, would be repeated in that comparison. It is likely that a substantial proportion of the queuing is a result of the VISSIM modelling, and given the improvements on the A128 and Rectory Road seen in the Do Something model, it is quite possible that the Project would actually lead to a reduction</p>

Section no.	Thurrock Council's comments	Applicant's response
		in the flows through Orsett Village, which is in line with outputs of the LTAM as presented in the DCO application.
<b>Section 5 - Impact on Economic Appraisal of using VISSIM Results rather than LTAM Results</b>		
5.3.5	If the disbenefits at the Orsett Cock Junction are included in the economic appraisal for the scheme then the BCR for well-established Level 1 benefits reduces by 0.05 from 0.48:1 to approximately 0.53:1. The BCR including all benefits reduces from 1.22:1 by 0.05 to 1.17:1, including the expected similar effects at other junctions in Thurrock will further reduce the BCR	The Applicant has provided a full review of the assessment undertaken by Thurrock Council within Section A.8 of 9.190 Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for ISH13, submitted at Deadline 8.
<b>Section 6 – Wider Network Impacts</b>		
6.7.2	Overall Summary of All Junctions: the applicant has continued to resist efforts to complete a collaborative localised modelling process. Almost all the localised models remain incomplete and therefore the LTC impacts on the operation of the local highway network are not understood. There is not sufficient time remaining in the Examination process to complete the localised modelling and it therefore remains not agreed. Given this, the Council has worked jointly with PoTLL, DPWLG and TEP to agree draft Requirements for the monitoring and mitigation of Wider Network Impacts, which have been presented at D6 by the PoTLL and will be presented by the Council at D7.	<p>The Applicant does not agree with the Council's position on the localised traffic modelling that it has undertaken and submitted into the examination.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the localised modelling, while undertaken in different software packages to the Project's strategic transport model, has not identified significantly different outputs to those that the Applicant (and the Council) were already aware of and as are set out in the Transport Assessment <a href="#">[REP4-148 to REP4-152]</a> and the modelling outputs provided to the Council.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan <a href="#">[APP-545]</a> provides a mechanism which local authorities can use to help provide an evidence base for securing funding for interventions.</p>
<b>Section 7 – Tilbury Junction</b>		
7.5.4	Summary: the Tilbury Junction has been designed for the use of emergency and operational vehicles, potential future use by public transport vehicles and with passive provision for a connection to Tilbury Link Road (which formed part of	The Applicant has clearly set out its position on the Tilbury Link Road within Section 5.5 of the Planning Statement <a href="#">[APP-495]</a> , and the Interrelationship with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and Major Development Schemes <a href="#">[APP-</a>



Section no.	Thurrock Council's comments	Applicant's response
	<p>LTC until late 2018). An adequate explanation has not been provided of why Tilbury Link Road was removed from the scheme and its inclusion would provide greatly improved access to public transport services for Thurrock residents and enable the Orsett Cock junction to be significantly reduced in size.</p>	<p><a href="#">550</a>]. Further commentary is provided within Annex A.9 of Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for ISH4 <a href="#">[REP4-180]</a> and at items 2.1.167, 2.1.98 and 2.1.99 of the SoCG between the Applicant and Thurrock Council <a href="#">[REP6-030]</a> and page 42 of the Applicant's Comments on LIRs Appendix H: Thurrock Council (Part 1 of 5) <a href="#">[REP2-062]</a>.</p> <p>In relation to the Council's proposals for a Tilbury Junction and a Tilbury Link Road to be provided as part of the Project, the Applicant considers it wholly inappropriate to include either as part of the Project and notes that the Council's position would prejudice the statutory process, which National Highways is undertaking, to determine all aspects of the Tilbury Link Road scheme. .</p>

## 5 Applicant's response to submissions made by John Elliott

- 5.1.1 At Deadline 6A, John Elliott submitted Supplementary Evidence from John Elliott following hearing ISH10 on 24th October in time for Deadline 6A on 14th November [[REP6A-015](#)]. The Applicant's response to some of the matters raised is set out in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by John Elliott**

Section no.	John Elliott's comments	Applicant's response
<b>Section 1 – Known Knowns, Known Unknowns and mitigation</b>		
1.4	A 'Known Known' is the issue of extra major road infrastructure generating substantial extra traffic over and above any NH predictions especially anywhere near London. This was fully researched and explained in my detail submission (iv) including the paper republished in WTPP 'The Effects of Strategic Network Changes on Traffic' report (REP5 - 118). This is described briefly in the summary above but also included in overview in most of my other evidence. It should be noted that there are a number of other studies (since 1921) showing the generation of extra traffic (not diverted from other routes) including the 1994 report from the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road on this subject.	The Applicant has applied the parameters for the variable demand modelling, which leads to the changes in trip frequency and destination that lead to a change in vehicle kilometres driven, that are supplied in DfT TAG Unit M2.1 Variable Demand Modelling (DfT, 2020). This is documented in Chapter 10, of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal report - Appendix B - Transport Model Package [ <a href="#">APP-520</a> ].
<b>Section 5 - The rapidly diminishing 'business case'/ BCR for the LTC</b>		
5.3	Proper mitigation measures (section 1 of my REP4-377), with the funding required to implement them, would inevitably ensure that this BCR would be significantly less than 1.0. (Cost over-runs or in accuracies in the assumptions or calculations in the modelling and assessment of as small a margin of about 10%, even without the mitigation measures, are more than likely to result in the calculated benefits (with all the flaws – please see Appendix below) to be less than the costs.	This is not necessarily the case. If a mitigation measure had a BCR above 1.0, then if it were to have been included in the calculation of the BCR for the Project then this would have raised the BCR for the Project. It is not a given that all the mitigation measures would have a BCR below 1.0

## 6 Applicant's response to submissions made by Port of Tilbury London Limited

6.1.1 At Deadline 6A, Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL) submitted Submission of comments by Local Highway Authorities, Ports and other IPs engaged in traffic and transportation topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023 [REP6A-016]. The Applicant's response to some of the matters raised by PoTLL is contained in Table 6.1.

**Table 6.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Port of Tilbury London Limited**

Section no.	Port of Tilbury London Limited's comments	Applicant's response
<b>Section 2 – 9.158 applicant's submissions on construction impacts and management at Asda roundabout [REP6-123]</b>		
2.5	<p>As noted, PoTLL welcomes the additional detailed assessment of Construction Period 1 that has been provided and that this will necessarily be required, in a more comprehensive form, at the detailed design stage of the Scheme. However, the assessment set out at Table 4.1 is optimistic in terms of the works that could be undertaken without impacting upon the carriageway. The Applicant has assumed that works on footways and verges do not necessitate carriageway works. However, this assumes that there will be no constraints on works in the verge or footway, such as where pedestrian routes are to be maintained, or in relation to the need to manage the environmental impacts of works in heavily vegetated verges. The assessment also assumes a narrow working width of 600mm (see paragraph 4.2.4). The assessment in Table 4.1 should be viewed cautiously and PoTLL does not accept its findings.</p>	<p>Within the Applicant's response below, reference is made to the Applicant's submissions on construction impacts and management at Asda roundabout [REP6-123].</p> <p>With regard to comments made on Table 4.1, the Applicant has not assumed the works would not necessitate carriageway works, it has been assumed that the works would not require temporary traffic management (TTM) that would impede peak flow vehicle movements. This consideration is repeated within the according statements at paragraph 4.2.17 "<i>a high potential of removing TTM that would impede traffic during any peak periods</i>". This would be achieved via working in the verge or footway without a need for TTM that affects the users of the carriageway, or by undertaking the works outside of peak flow times with TTM in place during those periods only, as is typical when considering these types of works.</p> <p>Constraints associated with working in the verge or footpath were set out at paragraph 4.2.16 following a further site inspection. It considered those factors that would determine how the works could be reasonably delivered, as communicated at paragraph</p>

Section no.	Port of Tilbury London Limited's comments	Applicant's response
		<p>4.2.13 before apportioning a hierarchy of preferable location, as at paragraph 4.2.14. Of note, and supported by the photos contained within Plate 4.1, where works are proposed within the verge or footway, throughout the length of the works there is an adjacent footway of sufficient width, or an alternative footway in the vicinity that would be equally advantageous that WCH could reasonably be diverted to, or around the working area with limited to no detrimental effect on the user's route.</p> <p>As to not promote an optimistic or unreasonable assessment, the Applicant refers to the assessment of Section 7 at paragraph 4.2.17(g), where, albeit works could be undertaken outside of the carriageway, supported by Plate 4.1 'Brentwood Road western footway approaching petrol station', it has been assessed that the works would have an impediment on peak flow traffic (works within the carriageway) as a reasonable worst case to pass the frontage of the shops and petrol station.</p> <p>In response to the 'narrow working width' statement made by PoTLL, the Applicant would clarify that paragraph 4.2.4 details the envisaged trench dimensions (600mm wide, of sufficient depth to locate ducts at 750mm to 1200mm beneath the ground surface) into which the ducts and cables would be located, not the working width which would differ in width and length dependent on site specifics. This has not been determined at this stage, nor communicated explicitly, owing to it being relevant to other factors such as the choice of plant and setting of the works as communicated within paragraphs 4.2.5 to 4.2.8.</p> <p>Therefore the Applicant refutes the claim that Table 4.1 is optimistic and maintains that its conclusions within <a href="#">[REP6-123]</a> remain valid.</p>

## 7 Applicant's response to submissions made by Morzine Limited and Thames Enterprise Park Limited

- 7.1.1 At Deadline 6A Morzine Limited submitted "Applicant's submission of responses to traffic modelling materials submitted at D6 arising from ISH4 or ISH10 and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023" [REP6A-020] and Thames Enterprise Park Limited (TEP) submitted "Submission of comments on topics relating to traffic modelling and intended to be heard at ISH13 on 27 November 2023" [REP6A-022].
- 7.1.2 The Applicant has reviewed both submissions and has determined that they are substantively identical. Therefore, the Applicant has responded to these together in Table 7.1.

**Table 7.1 Applicant's response to submissions made by Thames Enterprise Park Limited**

Section no.	Morzine Limited and Thames Enterprise Park Limited comments	Applicant's response
<b>Joint Representation</b>		
3	<p>To assist the Examination and help the Examining Authority, and to try and find a pragmatic way forward, TEP has now entered into a joint representation with Thurrock Council (TC), DPW London Gateway (DPWLG), and Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL). All four parties have reached a common position with respect to three proposed requirements. The joint representation covers:</p> <p>A. Draft Requirement: Asda roundabout – construction traffic mitigation, found at Appendix 3 to PoTLL's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-163].</p> <p>B. Draft Requirement: Orsett Cock roundabout – operational traffic mitigation, found at Appendix 4 to PoTLL's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-163].</p> <p>C. Draft Requirement: Wider highway network monitoring and mitigation, found at Appendix 6 to PoTLL's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-163].</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided comments on these proposed requirements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A – Draft requirement: Asda Roundabout – The Applicant set out how the controls are secured in the Applicant's submissions on construction impacts and management at Asda roundabout [REP6A-008]</li> <li>• B – Draft Requirement: Orsett Cock roundabout – operational traffic mitigation – The Applicant provided a response to the proposed Orsett Cock roundabout requirement at Section 7.2 of the Applicant's responses to Interested Parties' comments on the draft DCO at Deadline 6 [REP7-190]</li> <li>• C - Draft Requirement: Wider highway network monitoring and mitigation – The Applicant provided a response to the proposed Requirement in the Applicant's comments on Interested Parties' submissions regarding Wider Network Impact at D7, submitted at Deadline 8 [Document reference 9.208].</li> </ul>

Section no.	Morzine Limited and Thames Enterprise Park Limited comments	Applicant's response
<b>Additional Items</b>		
5	<p>The joint representation has been reached primarily due to NH failing to address the following key concerns identified by TEP throughout the consultation period. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Assessment Hours: There is no assessment of the busiest peak period on the local highway network – the shift changeover period at 14:00. Instead, NH has assessed the 'average' hourly flow between 10:00 – 16:00. Further details is provided in item no 2.1.9 of the Deadline 6 Draft Statement of Common Ground between NH and TEP [REP6-120].</li> <li>— TEP VISSIM Model: TEP has developed a fully validated VISSIM model (referred to as the TEP VISSIM model) which includes Sorrells Roundabout, the A13 / Manorway Interchange, and the Orsett Cock roundabout. The TEP VISSIM model is the most up to date model of the local highway network, which meets TAG validation and calibration requirements, and has been signed off and approved by NH. NH is aware of the TEP VISSIM model but has chosen not to use the TEP VISSIM model to understand the localised impacts of LTC. This is the model that should be used to assess the operation of Sorrells Roundabout, the A13 / Manorway Interchange, and the Orsett Cock roundabout, and NH has not explained why the TEP VISSIM model has not been used. Further detail is provided in item no 2.1.2 of the Deadline 6 Draft Statement of Common Ground between NH and TEP [REP6-120].</li> <li>— NH VISSIM Model: The NH VISSIM model of The Manorway Interchange does not include a base model, has not been validated and there is no supporting Local Modelling Validation Report (LMVR). NH has not explained</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant's interpeak assessment within the LTAM is an average hour between 09:00 and 15:00 and is intended to reflect traffic conditions between the AM and PM peak hours. The methodology for identifying the modelled hours is set out within Section 3.3 of Combined Modelling and Appraisal report - Appendix B - Transport Model Package [APP-520].</p> <p>The Applicant's localised traffic model of the Manorway junction was built in collaboration with Thurrock Council, the highway authority for the junction. As part of the model development the modelled hours were agreed and there was no requirement to model the 14:00 – 15:00 hour.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments from TEP with regard to the TEP VISSIM model. As noted above, the Applicant developed both the Manorway and Orsett Cock junction models collaboratively with Thurrock Council and it was agreed to develop new VISSIM models.</p> <p>As part of the model development, no suitable base count data was available for the Manorway junction and so it was agreed with Thurrock Council that no base model would be developed.</p> <p>Regarding the supposed discrepancy that TEP have noted between flows in the LTAM and the Orsett Cock junction VISSIM model, the Applicant has responded to their concerns against matter 2.1.6 in the TEP SoCG [REP6-120] and is awaiting a response from TEP on this matter.</p>

Section no.	Morzine Limited and Thames Enterprise Park Limited comments	Applicant's response
	<p>why this was used as opposed to the validated TEP VISSIM model. Further detail is provided in item no 2.1.2 of the Deadline 6 Draft Statement of Common Ground between NH and TEP [REP6-120].</p> <p>— NH LTAM model: There appears to be a discrepancy between the LTAM traffic flows and the VISSIM traffic flows for Orsett Cock Roundabout. The discrepancy between the LTAM and VISSIM models raises doubt with the accuracy of the models themselves and whether the correct traffic flow data has been used and whether the results of the modelling is therefore reliable. The data contained within the Localised Traffic Modelling Report (REP3127 Tables 4.5 and 4.6) shows variances of up to 50% in traffic movement on certain arms when comparing the LTAM and VISSIM flows. Further details are provided in item no 2.1.6 of the Deadline 6 Draft Statement of Common Ground between NH and TEP [REP6-120].</p>	

## References

Department for Transport (2014). National Policy Statement for National Networks.  
<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7e0a40ed915d74e6223b71/npsnn-web.pdf>

Department for Transport (2020). TAG Unit M2.1 Variable Demand Modelling.  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/tag-unit-m2-1-variable-demand-modelling>



## Glossary

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
<b>A122</b>		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)
<b>A122 Lower Thames Crossing</b>	<b>Project</b>	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.
<b>A122 Lower Thames Crossing/M25 junction</b>		New junction with north-facing slip roads on the M25 between M25 junctions 29 and 30, near North Ockendon.
<b>A13/A1089/A122 Lower Thames Crossing junction</b>		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"> <li>• Improved A13 westbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing southbound</li> <li>• Improved A13 westbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing northbound</li> <li>• Improved A13 westbound to A1089 southbound</li> <li>• A122 Lower Thames Crossing southbound to improved A13 eastbound and Orsett Cock roundabout</li> <li>• A122 Lower Thames Crossing northbound to improved A13 eastbound and Orsett Cock roundabout</li> <li>• Orsett Cock roundabout to the improved A13 westbound</li> <li>• Improved A13 eastbound to Orsett Cock roundabout</li> <li>• Improved A1089 northbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing northbound</li> <li>• Improved A1089 northbound to A122 Lower Thames Crossing southbound</li> </ul>
<b>A2</b>		A major road in south-east England, connecting London with the English Channel port of Dover in Kent.
<b>Application Document</b>		In the context of the Project, a document submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the application for development consent.
<b>Construction</b>		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.
<b>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</b>	<b>DMRB</b>	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.
<b>Development Consent Order</b>	<b>DCO</b>	Means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
<b>Development Consent Order application</b>	<b>DCO application</b>	The Project Application Documents, collectively known as the 'DCO application'.
<b>Environmental Statement</b>	<b>ES</b>	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.
<b>Highways England</b>		Former name of National Highways.
<b>M2 junction 1</b>		The M2 will be widened from three lanes to four in both directions through M2 junction 1.
<b>M2/A2/Lower Thames Crossing junction</b>		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.
<b>M25 junction 29</b>		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.
<b>National Highways</b>		A UK government-owned company with responsibility for managing the motorways and major roads in England. Formerly known as Highways England.
<b>National Planning Policy Framework</b>	<b>NPPF</b>	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.
<b>National Policy Statement</b>	<b>NPS</b>	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.
<b>National Policy Statement for National Networks</b>	<b>NPSNN</b>	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.
<b>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</b>	<b>NSIP</b>	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.
<b>North Portal</b>		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.
<b>Operation</b>		Describes the operational phase of a completed development and is considered to commence at the end of the construction phase, after demobilisation.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
<b>Order Limits</b>		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.
<b>Planning Act 2008</b>		The primary legislation that establishes the legal framework for applying for, examining and determining Development Consent Order applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.
<b>Project road</b>		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).
<b>Project route</b>		The horizontal and vertical alignment taken by the Project road.
<b>South Portal</b>		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.
<b>The tunnel</b>		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/](http://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](mailto: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](mailto: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