

Lower Thames Crossing

5.4.4.8 Final Agreed Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways and (2) London Borough of Havering (Clean version)

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications:
Prescribed Forms and Procedure)
Regulations 2009

Volume 5

DATE: December 2023
DEADLINE: 9A

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032
Application Document Ref: TR010032/APP/5.4.4.8

VERSION: 5.0

Revision history

Version	Date	Submitted at
1.0	31 October 2022	DCO Application
2.0	18 July 2023	Deadline 1
3.0	3 October 2023	Deadline 5
4.0	31 October 2023	Deadline 6
5.0	15 December 2023	Deadline 9A

Status of the Statement of Common Ground

This is the Final Agreed Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways (the Applicant) and (2) London Borough of Havering.

Both parties have reached agreement on the position on the status of all 96 matters. Of the 96 matters contained within, 61 matters are agreed and 35 are not agreed, leaving no matters outstanding.

On behalf of the Applicant

Name	[REDACTED]
Position	[REDACTED]
Organisation	National Highways
Signature	[REDACTED]

On behalf of the London Borough of Havering

Name	[REDACTED]
Position	[REDACTED]
Organisation	London Borough of Havering
Signature	[REDACTED]

Lower Thames Crossing

5.4.4.8 Final Agreed Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways and (2) London Borough of Havering (Clean version)

List of contents

	Page number
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground	1
1.2 Principal Areas of Disagreement	1
1.3 Terminology	1
2 Matters.....	2
2.1 Final position on matters.....	2
Appendix A Engagement activity	149
Appendix B Glossary.....	151

List of tables

	Page number
Table 2.1 Final position on Matters.....	4
Table A.1 Engagement activities between the Applicant and London Borough of Havering since the DCO application was submitted on 31 October 2022	149

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the proposed A122 Lower Thames Crossing (the Project) made by National Highways Limited (the Applicant) to the Secretary of State for Transport (Secretary of State) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 on 31 October 2022.
- 1.1.2 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the Applicant and London Borough of Havering, and where agreement has not been reached.
- 1.1.3 This version of the SoCG has been submitted at Examination Deadline 9A.

1.2 Principal Areas of Disagreement

- 1.2.1 On 19 December 2022 the Examining Authority made some early procedural decisions to assist the Applicant, potential Interested Parties and themselves to prepare for the Examination of the DCO application.
- 1.2.2 One of these procedural decisions was to use a tracker recording Principal Areas of Disagreement in Summary (PADS).
- 1.2.3 The PADS Tracker would provide a record of those principal matters of disagreement emerging from the SoCG and should be updated alongside the SoCG as appropriate throughout the Examination with the expectation that a revised PADS Tracker should be submitted at every Examination deadline.
- 1.2.4 This SoCG should be read in conjunction with the London Borough of Havering PADS Tracker.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the Final position on Matters table in Section 2 of this SoCG, “Matter Not Agreed” indicates agreement on the matter could not be reached following significant engagement. “Matter Agreed” indicates where the issue has now been resolved.

2 Matters

2.1 Final position on matters

- 2.1.1 Following submission of the previous version of this SoCG between the Applicant and London Borough of Havering, further discussions on the outstanding matters have taken place. These discussions are summarised in Table A.1 in Appendix A and the outcome of these discussions is summarised below.
- 2.1.2 The following matters have moved from ‘Matter Under Discussion’ to ‘Matter Agreed’:
- a. 2.1.15, Environment;
 - b. 2.1.23, Communication and community engagement;
 - c. 2.1.29, Closures and diversions;
 - d. 2.1.42, Assessment of likely significant effects;
 - e. 2.1.43, 2.1.58 Monitoring;
 - f. 2.1.45, 2.1.47, 2.1.48, 2.1.49 & 2.1.50, Archaeology;
 - g. 2.1.62, 2.1.63 & 2.1.64, Worker transport;
 - h. 2.1.81, Consent Process
 - i. 2.1.82, 2.1.83 & 2.1.96, Project design and mitigation;
 - j. 2.1.90, Materials & waste handling.
- 2.1.3 The following matters have moved from ‘Matter Under Discussion’ to ‘Matter Not Agreed’:
- a. 2.1.21, Impacts;
 - b. 2.1.24, Mitigation;
 - c. 2.1.25, Closures and diversions;
 - d. 2.1.26 & 2.1.30, Construction traffic impacts;
 - e. 2.1.37, Modelling methodology;
 - f. 2.1.39, Wider Network Impacts approach;
 - g. 2.1.41, Local Wider Network Impacts concerns;
 - h. 2.1.46 & 2.1.84, Archaeology;
 - i. 2.1.60, 2.1.61 & 2.1.65, Worker transport;
 - j. 2.1.70, WCH/active travel – design;
 - k. 2.1.72, Lighting;
 - l. 2.1.73, WCH impacts during and after construction.
 - m. 2.1.76, Assets;
 - n. 2.1.78, Road alteration and maintenance;
 - o. 2.1.80, 2.1.92 & 2.1.94, Project design and mitigation;

- 2.1.4 The following matters have moved from ‘Matter Not Agreed’ to ‘Matter Agreed’:
a. 2.1.2, Consent Process.
- 2.1.5 In the column ‘Item No’ in Table 2.1, ‘RRN’ indicates a matter entered into the SoCG as a result of content in the Relevant Representation, ‘RRE’ indicates an existing SoCG matter that was also raised in the Relevant Representation and ‘DL1’ indicates a new matter added during examination at/around that deadline.
- 2.1.6 In Table 2.1, relevant issues relating to the draft DCO articles and Requirements in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO have been identified under the heading ‘DCO and consents’.
- 2.1.7 At Examination Deadline 6 there were 96 matters in total, of which 41 were agreed, 15 were not agreed and 40 remained under discussion.
- 2.1.8 At Examination Deadline 9A there are 96 matters in total of which 61 are agreed and 35 are not agreed.
- 2.1.9 This is the final Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the London Borough of Havering.

Table 2.1 Final position on Matters

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
DCO and consents					
Discharge authority and the local authority's consultation role	2.1.1	<p>In its comments on the draft DCO, London Borough of Havering has objected to the Secretary of State acting as the discharging authority for key requirements in the manner presented. London Borough of Havering's position is that London Borough of Havering should be consulted during the approval process.</p> <p>London Borough of Havering further noted that key documents such as Traffic Management Plans, site specific Travel Plans, and Environmental Management Plans would be produced by contractors, and objected to the possibility that they may discharge these requirements.</p> <p>In its Relevant Representation and PADS Tracker, the Council repeated this request.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains that the most appropriate discharging authority for the Project is the Secretary of State on the basis outlined in Sections 1.1.1 to 1.1.10 of its response letter dated 30 July 2021.</p> <p>The Applicant is solely responsible for submitting details to the Secretary of State to discharge the Requirements of the DCO. Even where Contractors or agents are appointed, they will be acting on behalf of the Applicant. See the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC); ES Appendix 2.2 Annex A: outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP); ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B: outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP); outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP); and ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), where the specific roles in connection with the discharge of requirements are set out in further detail.</p> <p>London Borough of Havering will be consulted on the discharge of Requirements 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 (as well as any variation to the limitation of deviation under article 6); as set out in paragraph 18</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p> <p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2 Annex A: oSWMP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 Annex A (4)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B: oMHP [Document Reference 6.3</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO, representations from London Borough of Havering will be provided to the Secretary of State and so its views will be properly represented to, and considered by, the Secretary of State.</p> <p>On 28 June 2022 London Borough of Havering Council indicated it was considering its position and in its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, noted that it sought a full draft copy of the DCO wording and supporting documents in order to do this. Draft DCO Schedules 2, 9, 12 and 13 plus parts 1-7 were shared between 3-9 August 2022.</p> <p>At a meeting on 19 August 2022, the Council supported the proposal for its comments to be supplied to the Secretary of State in the discharge submission. This matter is under discussion pending London Borough of Havering's consideration.</p> <p>No requirements in the draft DCO can be discharged by Contractors and the Applicant maintains responsibility to ensure the commitments and obligations are met.</p> <p>Further responses to related matters were provided during a meeting on 21 July 2023 and in writing in the Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1, submitted at Deadline 2.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B (5)] oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)] Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1 [REP2-077]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
<p>Consent process</p> <p>Deemed consent</p>	<p>2.1.2</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>London Borough of Havering has significant concerns about the general principle of 'deemed consent' in its areas of statutory responsibility as applied throughout the draft DCO.</p> <p>At a meeting on 19 August 2022, the Council proposed a minimum of 42 days as standard to respond instead of 28, as used in the recent M25 Junction 28 DCO.</p> <p>In its Relevant Representation and PADS Tracker, the Council repeated this request.</p> <p>The Council noted that the matter remained not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p> <p>After further consideration of this matter and the information provided by the Applicant during examination, at examination deadline 8 the Council stated in its Response to the Examining Authority's</p> <p>Commentary on the draft Development Consent Order that it was content with the 28 day response times proposed within the draft DCO. In an email on 8 December 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the deemed consent provisions to be reasonable and necessary, having regard to the significance of this Project and the far-reaching consequences a failure to reach a decision in an expeditious manner could have on its delivery. The Applicant has proposed a reasonable period of time for the Council to determine such requests for approval, given the Council will have had time during the consultation and examination to better understand the particular impacts and proposals forming part of the DCO (in comparison to any usual approval unrelated to a DCO). The deemed consent provisions only take effect in relation to a failure to reach a decision, rather than a failure to give consent. If the Council consider insufficient time or information had been provided, it could refuse the relevant application. There is nothing in the draft DCO which would prevent the Council from refusing an application in this case. In circumstances where the Council does not consider it has received appropriate information, or it requires more than 28 days, there is no provision in the draft DCO which prevents the refusal of an application. Following such a refusal, the Applicant would determine whether it would utilise the</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1 [REP2-077]</p> <p>Response to the Examining Authority's Commentary on the draft Development Consent Order [REP8-151]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>appeal process (endorsed by the Council) or re-submit an application.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 July 2023, the Applicant further clarified its general position on deemed consent:</p> <p><i>"Deemed consent provisions are, in our submission, plainly reasonable and necessary, having regard to the significance of this Project and the far reaching consequences which a failure to reach a decision in an expeditious manner could have on its delivery. National Highways has proposed a reasonable period of time for the Council to determine such requests for approval (i.e., 28 days)."</i></p> <p>Further context was provided around the Project's national significance, the time to learn about the Project through the DCO process, the fact that deemed consent provisions take effect in relation to a failure to make a decision, not a failure to give consent; and the concept being well precedented.</p> <p>Further responses were provided in writing in the Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1, submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			agreed following progress during the examination period.		
<p>Safety</p> <p>Traffic responsibilities and New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA)</p>	2.1.3	<p>London Borough of Havering has concerns about the disapplication of NRSWA proposed, and expects its agreement regarding Access to Works. London Borough of Havering observed that a number of road safety responsibilities and considerations of route suitability would be place in the hands of contractors and was uncertain as to how a "risk-based approach" to traffic management would be implemented appropriately.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>The disapplication of NRSWA provisions (which are designed primarily to regulate the carrying out of street works by utility companies in respect of their apparatus) is appropriate given the scale of works proposed under the draft DCO, the specific authorisation given for those works by the draft DCO (particularly article 3 and Schedule 1 to the draft DCO), and the provisions in the draft DCO (including the requirements) which would regulate the carrying out of the DCO works. The NRSWA provisions are intended to regulate a general power exercisable by utilities by virtue of their status or a street works licence. By contrast, the DCO would grant specific authority to carry out works, and it is therefore inappropriate for them to be subject to further approval as if they were general powers. The disapplications must also be seen in the context of requirement 10 in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO which sets out the requirement for a traffic management plan, which London Borough of Havering will be consulted upon and which the Secretary of State must approve. The Applicant notes that these disapplications are heavily precedent for highways development</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p> <p>Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1 [REP2-077]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>consent orders. For completeness, please note temporary traffic diversion powers are contained in article 12.</p> <p>The Applicant had provided an oTMPfC (oTMPfC) which outlines a number of measures, controls and processes. A Traffic Management Plan which is substantially in accordance with that outline plan will be consulted upon (including with London Borough of Havering), and then submitted to the Secretary of State. London Borough of Havering’s submissions will be included in the submission to the Secretary of State. In addition, as set out in the management plan, even after a Traffic Management Plan is approved, there are number of measures and processes secured which ensure ongoing engagement with London Borough of Havering (e.g., the Traffic Management Forum). London Borough of Havering will therefore be involved in the consultation of the Traffic Management Plan, as well as the ongoing processes secured following any approval of such a plan. The outline management plan formed part of the Community Impacts Consultation, so comments (including those from London Borough of Havering) were considered when shaping the outline document in the DCO application submission.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>On 28 June 2022, the London Borough of Havering indicated it was considering its position and in its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation noted that it sought a full draft copy of the DCO wording and supporting documents in order to do this. Draft DCO Schedules 2, 9, 12 and 13 plus parts 1-7 were shared between 3-9 August 2022.</p> <p>Further responses were provided during a meeting on 21 July 2023 and in writing in the Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1, submitted at Deadline 2.</p>		
<p>Environment</p> <p>Knowledge of access points</p>	2.1.4	<p>London Borough of Havering queried, at a meeting on 19/8/22, how it was possible for environmental impacts to be assessed as above under matter 2.1.3 "Traffic responsibilities and New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA)" without the access arrangements being confirmed. Compound locations cannot be identified without understanding the viability of access arrangements, e.g. swept paths which the response indicates are for the future. Comments about other developments emerging would be inappropriate given the Project would have safeguarding.</p>	<p>Whilst every effort has been made to identify all accesses and all works required to those accesses, it is possible that unknown or informal accesses exist or the need to improve an access or layout a further access will only come to light at the detailed design stage, once the full construction methodology has been determined. For example, the precise layout of accesses to construction compounds will need to take into account factors such as the swept path of the construction vehicles together with appropriate landscape mitigation which cannot be fixed at this stage. In addition, accesses may change because of developments which are themselves not</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p> <p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p> <p>Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>yet consented or anticipated. In addition, the exercise of the power would be subject to the requirements, in particular Requirement 4 which secures compliance with the measures in the CoCP, and (the updated) Requirement 10 which requires compliance with the oTMPfC. Accesses are indicatively shown in the latter document.</p> <p>The Applicant provided expanded responses to this and related matters during a meeting on 21 July 2023 and in writing in the Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1, submitted at Deadline 2.</p>	at Deadline 1 [REP2-077]	
Consultation Provision of comments to the Secretary of State	2.1.5	In matters where the undertaker is required to consult the local planning authority, London Borough of Havering welcomes the inclusion of clause 16(3)(c) to supply consultation responses and an explanation of the undertaker's response to the Secretary of State, noting this should apply to all Requirements requiring consultation with the Local Planning Authority.	Noted. This clause applies across all Schedule 2 Requirements where the undertaker is required to consult.	Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Agreed
Environment Future conformity with outline	2.1.6 RRE	London Borough of Havering has raised serious concerns about the clauses in the DCO requiring the Project to work "substantially in accordance" with control documents or for work to be performed to "a reasonable standard", in its response to	The requirement to work "substantially in accordance" is necessary for the Project because it has not yet been designed in detail, and because the documents referenced are outline management plans. The existence of outline management	Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
management plans		<p>the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation and subsequent meetings. It believes these wordings offer the Applicant a degree of flexibility that undermines the environmental assessments subject to the examination process or a lack of certainty as to what standard will be achieved.</p> <p>At a meeting on 25/8/22, London Borough of Havering strongly recommended the Applicant revises its wordings of "substantially in accordance" to "in accordance" in light of this being incorporated into the recent M25 Junction 28 DCO.</p> <p>In its Relevant Representation and PADS Tracker, the Council repeated this request and further requested stronger wording to replace "reasonable endeavours" and "best endeavours" in line with the M25 Junction 28 DCO.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>plans provides a suitable framework of control, without impeding the flexibility and necessity for changes in the course of the construction and operation of the Project. The Applicant would emphasise that the level of control provided in the DCO application exceeds highway precedents. The Applicant would further emphasise that the controls ensure that there are no materially new or materially different environmental impacts as compared with the environmental statement. Changes to the preliminary scheme design which give rise to such different/new impacts are prohibited under Requirement 3 and article 6.</p> <p>The Applicant identified that this concern is about the specific "a reasonable standard" wording in Requirement 5(3) regarding landscaping works. "Reasonable standard" should not be read in isolation. The full provision states a reasonable standard which is "in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other recognised codes of good practice". This provides certainty as to any standards or codes which would be utilised for the Project. It would not be acceptable to specify particular standards as these may change over time and potentially have the perverse effect of</p>	<p>Applicant’s response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1 [REP2-077]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>requiring a lower standard. The Applicant notes that leaving aside this Project-specific justification, this drafting has been endorsed in every single the Applicant DCO, and has given rise to no concerns during implementation across its portfolio.</p> <p>On 28 June 2022 London Borough of Havering indicated it was considering its position and in its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation noted that it sought a full draft copy of the DCO wording and supporting documents in order to do this. Draft DCO Schedules 2, 9, 12 and 13 plus parts 1-7 were shared between 3-9 August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant provided additional justification of the terminology at a meeting on 21 July 2023:</p> <p><i>‘The Applicant considers the word “substantially in accordance with” to be sufficiently clear, and its usage in other DCOs (including on projects of significant scale and size, see for example Schedule 2 to the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Development Consent Order 2022) supports this conclusion. In terms of specific justification for the Project, the use of the phrase is necessary and appropriate because the relevant outline management plans for the Project will be in outline form and will require development following the</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>DCO (if granted). We wish to draw the Examining Authority's specific attention to the A47 Wansford to Sutton decision letter. That project was promoted by the Applicant. The Secretary of State reinstated the phrase as "the Secretary of State considers its omission is an inappropriate fettering of his discretion". There are no circumstances which distinguish that project from the Project in this context. We would respectfully submit therefore that the Secretary of State's discretion is not fettered. While one DCO has removed this drafting, it is considered that this represents the Secretary of State's current (and more well-established) view.'</i></p> <p>Further responses were provided during the meeting on 21 July 2023 and in writing in the Applicant's response to IP comments made on the draft DCO at Deadline 1, submitted at Deadline 2.</p>		
<p>Consultation</p> <p>Clarification of legacy and mitigation</p>	<p>2.1.7</p>	<p>London Borough of Havering considers that there is a lack of evidence in the consultation material up to and including the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation to determine the difference between legacy schemes that will be used to support the scheme and mitigation that is required to make the Project acceptable environmentally. Until this difference is clarified, and mitigation is clearly cited,</p>	<p>The Applicant held a workshop with local authorities including London Borough of Havering on 3 November 2021 to explain the difference between "mitigations, compensation or benefits", its approach to securing these within the DCO where appropriate, and which lay outside the DCO (e.g. benefits financed through the Applicant designated funds). Securing mechanisms may include S106</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)] Section 106 Agreements – Heads of Terms [REP4-144]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Havering is not able to support the scheme.</p> <p>After concluding this matter, the Council noted at a further meeting on 19/8/22 that there is a lack of confidence in how the Applicant will use these tools in future and a belief some legacy items should be in the ES as mitigations.</p>	<p>agreements. The Applicant aims to submit signed S106 Heads of Terms pre-examination, and final agreements by the end of examination. The workshop notes were issued on 29 November 2021.</p> <p>It was agreed at a meeting between the Applicant and London Borough of Havering on 13 December 2021 that sufficient clarity had now been provided on this matter.</p>		
<p>Consent process</p> <p>Need for further DCOs for utility works</p>	2.1.8	<p>In its response to Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that the consultation documents state that it is still unknown as to whether the utility works, power line changes etc, will require their own DCO. It requests that the Applicant states what impact that process will have on the proposed construction timescales.</p>	<p>The Local Refinement Consultation stated on page 27 that '<i>we will continue to keep the legal assessment of whether the proposed works are Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) under review</i>'. This is to ensure due diligence in the application. The Borough's interface with the Project's energy NSIPs is limited to the completion of restringing and earthing operations at two existing pylons in the Borough (at pylons ZB038 and ZB039 for Work No. OH7).</p> <p>The powers to undertake the utility works required for the Project will be included within the DCO application and they will not require their own DCO. Pursuant to the relevant sections of the Planning Act 2008, some of the utilities diversions also constitute an NSIP in their own right. This is applicable for the following:</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 1.3: Assessment of proposed gas pipeline works for the purposes of section 20 of the Planning Act 2008 [APP-334]</p> <p>Explanatory Memorandum [Document Reference 3.2 (7)]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion of National Grid Electricity Transmission's (NGET) overhead line (ZB018-027) (Work No. OH7). • Three gas pipeline diversions which constitute NSIPs pursuant to sections 14(1)(f) and 20 of the 2008 Act. The diversion of the National Grid Feeder 5 (Phase 1 and 2) (Work Nos. G2 and G4), and National Grid Feeder 18 high pressure gas pipelines (Work No. G3). <p>While these diversions are NSIPs, the draft DCO contains sufficient powers to authorise them.</p> <p>Further details are provided in ES Appendix 1.3: Assessment of proposed gas pipeline works for the purposes of section 20 of the Planning Act 2008, and Explanatory Memorandum Annex 2: Assessment of proposed electricity line works for purposes of section 16 of the Planning Act 2008.</p>		
<p>Consent Process</p> <p>Section 106 request for officer support funding</p>	<p>2.1.81</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of officer support contributions for construction and post-opening phases of the scheme.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its request in its Local Impact Report (LIR) and Written Representation (WR).</p>	<p>The Applicant is considering a variety of options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023.</p> <p>Proposed roles and a funding breakdown were shared with the Council for comment at a meeting on 25 August 2023.</p>	<p>Section 106 Agreements – Heads of Terms [REP4-144]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council noted that there were ongoing negotiations regarding this matter and its concerns about the number, skill level and value of certain officer roles proposed by the Applicant. Constructive discussions continued regarding potential solutions and on 5 December 2023 the Council reached agreement on the treatment of this request as part of a final draft section 106 agreement to be signed by both parties. In an email on 8 December 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.	The Applicant welcomed the constructive negotiations regarding the section 106 agreement. The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.		
Need for the Project					
Need for the Project	2.1.9 RRE	London Borough of Havering supports the Lower Thames Crossing scheme in principle. The Council recognises that the scheme will provide additional capacity to an important part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the added resilience a tunnel crossing will bring.	Noted.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Planning Statement/policy					
Infrastructure strategy	2.1.10 RRE	Compliance with NN NPS Havering has reviewed the proposed Project in the context of determining its compliance with the NN NPS December 2014. Havering is of the view that the	In its response to the Council's Written Representation, the Applicant provided a statement building upon the information supplied in the previous version of this SoCG:	Planning Statement [Document Reference 7.2 (2)]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Planning statement and the NPS		<p>proposed scheme is not compliant with the NN NPS on a number of fronts.</p> <p>Areas where the proposed scheme is considered non-compliant are listed below: Paragraphs 1.1.8, 2.9, 3.5, 3.10, 3.16, 3.17, 3.19, 4.4, 4.16, 4.19, 4.62, 4.80, 5.2, 5.7, 5.89, 5.167, 5.184, and 5.198.</p> <p>The London Borough of Havering will provide more details relating to this non-compliance in its Local Impact Report should further negotiations on this matter with the Applicant prove unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The Council's Relevant Representation repeated these concerns and noted that the Applicant cites the overarching need for the scheme outweighing policy compliance. The Council does not consider that this is an appropriate approach where severe permanent effects are sustained, for example nitrogen deposition.</p> <p>This matter was amended on 28 June 2023 to reflect the Council's change of position from overall objection to qualified support in principle for the Project. The Council reiterated its concerns in its LIR and WR.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p><i>'The Applicant submitted a Planning Statement [APP-495] in the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, building upon the draft structures shared on 16 March 2022 and 12 August 2022. This contains an assessment of the Project against the draft National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) (Chapter 6 of the Planning Statement [APP-495], supported by Appendix A [APP-496]), and in the light of emerging and adopted local planning policy (Chapter 7 [APP-495], supported by Appendix C [APP-498]). It is important to note that a DCO application must demonstrate accordance with national policy albeit that relevant local policy is capable of being an 'important and relevant' matter under the provisions of section 104(2)(d) of the 2008 Planning Act. A meeting was held with London Borough of Havering 10 February 2022 to explain this position, with written responses issued 25 May 2022.</i></p> <p><i>It is the Applicant's position that the Project complies with the NPSNN and that the DCO application demonstrates accordance.'</i></p>	<p>Comments on WRs Appendix C – Relevant Local Authorities & Transport Bodies [REP2-048]</p> <p>Planning Statement - Appendix A - NPSNN Accordance Table [Document Reference 7.2 Appendix A (2)]</p> <p>Planning Statement - Appendix C - Local Authority Policy Review [Document Reference 7.2 Appendix C (2)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
<p>Infrastructure strategy</p> <p>Lack of evidence in Community Impacts Consultation 2021</p>	<p>2.1.11</p>	<p>The NN NPS paragraph 5.2 states '<i>Sufficient relevant information is crucial to good decision-taking, particularly where formal assessments are required (such as Environmental Impact Assessment, Habitats Regulations Assessment and Flood Risk Assessment).</i>' Whilst the Applicant has discussed what information is required within Havering, for example traffic modelling data, this evidence has not been provided as part of this consultation [Community Impacts Consultation 2021] leaving Havering in a position whereby it is unable to form a view of the accuracy of the data reported for air quality, noise, traffic disruption and traffic impacts. This gives rise to uncertainty for the London Borough of Havering.</p> <p>At a meeting on 19/8/22, the Council noted that at Community Impacts Consultation, older 2029 opening year traffic modelling was used for the maps and the 2030 opening year data was not shared publicly. No updated ES chapters were included. The Local Refinement Consultation did not include the North Ockendon compound location changes. These all mean these forms of evidence are unavailable to various parties until DCO submission.</p> <p>On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>	<p>The Project's traffic and environmental impacts, and mitigation measures, were duly reported in the consultation. These were based on sound data. The full extents of the datasets and methodologies will be included in the DCO submission.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
<p>Waste management</p> <p>Waste handling arrangements</p>	<p>2.1.12</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>The London Borough of Havering noted in its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation that the NPS on National Networks requires that the Applicant sets out the proposed arrangements for managing any waste produced. The Applicant should set out the arrangements that are proposed for managing any waste produced. The arrangements described should include information on the waste recovery and disposal system for all waste generated by the development (para 5.42). It also requires the Applicant demonstrates that the waste generated can be dealt with appropriately by the waste infrastructure which is, or is likely to be, available. Such waste arisings should not have an adverse effect on the capacity of existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arisings in the area (bullet 2 para 5.43). Given that locations for off-site management are not identified (this is deferred to the to be appointed Contractor in the to be produced Construction Site Waste Management Plan), the documentation as it stands cannot be said to provide the assurances the Secretary of State is to seek.</p> <p>A meeting was held with the Applicant on 23/2/23 and the report supplied in advance</p>	<p>The DCO submission will provide sufficient evidence of these arrangements for consent, with details of offsite waste management matters to be submitted for approval at the discharge of requirements stage in the future, to cater for the latest circumstances and the procured contractor's proposals. The Project's approach is set out in the oMHP and oSWMP and follows the principles of the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment provides a framework for the Contractors to identify waste receiver site as well as alternative potential receiver sites not previously assessed or sites previously excluded, subject to such sites meeting the criteria established in this document. The methodology applied provides a standardised approach for identifying third-party potential receiver sites available to the Project. The Applicant is obliged to follow this methodology under REAC Commitment MW012. The Excavated Materials Assessment provides a list of potential sites that have been through the methodology and have met the criteria.</p> <p>It would be up to the appointed Contractor to source materials and manage waste during the construction of the proposed</p>	<p>ES Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment [APP-435] ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 11 (2)] ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)] ES Appendix 2.2 Annex A: oSWMP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 Annex A (4)] ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B: oMHP [Document Reference 6.3]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>welcomed the Applicant's response to date. The Council has confirmed the matter is resolved.</p>	<p>scheme, and typically they would look to use local (sub-regional) material sources and waste infrastructure wherever feasible to minimise the environmental impact and cost of transport, and support the economic well-being of local communities.</p> <p>Details of offsite waste management matters are to be submitted for approval at the discharge of requirements stage in the future, to cater for the latest circumstances and the procured contractor's proposals and avoid constraining the Project to specific material suppliers and waste management facilities at this stage. The arrangements will be reported through the processes set out in the control documents. London Borough of Havering will be consulted on the Environmental Management Plan 2, including waste handling, when this is submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS) before final handling plan approvals.</p> <p>The ability to use materials suppliers and waste management infrastructure from a wide range of locations would allow existing material resources and waste management capacity to be used effectively and efficiently, without resulting in local overcapacity to the detriment of the local economy.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B (5)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste provides an assessment of likely significant effects of the Project's wastes on waste management facilities within the defined study area of Kent, Essex and East London Waste Authority. The assessment on landfill capacity within the study area has been based on a 'worst case' scenario using the Waste Framework Directive target of 70% recycling/recovery, whilst conservative assumptions on the generation of contaminated and/or hazardous waste, destined to leave site have been built into the waste and traffic assessments.</p> <p>Meetings were held with London Borough of Havering on 15 February 2022 and 23 February 2023 to explain the Project's position.</p>		
<p>Waste management</p> <p>Assumed waste management capacity</p>	<p>2.1.13</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>The London Borough of Havering noted in its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation that the Secretary of State should consider the extent to which the Applicant has proposed an effective process that will be followed to ensure effective management of hazardous and non-hazardous waste arising from the construction and operation of the proposed development. The Secretary of State should be satisfied that the process sets out:</p>	<p>ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste provides an assessment of likely significant effects of the Project's wastes on waste management facilities within the defined study area of Kent, Essex and East London Waste Authority. A review of the baseline capacity of waste management facilities within the study area is presented in the ES chapter.</p> <p>The ES does not define the sites that Project wastes will be sent to, however, it does provide a list of third-party sites that</p>	<p>ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 11 (2)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment [APP-435]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> any such waste will be properly managed, both on-site and off-site; the waste from the proposed facility can be dealt with appropriately by the waste infrastructure which is, or is likely to be, available. Such waste arisings should not have an adverse effect on the capacity of existing waste management facilities to deal with other waste arisings in the area; <p>Concern was expressed that assumptions appeared to have been made that as the Project is within SE England with a high density of registered carriers and licensed waste handling facilities, that capacity for waste requiring off-site management is adequate. No analysis appears to have been undertaken.</p> <p>It was noted that the documentation shared at consultation stated ‘<i>Excavated materials are anticipated to be the largest sources of waste from the Project. A target has been set to ensure that these would be diverted from landfill disposal. In order to validate this proposal, an Excavated Materials Assessment will be undertaken, which will verify that sufficient capacity is available in the study area to accept excavated materials for recovery activities.</i>’ This indicates that estimates require verification, that assessments of waste management</p>	<p>could be potentially used by the contractor. At this point in time commitments to use specific locations have not been defined as the Project does not want to restrict future options for the Contractor.</p> <p>It would be up to the appointed Contractor to source materials and manage waste during the construction of the proposed scheme, and typically they would look to use local (sub-regional) material sources and waste infrastructure wherever feasible to minimise the environmental impact and cost of transport and support the economic well-being of local communities. Details of offsite waste management matters are to be submitted for approval at the discharge of requirements stage in the future, to cater for the latest circumstances and the procured contractor’s proposals and avoid constraining the Project to specific material suppliers and waste management facilities at this stage. The arrangements will be reported through the processes set out in the control documents. London Borough of Havering will be consulted on the Environmental Management Plan 2, including waste handling, when this is submitted to the SoS before final handling plan approvals.</p> <p>The ability to use materials suppliers and waste management infrastructure from a</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>capacity have not yet been undertaken, and so an assumption that this will be available.</p> <p>A meeting was held with the Applicant on 23/2/23 and the Council has confirmed the matter is resolved.</p>	<p>wide range of locations would allow existing material resources and waste management capacity to be used effectively and efficiently, without resulting in local overcapacity to the detriment of the local economy.</p> <p>ES Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment provides a framework and screening criteria for identifying potential receiver sites available to the Project to accept surplus excavated materials. The methodology applied provides a standardised approach for identifying third-party potential receiver sites available to the Project and will form the basis for the final selection completed by the appointed contractors. The Applicant is obliged to follow this methodology under REAC Commitment MW012. The Excavated Materials Assessment presents suitable potential receiver site identified at the DCO stage. These potential sites have been assessed against the methodology and screening criteria and help demonstrate sufficient capacity to manage the surplus Project excavated wastes.</p> <p>Meetings were held with London Borough of Havering on 15 February 2022 and 23 February 2023 to explain the Applicant's position.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Open space Loss of open space	2.1.14 RRE	<p>London Borough of Havering requested that the Project reconsider its plans to replace open space affected by utility and widening works at Folkes Lane woodland and stretching south along the western edge of the M25 with land at the future Hole Farm woodland site in Brentwood Borough. London Borough of Havering noted that that Policy 18 of Havering's Local Plan states that where development results in a loss of Open Space, <i>'Replacement provision of equivalent or better quantity and quality will be made in a suitable location'</i>. London Borough of Havering assert that this land should be inside the borough boundary to maintain the allocation within the local plan.</p> <p>London Borough of Havering accepts that the replacement land proposals (where applicable) meet the s131 tests under the Planning Act.</p>	<p>The Applicant emailed London Borough of Havering 3 December 2021 to advise it reviewed and assessed potential suitable sites for replacement public open space taking into consideration the Planning Act tests. In 2021 the Applicant purchased Hole Farm directly east of the M25. Given its new ownership status and accessibility to the impacted area of public open space (via the footbridge), the Applicant is proposing approximately 29,179m² of replacement open space at Hole Farm, which would be suitably preserved for public access. The proposal will link into the emerging proposals for the wider Hole Farm site (e.g. plans for a community forest). The existing footbridge between Folkes Lane and Beredens Lane will connect the two spaces. There is a requirement to utilise land in the Applicant's ownership in preference to the use of compulsory acquisition powers, therefore following the purchase of Hole Farm this site is considered to meet the legal tests set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the policy requirements in the NPSNN.</p> <p>The mechanics of the selection process and clarification that the proposed location, although outside the borough, would be no less advantageous to residents (with the added pull factor of Hole Farm's status)</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>was compliant with Planning Act obligations were explained at a meeting on 15 February 2022. It was noted that the majority of land was not permanently lost, albeit some would gain restrictions on planting. The Applicant will compensate for permanent losses and long duration disruptions and exact area figures were provided 6 May 2022. London Borough of Havering advised on 15 June 2022 that if figures can be provided for other open space replacement in the borough, the total net loss/gain may allow a position to be agreed.</p> <p>On 25 July 2022 the Applicant confirmed by email that there is a net gain of 6,643.05m² of open space within London Borough of Havering. This is entirely provided by the replacement associated with Thames Chase. The replacement associated with Folkes Lane lies entirely outside London Borough of Havering at Hole Farm and is in addition to the figure above. The absolute loss being compensated for at Folkes Lane is the strip along the M25 and the majority of land eventually returns to public open space, but with restrictions on use/planting, access rights to the gas main and after a substantial 9+ months access interruption.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>On 23 August 2022 the Applicant confirmed by email that the replacement land will be of good quality due to the Design Principles that will be followed at Thames Chase Community Forest, with the key principle being S14.05: <i>'The design of new areas of woodland planting south of the Thames Chase Community Forest, including the location of memorial tree planting and replacement of trees planted by the community, shall be developed in collaboration with Thames Chase Trust and Forestry England.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant believes that the replacement land proposals (where applicable) meet the s131 tests under the Planning Act.</p>		
<p>Environment</p> <p>Heritage as an environmental factor</p>	<p>2.1.15</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>The draft DCO Requirement 4 on Environmental Management Plans does not include heritage as an environmental factor. Requirement 4 (6) should reflect that where achievable, physical preservation of important remains is the most desirable management technique and should be robustly explored, to remain compliant with the NNNPS.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that 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</p>	<p>Requirement 9 of the draft DCO addresses the management and delivery of archaeological mitigation in line with the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy – Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (AMS-OWSI), which prominently states that the first principle of mitigation is to preserve or protect archaeological remains wherever possible.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR and WR, the Applicant repeated its position and provided further details about mitigation, including noting:</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>considered unacceptable by the Council, particular where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear interventions are requested for agreement with the Council. The Council reiterated its concerns about securing appropriate archaeological management measures in its LIR and WR including as follows:</p> <p><i>"The design will create unavoidable harm to archaeological remains. LB Havering, however, is content that certain aspects of the harm (such as the line of the road) can be implemented without unacceptable harm, on the understanding that appropriate management measures can be successfully secured. Such management measures have not yet been fully detailed or agreed."</i></p> <p><i>"Mitigation is proposed to be subject to forthcoming documents, including an AWSI, currently in draft. The fact that this document is yet to be drafted and will not be subject to the scrutiny during the Examination is unsatisfactory to LB Havering."</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 14 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p><i>"The Applicant strongly disagrees with the comments regarding the status and scrutiny of the dAMS-OWSI. ES Appendix 6.9: Draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-367] was submitted with the application. Its status and purpose and scope are clearly defined in Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 (pages 3 to 5) of the document."</i></p> <p>The Applicant also referred to the method by which the draft AMS-OWSI is secured as noted in item 2.1.45 (CoCP and archaeology), below.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	
Environment	2.1.16	<p>No mention of Biodiversity net gain in the document. It is important to ensure that Biodiversity enhancements deliver</p>	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will become a mandatory requirement for all major infrastructure projects in November 2025,</p>	<p>ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Biodiversity net gain	RRE	<p>measurable net gain in line with The National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) Paragraph 5.33.</p> <p>The Council expanded upon this matter in its LIR, noting:</p> <p><i>"In relation to paragraph 5.23 of the NPSNN, which states, 'The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests', LB Havering welcomes the Biodiversity Metric calculations which have assessed the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) baseline conditions and the post development BNG forecast to be generated by the project. Havering accepts that the current assessment is based on the preliminary project design (as of August 2022) and uses the Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool to determine whether the project could result in a net gain in biodiversity units. Havering notes the Metric results for the project overall are predicted to be 7% for habitat units but -11% for hedgerows and -7% for rivers and streams. It is, however, important to consider how the deficiencies to ensure no net 44 loss of biodiversity will be overcome for the scheme which is necessary before any claim for BNG can be made for this NSIP."</i></p>	<p>following the Environment Act being passed into law in November 2021. The DCO Application Documents provide details of the BNG associated with the Project. This information is presented in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement with the detail of the BNG metric calculations provided in ES Appendix 8.21: Biodiversity Metric Calculations.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant noted:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant is not claiming that the Project is achieving biodiversity net gain. In its design, the Project has focused on maximising biodiversity value through being ambitious in terms of the habitats proposed for essential mitigation requirements, shown in ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan [APP-159 to APP-168], and their long-term management described in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP1-173], with a focus on the Lawton principles of more, bigger, better and joined up. It is recognised that the ambition demonstrated in the design does not necessarily maximise the value calculated by the Biodiversity Metric, but it is the view of the Applicant that the Project delivers a design of high biodiversity value. It is</i></p>	<p>[Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 8.21: Biodiversity Metric Calculations [APP-417]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.	<i>expected that the forecast Metric performance would improve during detailed design. Design refinements would seek to further reduce habitat loss during construction, minimise lags between habitat loss and creation and to maximise the condition and distinctiveness of habitats created, and the Project would seek to maximise biodiversity performance over the full Project lifecycle."</i>		
Open Space and common land Rights retained over open space	2.1.86 DL1	London Borough of Havering agrees that the exemptions identified have been applied in accordance with s132(3) of the Planning Act 2008. The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.	Where the Applicant intends to retain rights over open space at Thames Chase Community Forest and Folkes Lane Woodland without providing replacement land, this is in accordance with the exemptions provided under s132(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (i.e. this does not lead to the land being any less advantageous). The rationale for the exemptions was outlined to the Council at a meeting on 15 June 2023 and followed by a detailed explanation email on 28 June 2023.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Route selection, modal alternatives and assessment of reasonable alternatives					
Route selection Route alignment	2.1.17	London Borough of Havering agrees with the proposed route alignment. The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.	The Applicant awaits London Borough of Havering's position on this matter.	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Consultation and engagement					
Adequacy of Consultation test	2.1.18	London Borough of Havering considers that, on the whole, the consultation process that the Applicant has undertaken following its withdrawal of its application in October 2020, has met with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. However, there are a number of issues related to the adequacy of consultation that will be drawn to the attention of the Planning Inspectorate in the Adequacy of Consultation Report.	The Applicant notes London Borough of Havering's position on this matter as provided in their summary to the Planning Inspectorate.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Need for consultation/ engagement Engagement with gypsies, travellers and showpeople	2.1.19	London Borough of Havering informed the Applicant that 5 Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's sites identified in the Local Plan were in close proximity to the Order Limits. The sites were: Ashlea View, Laburnum Stables, Railway Sidings, Tyas Stud Farm and Fair Oaks showmen's quarters. London Borough of Havering raised concerns that without adequate information and support, residents may vacate sites when construction starts requiring the Council to identify alternative sites. London Borough of Havering noted that there are no public Gypsy and Traveller sites, (Council owned or registered provider) within the borough and there is no capacity/flexibility on privately owned sites.	The Applicant committed to providing ongoing updates on traveller engagement. Railway Sidings, Tyas Stud Farm and Fair Oaks were included in voluntary negotiation letters in November 2021. On 13 December 2021 the Communities and the Applicant explained the engagement approach, committing to in-person contact for all the sites flagged. In-person introductions were reported on 31 January 2022 and 1 February 2022 with notable positive reception at the three sites named above as directly affected. Contact details were exchanged with the communities team and the residents confirmed their understanding of the plans. The Railway Sidings are already familiar with pre-enabling works teams and	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>London Borough of Havering will not be making any additions or alterations to the sites that have been identified as the sites have been allocated in the emerging Local Plan to meet identified need. Assurances were sought that a suitable level and type of engagement was in place with these residents, accounting for potential literacy issues, to ensure they understood and could comment on the proposals.</p> <p>On 25/7/22, London Borough of Havering noted its contentment that wishes had been respected and will share known contacts for the harder to contact sites.</p> <p>On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>	<p>Fairoaks gave a warm reception, flagging their sole significant concern as maintenance of access during works.</p> <p>Targeted visits to Tyas Stud Farm during the Local Refinement Consultation have been positive and residents were pleased to learn of the reduced disruption and removal of proposed work from inside their site due to the revised utility work.</p> <p>Engagement continues as initiated by residents or periodically as the Project develops according to impact. A further update was presented to London Borough of Havering on 25 July 2022, reporting difficulties with access at Willow Tree Lodge and Ashlea View, with contact cards left. The Applicant will revisit these sites.</p> <p>The policy adopted by the Applicant is to engage where a change or activity will affect the residents. This has been consistently requested by residents.</p>		
<p>Adequacy of Consultation</p> <p>M25 compound changes at North Ockendon</p>	2.1.20	<p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted the relocation of a works compound from North Ockendon Pit to an expanded compound close to residents in Church Lane, North Ockendon. This was due to the Applicant's decision to reduce its impact on a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). It stated that whilst reducing the impact on North</p>	<p>At a meeting on 25 August 2022, it was explained that the change was documented in the Landowner Engagement and Minor Refinements document issued online at the same time as the Local Refinement Consultation. Due the minor nature and extent of the changes, the Applicant wrote to those with a legal interest in the land on which the M25 construction compound would be</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Ockendon Pit is welcome, the relocation of the construction compound should have been included within the Local Refinement Consultation itself, so that residents could better understand what the impact would be for them and have the opportunity to respond.</p> <p>The Council expects further information to be provided detailing the impact the construction compound relocation will have on residents and businesses located in Church Lane, particularly with regard to noise, lighting and vibration.</p> <p>London Borough of Havering emailed the Applicant on 16/8/22 to follow up points raised at a meeting between the Applicant and the Council's Leader and cabinet about this site. A formal request was made for an officer briefing and for details of the change to be directly communicated to the affected residents together with an opportunity to formally respond despite the main consultation closing. It was noted that choosing not to do so would be unacceptable and would be a matter the Council would consider raising with the Planning Inspectorate when invited to comment on the Adequacy of Consultation (AoC). The Council believed that offering residents the opportunity to comment would remedy the oversight in the Local</p>	<p>located to let them know about the proposed change to its layout and to seek any feedback from them. The document explained the change.</p> <p>At the meeting, it was confirmed that due to the nature of the activities planned and the robust mitigation measures in the CoCP, the Applicant did not believe the change would materially alter the impacts on residents compared to those originally publicised in the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation.</p> <p>At the meeting it was agreed that to address the Borough's concerns, residents on Church Lane would be written to with this information and an opportunity to formally comment between 1 September 2022 and 2 October 2022 (this includes allowances for Royal Mail industrial action). The letter will also offer an option to book call-backs with specialists to discuss the change.</p> <p>The engagement exercise was completed and this matter is under discussion pending London Borough of Havering's consideration.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		Refinement Consultation process and confirmed on 23/6/23 that the matter was resolved.			
Land and compulsory acquisition					
Impacts Business impacts on Upminster cemetery	2.1.21 RRE	<p>London Borough of Havering is concerned that a closure of up to 19 months on Ockendon Road is going to lead to severe disruption for traffic in the local area and this will have wider implications for other community facilities.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised about Upminster Cemetery. The Outline Traffic Management Plan for construction suggests that the section of Ockendon Road that goes over the railway would be closed for up to 19 months.</p> <p>During the 2021/22 Financial Year, Upminster Cemetery handled 2878 Cremations and 287 Burials. There continues to be concern about the impact construction over such an extended period of time will have on the Cemetery's ability to serve a wide catchment area. London Borough of Havering believes that these impacts will lead to reputational damage with stakeholders choosing to use Cemeteries and Crematorium in the wider region instead, impacting on the local economy.</p>	<p>At a meeting on 20 April 2022, it was explained that the Applicant appreciates the impacts the closure would cause and is actively seeking to reduce the closure duration by using methods such as rephasing a water diversion and opening the underpass earlier. Any change will be accounted for in the oTMPfC road closure table in the DCO submission, although the proximity of the railway means a significant closure is considered unavoidable at this stage.</p> <p>Effects on businesses will be considered in line with a standard methodology – taking into account business type and localised effects (such as the closure of Ockendon Road) – within the Environmental Statement. On 17 August 2022, the Applicant received a letter detailing the Council's evidence of the impacts. On 3 February 2023, it responded with its conclusion that no compensation would be payable. Temporary or permanent changes to traffic flows are a commercial risk that all businesses are likely to face at some point. Compensation is only payable where there</p>	<p>Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p> <p>ES Chapter 13: Population and Human Health [APP-151]</p> <p>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR) [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>The Council has already begun discussions with local Funeral Services to better understand how they feel construction works are going to impact on their own business. The clear view it is getting from discussion with local Funeral Services is that diversions due to construction could add substantial mileage costs to local businesses. There is also a strong view that continual road closures, diversions and extended journey times will put a strain on local businesses such as Funeral Services.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the positive approach the Applicant has taken for trying to resolve this matter and it was noted that the Applicant would need to consider further information provided on the expected impacts before any further discussions can take place.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that 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 the Council, particular where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear intervention are requested for agreement with the Council.</p>	<p>has been an interference with a private right of access to an individual site. Even then, compensation for business losses is not payable. However, if a claimant can prove a reduction in the value of the land in such a case, compensation could be claimed for this loss of value.</p> <p>Through regular meetings and emails up to May 2023 and a meeting with the Council Leader on 7 February 2023, the Applicant advised that work continues to seek a reduction in the closure duration, aided by the contractor beginning to mobilise. The Applicant is considering a variety of other options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023 and a site visit on 19 May 2023.</p> <p>At the site visit it was confirmed that the closure duration will be capped at 10 months through a commitment in the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR). The commitment was included at Examination Deadline 1 as follows:</p> <p><i>'The temporary full closure of Ockendon Road (as defined below) shall not exceed 10 months. The temporary full closure is the closure which is in place between point 38/D and point 38/C in the Streets Subject to Temporary Restrictions of Use Plans</i></p>	<p>Written summary of oral comments made at Issue Specific Hearings 8, 9 and 10 [REP6-145]</p> <p>Correspondence between LB Havering and the Applicant concerning Upminster Cemetery and South Essex Crematorium [REP6-146]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of a wider range of business support funding, including for Upminster Cemetery during the proposed 19 month closure of Ockendon Road. A site visit on 19/5/23 generated further ideas including timing of the works to avoid peak business periods.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its LIR and WR and further noted: <i>"The Council is extremely concerned that works for the scheme could see a significant loss of revenue as a result of a project being delivered within the Borough by another organisation and through no fault of the Council. The Council therefore considers that it is within its right to seek financial recompense from NH for the injurious effects of any loss of revenue for UC and SEC during the extended construction period."</i></p> <p>The Council presented its concerns at the examination hearings, notably Issue Specific Hearing 8, and has supplied information on the costs that would be incurred if it were to implement extended operating hours to mitigate traffic impacts. It concurs with the Applicant that this matter cannot be agreed due to the</p>	<p><i>[Application Document APP-029], with the reference RNTM58 in the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction [Application Document APP-547].'</i></p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant noted: <i>'In its negotiations to date, the Applicant has emphasised that it will continue to work with the Council to seek to develop an agreed understanding of the issue and resolution of the concern raised. This accords with the principles of the oTMPfC.</i> [...]</p> <p><i>Section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 provides persons with an interest in land, but where no land is acquired, to a right to compensation for injurious affection to the claimant's interest caused by the execution of the works. Any potential claim would be considered by the Applicant on its own merits in due course.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant has continued discussions around the mitigations requested by the Council and has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed at this stage of the project due to the differing positions taken. The Applicant will continue to work with the Council to ensure the resilience of the diversion route and this is addressed within the Construction section of this SOCG.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		position taken by the Applicant regarding funding. The Council is continuing to work with the Applicant to ensure the resilience of the diversion route and this is addressed within the Construction section of this SOCG.			
Design – road, tunnels, utilities					
Green bridges Green bridge at Thames Chase Community Forest (TCCF)	2.1.22	At 2020 Supplementary Consultation and Design Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering expressed disappointment that unlike other bridges proposed over the Project, the walking cycling and horse riding (WCH) bridge linking east and west TCCF is not a 'green bridge'. Given the adverse impact the Project will have on the TCCF, London Borough of Havering strongly recommended the bridge is upgraded to a WCH green bridge so that it can also have the added benefits of acting as a wildlife corridor that connects habitats and therefore contributes to the wider green infrastructure network.	The Applicant's specialists met London Borough of Havering on 18 June 2021 to explain the design choice for the bridge. This was followed by a paper shared on 17 January 2022. The proposal for the new footbridge in this location resulted from conversations with Thames Chase Community Forest and Forestry England. They expressed concerns about the impacts of construction on the existing culvert (under the M25) which had come to be routinely used as a pedestrian link to the east side of the forest centre over the years. The parties raised their aspirations to improve access between the two sides of the site, and a bridge for non-motorised users (walkers, cyclists and horse riders) was requested. A green bridge was ruled out for ecological, design and cost reasons. It should be noted that the existing culvert access is not lost as a result of the Lower Thames Crossing, so provision of any	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>extra route over the M25 exceeds the mandatory project requirements.</p> <p>At 220m long, the length makes any meaningful benefit of soft landscape for habitat improvement difficult to achieve without substantially increasing the width of the bridge structure. The bridge has been designed for WCHs as a shared Non-Motorised User (NMU) route. Any additional soft landscape would require widening the footbridge structure to accommodate for the provision of 'green space' and result in prolonged closures of the M25 during construction due to the increased size. The cost of the structure would also likely double. The Project does not create any new severance of habitat at this location therefore there will be no impact of this type with or without the proposed bridge.</p> <p>London Borough of Havering subsequently accepted this reasoning and the choice of design.</p>		
Construction					
Communication and community engagement	2.1.23 RRE	In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering reported serious concern about the impact of Project construction on schools located along St Mary's Lane where there is scheduled to be traffic	The oTMPfC sets out general access requirements of school staff, parents and children and describes what should be addressed as a minimum in the Traffic Management Plan (e.g. maintaining safe access and egress, advance warning for	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Impact on schools in Havering – engagement		<p>management in place for several years, and a road closure nearby on Ockendon Road for up to 19 months. It was noted this is going to be disruptive for staff, parents and pupils accessing the school facilities. As some of these schools have catchment areas beyond the Havering boundary, this may have a greater impact on certain pupils who still have to travel by car.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant's traffic modelling indicates that a number of junctions in the borough are likely to be operating close to capacity which will cause disruption for journeys to schools close to these junctions. Out of the 26 schools that are identified as affected, 15 are TfL STARS accredited at gold, and 2 at bronze, showing that the Council has a well-established Active Travel programme amongst the schools that will be affected by the scheme.</p> <p>Given the impact the scheme will have on schools in the area, the Council would expect the Applicant to run a full engagement and communication programme with the schools to ensure they are fully aware of the Project, and its implications. Schools are important parts of a local community and need to be kept fully aware of any changes to the Project such as Project timescale etc, so these in turn</p>	<p>sensitive events, Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements not permitted past school entrances during drop off and pick up times). Work is ongoing to identify whether additional measures may be required.</p> <p>Engagement with the Council has taken place specifically around mitigation measures for potentially affected schools. As acknowledged, a School Engagement Plan is in place for the Project, accompanied by a register of engagement activities undertaken with individual schools which records feedback about issues / concerns that individual schools express. The engagement programme with schools aims to raise awareness of the Project and to manage issues, for example environmental issues or those relating to access / travel to school.</p> <p>Additionally, the CoCP states that the Contractor's Communication and Engagement Plan (CEP) will specify a detailed programme of community engagement for specific stakeholder groups, including schools, identifying proposed methods and likely timing of consultation activities during the construction period. Community Liaison Groups are proposed to be open to attendance from the local community,</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>can be communicated to parents and pupils.</p> <p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation London Borough of Havering acknowledged that the Applicant has produced a schools engagement plan setting out how it intends to work with schools impacted by construction works. The Council noted this is very welcome, and it is pleasing to see that the Applicant will be guided by the local authority and the schools themselves when determining the type of engagement activities.</p> <p>The Council remained of the view that the schools that will be part of this engagement exercise need to come from a much wider catchment area. A wider list was discussed at a meeting on 25/7/22, based on those close to modelled traffic increases.</p> <p>The Council approved the Applicant's working group invitation letter on 6/2/23 and provided a list of recommended contacts on 28/2/23.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its position in its LIR and added it <i>"is also concerned about the impact Corbets Tey Special school will experience during construction due to its proximity to the works proposed for Ockendon Road. All pupils travelling to the school do so by private vehicle. The vast</i></p>	<p>which would include school representatives. Local community leaders from the CLGs will be identified and invited to attend the Traffic Management Forum (this could include school representatives). At the meeting on 25 July 2022, it was confirmed that a Schools Working Group (St Marys Lane Working Group) would be created for those most affected. The schools engagement coordinator has liaised directly with Council officers to set this up. The meeting also clarified the Council's expectation that the engagement would be phased according to construction/traffic impacts timeline and designed proportionate to scale of impact, to ensure it was manageable and relevant. This is also subject of liaison with officers in order to develop a plan per school. Invitations were issued to the Schools Working Group in early March 2023 using contacts recommended by the Council. The introductory meeting took place on 6 July 2023 to address initial questions about the Project, setting out the timing and nature of ongoing engagement. Meetings will occur termly before construction starts and the delivery partner team will be introduced at a future session. The Applicant confirmed that Corbets Tey Special School was approached to</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p><i>majority of these pupils live within Havering. There is concern that these journeys will be affected by the wider construction traffic impacts. The potential impacts for Corbets Tey Special school emphasise the importance of the appointed contractor doing all it can to minimise the length of time Ockendon Road is fully closed for."</i></p> <p>The Council further requested that the ward councillor be invited to future St Marys Lane Working Group sessions and an explanation be given of the current plans to target school engagement activity based on construction phase.</p> <p>At a meeting on 3 November 2023, the Council was concerned that the value of engagement that had already taken place between the Council, local schools and the Applicant had been undermined by unsatisfactory progress towards achieving a desired level of security for the future school engagement activities proposed in the months to date.</p> <p>At a meeting on 14 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>participate in the Schools Working Group. The school did not send a representative to the initial meeting but the Applicant heard back from them on 24 August 2023 to confirm the school will send a delegate to the next meeting.</p> <p>The schools identified in the LIR are noted and the Contractors will be integrated into the engagement process to ensure knowledge transfer.</p> <p>In an email on 25 October 2023, the Applicant confirmed that the ward councillor had been invited to future St Marys Lane Working Group sessions. In an email on 31 October 2023, the Applicant supplied information presented to the Employment and Skills Working Group on 15 August 2023 noting the evolution of its approach to school engagement. It advised that the previous tiering system is to be replaced by a red/amber/green (RAG) rating system which will allow for the prioritisation of engagement for local educational facilities to be more dynamic, allowing for organisations to move through categories according to the project timeline and the impacts identified by the Project (both contractor's and Applicant's teams), local authorities and the schools themselves. The RAG rating considers both proximity and intensity of impact. The</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>ratings will be reviewed appropriately as construction progresses.</p> <p>In an email on 8 November 2023, the Applicant emphasised that engagement with all local authorities to date regarding school impacts has been invaluable in preparing for the future successful mobilisation of contractors, providing guidance and intelligence they will use to meet commitments. The Applicant has taken a proactive position by implementing pilot activities before consent (e.g. St Marys Lane Working Group), in order to build relationships with schools and create a credible programme of engagement for contractors to build their plans from.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Impact on schools in Havering – mitigation</p>	<p>2.1.24</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>In addition to the points made above under "Impact on schools in Havering – engagement", in its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering requested specific mitigations for the construction impacts on schools.</p> <p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation London Borough of Havering provided a list of schools most affected on St Mary's Lane and Ockendon</p>	<p>The requests are noted. The Population and Human Health assessment includes impacts on educational facilities. Schools have been identified within a prescribed study area (500m from the Order Limits) which include schools along St Marys Lane. The results of the assessment will feed into the oTMPfC which will identify further related mitigation measures.</p> <p>It is noted that the Council has stated the level of additional mitigation ultimately</p>	<p>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR) [Document Reference 7.21 (7)] oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Road and reinforced its request for mitigation in the form of both physical infrastructure improvements and behaviour change activities for the schools, fully funded by the Applicant, to be agreed with the Council and the schools themselves.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that 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 the Council, particularly where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear interventions are requested for agreement with the Council.</p> <p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of school road safety and sustainable travel education scheme contributions and physical road safety improvements at the schools most impacted by the scheme. The Council noted in its LIR and WR that its key requests were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Financial contribution to TfL STARS and Road Safety Education programme for Schools along roads to be impacted by the scheme during construction"</i> 	<p>requested will depend on the outcome of the school engagement planning detailed in item 2.1.23.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered a variety of options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023. At a meeting to review the Section 106 draft Heads of Terms on 25 August 2023, the Applicant acknowledged that the schools' safety education asks could potentially fall under Section 106 Skills, Education and Employment scope, if identified as a local need or priority under the employment and skills working group. The Applicant also drew attention to the general contractor education obligation in the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR), which this must be considered alongside: <i>'The Contractors shall develop and provide an educational road safety programme for school aged children.'</i> Crossing patrols and physical interventions were to be considered for future facilitation via risk assessment and mechanisms within the oTMPfC.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed at Section 106 agreement meetings in October and November 2023 that it had determined that the Council's requests themed around school road safety and sustainable travel</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p><i>including those along St Mary’s Lane. Measures would include a contribution to Bikeability training, Road Safety Theatre productions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fixed crossing points outside schools impacted by traffic during different construction programme periods including the junction of Front Lane and Isis drive for Engayne Primary</i> • <i>Roaming school crossing patrols to be utilised outside schools impacted by traffic during periods of construction</i> • <i>Should the road closures during construction trigger the statutory distances for free school transport being exceeded, the LB Havering would require NH to provide the necessary funding to allow LB Havering to discharge its statutory duties."</i> <p>The Council considered the Applicant's responses at a meeting on 14 November 2023. It concurs with the Applicant that this matter cannot be agreed due to the position taken by the Applicant.</p>	<p>education activities, interventions and improvements are ultimately not required to provide the minimum essential mitigation for the Project's impacts in respect to school engagement and safety within Havering. These are provided for within existing control documents including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • oTMPfC, notably table 2.3 under "Local Schools" • Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR), entry SACR-002 in table A.1, quoted above. <p>The Applicant has however been able to secure changes to table 2.3 “Stakeholder considerations” in the oTMPfC to commit to undertake risk assessments to identify hazards and risks associated with a potential increase in traffic movements at and near schools linked to the project’s construction, with the requirement to implement necessary safety measures in line with the oTMPfC protocols including oversight by affected local authorities. This is complemented by a change to paragraph para 4.5.9 of “Safety measures” to explicitly include "crossing patrols" as an option. The draft was shared with the Council and the Applicant submitted these changes formally at examination deadline 7.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>A further change has also been agreed to the SACR commitment quoted above to give local authorities input into how the commitment is fulfilled. The draft was shared with the Council and the Applicant submitted the change formally at examination deadline 7.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the difference between what it has offered and the Council's expectations. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		
<p>Closures and diversions</p> <p>Impact and duration of Ockendon Road closure</p>	<p>2.1.25</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation and 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering raised serious concerns that the proposed 19 month closure of Ockendon Road is going to lead to severe disruption for traffic in the local area with wider implications for other community facilities. The Council is also very concerned that some roads may receive displaced traffic because of the closure of Ockendon Road.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its LIR and WR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that while it welcomed the inclusion of joint inspections in the oTMPfC</p>	<p>At a meeting on 20 April 2022, it was explained that the Applicant appreciates the impacts the closure would cause and is actively seeking to reduce the closure duration by using methods such as rephasing a water diversion and opening the underpass earlier. The proximity of the railway means a significant closure is considered unavoidable at this stage.</p> <p>It was also explained that the oTMPfC commits the Project to a Traffic Manager and Traffic Management Forum, with attendees, consultees and contributors listed. The Traffic Management Forum, specifically, is intended to resolve issues through consultation and exploring the local knowledge that the relevant authority possesses and incorporating that</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR) [Document Reference 7.21 (7)] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>in principle, practical details regarding their implementation were yet to be finalised. For this reason, as well as its objection to the Applicant’s proposed protective provisions in principle under matter 2.1.76, this aspect cannot be agreed.</p> <p>The Council welcomed the confirmation that construction traffic would not use the Ockendon Road diversion route, along with the reduced build window for the M25 construction accesses. The ambition to open the accesses earlier was welcomed, but the Council believed there is currently a missed opportunity to achieve this through better integration with the early implementation of traffic management on the M25 itself.</p> <p>Due to the above issues and the level of certainty currently available, the Council advised that this matter cannot be agreed at this time, but welcomed the opportunity to work with the Applicant on this matter in the future. It will submit further responses at examination deadline 8.</p>	<p>knowledge into the Traffic Management Plans (TMPs). These TMPs will be developed post consent and in line with the controls and commitments in the oTMPfC. London Borough of Havering will be a consultee when developing TMPs.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of TMPs, temporary traffic management measure proposals will be consulted on with the relevant authority as set out in the oTMPfC. As such, the exact length, nature and duration of temporary traffic management measures will be discussed and relevant authority comments, issues considered and incorporated where reasonably practicable. The level of detail sought by London Borough of Havering will be developed by the contractor as part of the TMPs, which will include principles and mechanisms that allow interface and dialogue between relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC outlines the requirements of various stakeholders including community facilities and how the subsequent TMPs will address these when developed.</p> <p>Through regular meetings and emails up to May 2023, a meeting with the Council Leader on 7 February 2023 and a site visit on 19 May 2023, the Applicant has advised that work continues to seek a reduction in</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>the closure duration. This has been aided by the contractor beginning to mobilise.</p> <p>At the site visit it was confirmed that the closure duration will be capped at 10 months through a commitment in the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR). The commitment was included at Examination Deadline 1 as follows:</p> <p><i>'The temporary full closure of Ockendon Road (as defined below) shall not exceed 10 months. The temporary full closure is the closure which is in place between point 38/D and point 38/C in the Streets Subject to Temporary Restrictions of Use Plans [Application Document APP-029], with the reference RNTM58 in the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction [Application Document APP-547].'</i></p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant noted:</p> <p><i>'In its negotiations to date, the Applicant has emphasised that it will continue to work with the Council to seek to develop an agreed understanding of the issue and resolution of the concern raised. This accords with the principles of the oTMPfC.'</i></p> <p>A technical meeting was held with construction and WCH specialists to discuss this matter on 9 November 2023. A</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>further meeting was held on 10 November 2023 to discuss construction issues at which further information was shared, followed by additional background notes issued on 21 November 2023.</p> <p>In the meetings the Applicant explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ockendon Road diversion route will not be used as a construction route • Further opportunities to reduce closure duration may emerge in detailed design, e.g. opening the M25 underpass haul route earlier • The M25 construction accesses would be built within 6-12 months of the compounds being activated rather than the previously stated 12-24 months. This change is reflected in the oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7 • It may introduce a commitment in the oTMPfC to add emphasis to the ambition for an earlier build of the M25 construction accesses. A draft has been shared with the Council and may be added to the oTMPfC to be submitted at examination deadline 8 • It would be adding a commitment to the oTMPfC to conduct joint inspections with the local highway authority along construction and major diversion routes 		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>in advance of construction, to ensure implementation of works to those routes so as to ensure their condition is suitable for the anticipated use during construction as discussed in matter 2.1.78. This commitment was included in the oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		
<p>Construction traffic impacts</p> <p>General construction traffic impacts</p>	<p>2.1.26</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering welcomed engagement on traffic management to date but raised concerns about the traffic management measures for the scheme, and any displaced traffic, impacting other roads. For example, Front Lane which is a key route between A127 and St Marys Lane could see an increase in flows during construction.</p> <p>Traffic management in the wider areas needs to be planned carefully to minimise impact on residents and businesses. The Council's New Roads and Street Works team would need to be engaged in the planning of these traffic management measures given their statutory responsibilities for keeping traffic flowing</p>	<p>At a meeting on 20 April 2022, it was explained that the oTMPfC commits the Project to a Traffic Manager and Traffic Management Forum, with attendees, consultees and contributors listed. The Traffic Management Forum, specifically, is intended to resolve issues through consultation and exploring the local knowledge that the relevant authority possesses and incorporating that knowledge into the Traffic Management Plans (TMPs). These TMPs will be developed post consent and in line with the controls and commitments in the oTMPfC. London Borough of Havering will be a consultee when developing TMPs.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of TMPs, temporary traffic management measure</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p> <p>Interrelationship with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and Major Development Schemes [APP-550]</p> <p>Transport Assessment</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>and coordinating works on other parts of the road network. It is also important to note that there is a works embargo in the lead up to Christmas and this should be recognised within the final documentation.</p> <p>The Council considered that the early and swift construction of the haul roads and works accesses from the M25 was a practical step to reducing traffic impacts.</p> <p>The Council also noted the potential for disruption due to overlapping construction work for major projects, e.g. Gallows Corner or Lodge Avenue flyover improvements.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its LIR and WR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that while it welcomed the inclusion of joint inspections in the oTMPfC in principle, practical details regarding their implementation were yet to be finalised. For this reason, as well as its objection to the Applicant’s proposed protective provisions in principle under matter 2.1.76, this aspect cannot be agreed.</p> <p>The Council welcomed the confirmation that construction traffic would not use the Ockendon Road diversion route, the clarifications around various highways impacts, along with the reduced build</p>	<p>proposals will be consulted on with the relevant authority as set out in the oTMPfC. As such, the exact length, nature and duration of temporary traffic management measures will be discussed and relevant authority comments, issues considered and incorporated where reasonably practicable. The level of detail sought by London Borough of Havering will be developed by the contractor as part of the TMPs, which will include principles and mechanisms that allow interface and dialogue between relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC outlines the requirements of various stakeholders including community facilities and how the subsequent TMPs will address these when developed.</p> <p>At the meeting on 20 April 2022 it was explained that there will be 12-24 months of work before major earthworks. This span is reflected as the quoted window for building the M25 accesses. Enabling and utilities works will be carried out during this time. The Applicant appreciates that these accesses take construction movements and deliveries off the local network, but noted the window must be flexible due to the number of third parties influencing the work.</p>	<p>[REP4-148] to [REP4-152]</p> <p>ES Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-154]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>window for the M25 construction accesses. The ambition to open the accesses earlier was welcomed, but the Council believed there is currently a missed opportunity to achieve this through better integration with the early implementation of traffic management on the M25 itself.</p> <p>Due to the above issues and the level of certainty currently available, the Council advised that this matter cannot be agreed at this time, but welcomed the opportunity to work with the Applicant on this matter in the future. It will submit further responses at examination deadline 8.</p>	<p>An 'Interrelationship with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and Major Development Schemes' document was issued with the DCO submission, providing information on interfaces with other projects and how they are to be managed.</p> <p>The traffic assessment for the Project has taken into consideration the impact of construction for other consented/approved schemes. Further assessment of cumulative effects are presented in ES Chapter 16 and the chapter includes consideration of further mitigation measures, in addition to those identified for individual topics.</p> <p>A technical meeting was held with construction and WCH specialists to discuss this matter on 9 November 2023. A further meeting was held on 10 November 2023 to discuss construction issues at which further information was shared, followed by additional background notes issued on 21 November 2023.</p> <p>In the meetings the Applicant explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ockendon Road diversion route will not be used as a construction route • Further opportunities to reduce closure duration may emerge in detailed 		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>design, e.g. opening the M25 underpass haul route earlier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pea Lane was affected by limited utilities work, with the primary access via field off Ockendon Road • Suitable traffic management arrangements would be in place at locations such as the B187 where construction traffic interfaces with the highway, with the Traffic Manager to liaise with the Council • Safe turnback arrangements would be adopted within site boundaries to manage any HGVs that ignore a road closure warning, e.g. proceeding up Ockendon Road to the closure point • The M25 construction accesses would be built within 6-12 months of the compounds being activated rather than the previously stated 12-24 months. This change is reflected in the oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7 • It may introduce a commitment in the oTMPfC to add emphasis to the ambition for an earlier build of the M25 construction accesses. A draft has been shared with the Council and may be added to the oTMPfC to be submitted at examination deadline 8 		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be adding a commitment to the oTMPfC to conduct joint inspections with the local highway authority along construction and major diversion routes in advance of construction, to ensure implementation of works to those routes so as to ensure their condition is suitable for the anticipated use during construction as discussed in matter 2.1.78. This commitment was included in the oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7. <p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		
<p>Construction traffic impacts</p> <p>Traffic Management Plans post-consent</p>	<p>2.1.27</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>In its 2021 comments on the Transport Assessment from the previous DCO submission, the Council objected to the reliance on full Traffic Management Plans (TMP) being developed post-consent.</p>	<p>At a meeting on 20 April 2022, it was explained that the oTMPfC commits the Project to a Traffic Manager and Traffic Management Forum, with attendees, consultees and contributors listed. The Traffic Management Forum, specifically, is intended to resolve issues through consultation and exploring the local knowledge that the relevant authority possesses and incorporating that knowledge into the Traffic Management Plans (TMPs). These TMPs will be developed post consent and in line with the controls and commitments in the oTMPfC.</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>London Borough of Havering will be a consultee when developing TMPs.</p> <p>As part of the preparation of TMPs, temporary traffic management measure proposals will be consulted on with the relevant authority as set out in the oTMPfC. As such, the exact length, nature and duration of temporary traffic management measures will be discussed and relevant authority comments, issues considered and incorporated where reasonably practicable. The level of detail sought by London Borough of Havering will be developed by the contractor as part of the TMPs, which will include principles and mechanisms that allow interface and dialogue between relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Applicant believes this is appropriate for this stage of development.</p>		
<p>Logistics, materials, and operations</p> <p>Use of river for construction transport</p>	2.1.28	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering strongly encouraged the landing of aggregates and other construction materials at proximate wharves.</p> <p>In its report to a Material Assets & Waste meeting with the Applicant on 23/2/23, the Council noted that this issue had been covered adequately but that clarification was needed concerning applying an target to be set for 80% by weight of bulk</p>	<p>The Applicant has now committed to a target for use of port facilities for transportation of bulk aggregates. This is defined in an updated outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP), with a relevant extract shared on 5 April 2022.</p> <p>Subject to exceptions, the Project shall utilise port facilities for at least 80% by weight of bulk aggregates imported to the North Portal Construction Area. This commitment translates into 35% of the total</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B: oMHP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B (5)]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		aggregates to be imported via port facilities, equivalent to that proposed for the North Portal Construction Area. This should be embedded in the REAC. On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.	bulk aggregates across the Project being transported via port facilities. Materials supply lines and procurement will be developed by Contractors to align with their construction programmes, all within the framework of DCO control documents.		
Closures and diversions Access to Folkes Lane Woodland	2.1.29	<p>London Borough of Havering welcomes commitments from the Project to maintain public access to Folkes Lane Woodland during construction of the gas diversion. The Council welcomed the clarifications at the meeting on 16 October 2023 but requested expansion of the SACR commitment to be clearer that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access into and through the woodland to the M25 bridge via the PROW, and other permissive paths through Forestry England land from the south west and south east is unaffected by the work • The reasonable endeavours relate to access from Folkes Lane via the car park entrance and not the other unaffected accesses. <p>At a meeting on 14 November 2023, the Council advised that following the reply to the queries above, this matter could potentially be agreed, provided the record was clear that this matter solely relates to the management of public access to</p>	<p>Through engagement with Cadent, the Applicant obtained a commitment for the Utility Logistics Hub at Folkes Lane Woodland to be moved north. This was intended to permit retention of some parking and transit of pedestrians along the right of way between Folkes Lane and the M25 footbridge during construction.</p> <p>At a meeting on 16 October 2023, it was reported that this has evolved into a commitment (SACR-009) in the SACR to secure Forestry England maintenance parking and reasonable endeavours to provide continuous and safe pedestrian access from Folkes Lane into the woodland during construction. The pedestrian access element accounts for Forestry England's expectation that when the car park is closed, access should be encouraged (and advertised) via unaffected PROWs or from the network of permissive paths accessed elsewhere off Folkes Lane, while ensuring those walking into the car park are catered for when possible. Full details of the work and public</p>	<p>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR) [Document Reference 7.21 (7)] oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Folkes Lane woodland during the utility works covered by commitment SACR-009. It does not constitute resolution of unrelated matters concerning permanent WCH access mitigations requested along Folkes Lane to complement the Applicant's proposed A127 western WCH bridge.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed based on the clarification recorded above.</p>	<p>communication plans would be discussed at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the commitment relates only to the area affected by the utility works, which do not affect access routes other than through the car park, so an expansion is not considered necessary. It considers that the requests relating to other access routes are accommodated by the "Public Parks" and "Walkers, cyclists and horse riders" sections of table 2.3, Stakeholder Considerations, in the oTMPfC.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Construction traffic impacts</p> <p>Construction in the Transport Assessment</p>	<p>2.1.30</p> <p>RRE</p>	<p>In 2021, London Borough of Havering noted a number of changes to the revised draft Transport Assessment shared by the Applicant. It welcomed positive aspects including a move from 5 to 11 phases (giving more detail) across all areas rather than three areas, as construction traffic effects will be seen across the whole area irrespective of where they occur. Inter site and outbound movement of materials assumptions were also noted and HGV modelling at 2.5 PCUs per vehicle was confirmed to be in line with standard assumptions. The Council noted no detail of the HGV numbers assessment is</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the feedback and considered the revised structure of the Transport Assessment to potentially be a Matter Agreed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the request for the breakdown of site-related and other/diverted traffic and is aware of the example of Pea Lane being raised, where it was unclear what traffic was using this road. The Applicant would direct the Council to its response to the Council's LIR, paragraphs 7.2.14 to 7.7.20 where it explained:</p>	<p>Transport Assessment [REP4-148] to [REP4-152]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>provided i.e. how the number of HGVs have been built up for each site location and phase. The 20% buffer however, would appear to be a sensible buffer for a potentially robust analysis.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council noted that following information released during the examination to date, the Applicant has promised a breakdown of construction traffic impact into diverted traffic and site related traffic; this has not been received to date. The way in which the TA has been structured is not in dispute. The content of the TA and the applicant's conclusions contained within it with respect to construction traffic is not agreed.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that it believed data as provided was still not capable of addressing its concerns and that on this basis the matter cannot be agreed.</p>	<p><i>"With regards to flow on Pea Lane being higher than would be expected in construction traffic modelling phases 4–7 when Ockendon Road is closed, this is a result of vehicles choosing to route via Pea Lane instead of the proposed diversion route. The Applicant's transport model is not able to force vehicles to use the signed route, with vehicles taking the shorter route, as may happen in reality.</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p><i>The GIS shapefiles supplied to LBH show the forecast number of construction and non-construction vehicles on the links in the Fully Modelled Area of the transport model (Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM)) which includes LBH and neighbouring areas."</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed. The Applicant will continue to endeavour to address this concern in future through technical discussions.</p>		
<p>Closures and diversions</p> <p>Suitability of diversion routes</p>	<p>2.1.77</p> <p>RRN</p>	<p>In its Relevant Representation, the London Borough of Havering stated that there is a lack of surety in the Control Documents that the diversion routes proposed are appropriate for the type of vehicles that will be using them. This is of particular concern</p>	<p>This matter is under discussion pending further negotiations between the Applicant and the London Borough of Havering in light of the DCO application submission. It should be considered alongside the other mitigations being discussed regarding</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>in relation to the potential 19 month closure of Ockendon Road.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its LIR and WR.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that while it welcomed the inclusion of joint inspections in the oTMPfC in principle, practical details regarding their implementation were yet to be finalised.</p> <p>For this reason, as well as its objection to the Applicant’s proposed protective provisions in principle under matter 2.1.76, this aspect cannot be agreed.</p> <p>The Council welcomed the confirmation that construction traffic would not use the Ockendon Road diversion route along with the reduced build window for the M25 construction accesses. The ambition to open the accesses earlier was welcomed, but the Council believed there is currently a missed opportunity to achieve this through better integration with the early implementation of traffic management on the M25 itself.</p> <p>Due to the above issues and the level of certainty currently available, the Council advised that this matter still cannot be agreed, but welcomed the opportunity to</p>	<p>impacts on community facilities (namely Upminster Cemetery and South Essex Crematorium) under items 2.1.21 and 2.1.25, including a 10-month closure of Ockendon Road.</p> <p>To address the concern regarding the Ockendon Road diversion, further engagement and discussions with the local highway authority would be carried out in determining suitable diversion routes, which would be set out in the TMP.</p> <p>Table 4.5 in the OTMPfC has set a proposed diversion route as a start point for further discussion via the Traffic Management Forum as stated in paragraph 4.7.3: The diversion route 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 (e.g., other works in the nearby area which may be external from the Project works).</p> <p>The oTMPfC provides a framework that would apply to the design, management and communication of construction traffic management, around which the Contractors must develop their future proposals. It sets out how the Traffic Management Plans (TMPs) will be determined and developed by the Contractors through consultation with all</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>work with the Applicant on this matter in the future. It will submit further responses at examination deadline 8.</p>	<p>relevant stakeholders via the Traffic Management Forum. Additionally, the oTMPfC set out the minimum requirements the TMP would address for each stakeholder category i.e. residents, businesses, schools etc, set out in Table 2.3. This approach offers a robust framework for developing the TMP in consultation with relevant stakeholders, as the details associated with the construction methodology develop.</p> <p>The use of diversion routes is often necessary as part of a road closure to facilitate the safe construction of the works. In all cases, proposed diversion routes are a start point for further discussion via the Traffic Management Forum.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the significant progress made in reducing the overall closure duration, steps to reduce this further, clarification that the diversion route will not be used for construction traffic and its commitment to conduct joint inspections with the local highway authority along construction and major diversion routes in advance of construction, to ensure implementation of works to those routes so as to ensure their condition is suitable for the anticipated use during construction as discussed in matters 2.1.25, 2.1.26 and 2.1.78. This</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>commitment was included in the oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7. The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter remains not agreed.</p>		
<p>Road alteration and maintenance</p> <p>Section 106 request for highway maintenance funding during construction</p>	<p>2.1.78 DL1</p>	<p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of contributions towards impacts on the condition of Borough highways during construction.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that while it welcomed the inclusion of joint inspections in the oTMPfC in principle, practical details regarding their implementation were yet to be finalised.</p> <p>For this reason, as well as its objection to the Applicant's proposed protective provisions in principle under matter 2.1.76, below, this matter cannot be agreed.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered a variety of options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023.</p> <p>At a meeting on 10 November 2023, the Applicant explained that it would be adding a commitment to the oTMPfC to conduct joint inspections with the local highway authority along construction and major diversion routes in advance of construction, to ensure implementation of works to those routes so as to ensure their condition is suitable for the anticipated use during construction. This commitment was included in the oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7. The Applicant noted the need for close coordination with the Council to understand its own renewal plans and opportunities to plan this work effectively. The Applicant's position regarding this matter should be considered alongside its position on offering protective provisions for highway authorities considered in matter 2.1.76, below.</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.		
Materials & waste handling HG V movements associated with movement of material	2.1.90 DL1	In its report prior to a Material Assets & Waste meeting with the Applicant on 23/2/23, London Borough of Havering noted concerns remain about oMHP (paragraph 7.4.18) estimates of 19,000 HG V movements associated with transporting 165,000m ³ excavated material from Ockendon Road M25 compound. Mitigation proposed is using Ockendon Road for transport of material from the excavation site (M25 compound) during its closure to traffic. The mitigation proposed appears reasonable, and transport necessary to make best use of excavated material in embankments to the south, however transport specialists are better placed to comment on impacts. At a meeting on 16 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.	At a meeting on 9 November 2023, construction specialists explained that the plan remained to carry out the HG V movements via the closed section of Ockendon Road to avoid impacts on local roads. The number stated is a reasonable worst case. It was emphasised that these movements would not be sent via the public diversion route during this time. In the event that any movements in general did occur via the local highway network it would be monitored and managed in accordance with the oTMPfC. Plate 4.4 of the oTMPfC shows the haul routes. It is notable that the contractor will have a natural incentive to use efficient routes. As the M25 underpass is built nearby, it will become available as a haul route. Earlier opening of this route may reduce the closure duration for Ockendon Road when it is to be used as a haul route. This possibility would be addressed during the detailed design phase. The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Charging					
Local Residents’ Discount Scheme Resident and business discount for Havering	2.1.31 RRE	<p>London Borough of Havering considers the decision not to include the borough in the proposed local resident discount scheme (LRDS) for crossing charges to be unfair and unjustified and further believes this scheme should include local businesses. London Borough of Havering cites the fact it will 'host' part of the Project as will Thurrock and Gravesham. It notes that parts of boroughs included in the scheme are a similar or greater distance from the tunnel than parts of London Borough of Havering. London Borough of Havering considers that inclusion in the LRDS would mitigate scheme impacts on residents and businesses and will support the viability of local businesses and employment.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its PADS Tracker and Relevant Representation. It requested that the Road User Charging Statement be brought in line with the draft DCO, as the draft DCO offers the opportunity for all residents to apply to the Secretary of State for a discount.</p>	<p>It is proposed to offer a Local Residents’ Discount Scheme (LRDS) on the same basis as that provided at Dartford. That is, the discount will be offered to residents living in boroughs that host a tunnel portal, which Havering does not.</p> <p>The option to include business travel within the LRDS, as well as to modify the geographical extent, were among several reviewed by DfT in 2012. Inclusion of business travel was rejected, as recorded in the 2013 Local Residents Discount Scheme and Dart-Tag Review report (DfT, 2013) since it would generate more traffic and reduce income and would be an extra cost to administer. The report also concluded that any extension of the LRDS to other boroughs or parts thereof generates more traffic, and leads to further boundary issues.</p> <p>Paragraph 5 of Schedule 12 of the draft DCO provides for the Secretary of State to enter into a ‘<i>local resident’s agreement</i>’ regarding a reduced charge. However, “local resident” is defined in paragraph 1 (Interpretation) as ‘<i>a person who permanently resides in the borough of Gravesham or Thurrock</i>’, therefore there is</p>	Road User Charging Statement [APP-517] Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			no conflict with the LRDS proposed in the Road User Charging Statement.		
Charging DCO/policy issues Hypothecation	2.1.32	London Borough of Havering asserts that funding for proposed interventions should be hypothecated from the user charging revenue rather than other funds being sought to pay for mitigation. London Borough of Havering seeks further clarification as to the purpose of the charge, the destination of any income generated and whether it can be used to invest in local or national transport projects.	Revenues raised by the charge at Lower Thames Crossing will be accounted for in the Department of Transport's Main Supply Estimate which is voted for annually by Parliament. The charge at both Dartford and Lower Thames Crossing is a congestion charge and not a toll. They are not hypothecated, i.e. revenues from charges are not part of the funding mechanism for the crossing. Hypothecation is not a central feature of the UK tax system and governments have opposed its adoption on the grounds that spending priorities should not be determined by the way in which money is raised. Further information is available in the Road User Charging Statement.	Road User Charging Statement [APP-517]	Matter Not Agreed
Local Residents' Discount Scheme Consistency of charging with other crossings	2.1.33	London Borough of Havering requests a comparable and consistent charging system to the Dartford Crossing including a toll discount for residents, employees and businesses of host boroughs. London Borough of Havering further requests for the Applicant to work closely with TfL/GLA regarding other future chargeable crossings (e.g. Silvertown and Blackwall) and in considering the strategic implications of charging schemes.	Following feedback from the 2018 Statutory Consultation, the Applicant has accepted feedback from the consultation stakeholders, that it is important to have consistency in charging between the crossings at Dartford and Lower Thames Crossing. Hence all charges, hours of operation, exemptions, enforcement are proposed to the same at both crossings. Charging regimes at Blackwall and Silvertown tunnels are a matter for the	Road User Charging Statement [APP-517]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			Mayor of London and the level of charges has not yet been announced. However, the Applicant and TfL are in ongoing discussions about the evolution of their plans and how they may interact for the primary purpose of operational coordination.		
Charging regime Provision for flexibility	2.1.34	London Borough of Havering queried that at statutory consultation the Applicant intended to offer a “flexible” approach on charging. However, this changed at Supplementary Consultation and the proposal was to align charges at Lower Thames Crossing with Dartford.	In the 2018 Statutory Consultation comments were invited on charging flexibility in particular in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • charge amounts • charged and non-charged hours • application of peak charges • vehicle classifications • emissions-based charging • accounts, discounts and exemptions The majority of local authority stakeholders that commented on charging flexibility stated that their preference was for charges at Lower Thames Crossing to equal those at Dartford. The Applicant supported this preference on the grounds of economies of scale, the performance of the scheme and better customer experience.	Road User Charging Statement [APP-517]	Matter Not Agreed
Charging DCO/policy issues	2.1.35	London Borough of Havering questioned whether the assumptions upon which the ES is based could be undermined by the DCO itself granting powers for, but not	The assessment is compatible with the powers sought under the DCO to introduce charging on the first day of the opening of the Project.	Road User Charging Statement [APP-517]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Charging from day one of operation		compelling, the SoS to implement the charging scheme as proposed. The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.	The Secretary of State is the charging authority and will always have the power within the relevant legal framework to amend the charge as he/she sees fit.		
Charging DCO/policy issues Charging justification and the NPS	2.1.36	At a meeting on 19/8/22, London Borough of Havering challenged why charging was in place for demand management and not to pay for the infrastructure, as this contradicts the relevant part of the NPS. The Council reiterated its concerns in its LIR and WR. The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.	Although charging revenue would not directly fund the Project, it would go to the Government and hence distribute the cost of the Lower Thames Crossing between the taxpayer and users. This is aligned with the National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraph 3.25. Further information is available in the Road User Charging Statement. The Road User Charging Statement has been reviewed and approved by the Department for Transport which has confirmed that the proposals are in line with Government policy and the Scheme Objectives.	Road User Charging Statement [APP-517]	Matter Not Agreed
Traffic and economics					
Modelling methodology Comprehensive traffic assessment	2.1.37 RRE	London Borough of Havering requested sufficient modelling data to carry out a comprehensive review of the traffic impacts of the Project. Concerns were raised, based on the DCO1 transport assessment, that the strategic nature of the model impaired its accuracy in predicting local impacts and that the age of its 2016 base year may reduce its validity. It was felt that summaries shared in the Community Impacts Consultation 2021 did not supply a	The scale of the Project requires a strategic model, but many local roads are included and cordons have been provided to London Borough of Havering for detailed analysis. Replies issued on 25 May 2022 to confirm the Applicant considers growth in the Project's transport model, which is capped to DfT growth figures, is robust, especially as it is higher than growth within LoHAM	Transport Assessment [REP4-148] to [REP4-152] Transport Assessment Appendix E: Construction Traffic Assessment	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>full picture of the detailed impacts predicted by revised modelling.</p> <p>The Council stated in its Relevant Representation that it agrees with the strategic approach that has been undertaken but is deeply concerned that granularity at a local level has not been presented. This supported comments made at a meeting with the Applicant on 16/1/23.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its position in its LIR and WR, noting concerns about the need granularity in construction and operational phase modelling. For construction, issues were raised concerning lack of accounting for construction compound accesses and traffic management. For operation, it was noted that <i>"Alternative growth scenarios are assessed, but only as a mathematical construct from the 'central case'"</i>.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council noted the revised oTMPfC wording but explained that the iterative approach to local junction issues proposed through the Traffic Management Forum in paragraph 2.4.21 may not provide conclusive resolutions, so this matter cannot be agreed. The Council will submit a further reply to the oTMPfC at examination deadline 8.</p>	<p>(the London Highway Assignment Model, used by Transport for London).</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that the age of the baseline data would reduce the validity of the model – 2016 is within the guidance of an acceptable model duration (validity period of the model). The Applicant notes that the last 'pre-Covid' year is 2019 which is only three years after the model's Base Year.</p> <p>Joint meeting held with TfL 17 February 2022 to agree additional analyses required to understand the operational modelling released on 23 July 2021. Revised operational modelling was released on 29 April 2022, based on a 2030 opening year. Additional analyses were delivered on 4 August 2022.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant reaffirmed its confidence in the operational model, noting <i>'it has been produced following DfT's TAG as was current at the date the assessment was undertaken. An update to TAG which published NTEM 8.0 and the traffic growth factors needed to model the DfT's Common Analytical Scenarios were published as definitive guidance in November 2022.'</i></p> <p>Regarding construction modelling, the Applicant noted that the <i>'construction</i></p>	<p>Supporting Information [APP-534] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060] oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>modelling was a complex and detailed exercise which is recorded in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment [APP-529] and Transport Assessment Appendix E: Construction Traffic Assessment Supporting Information [APP-534]. More detailed modelling can be undertaken as appropriate nearer to the start of the construction phase as set out in paragraph 2.4.20 of the oTMPfC [REP1-175] as part of discussion. [...] The Applicant considers that the strategic transport model is the appropriate tool to model the impacts of construction traffic as it allows for the modelling of the route followed by vehicles being used to construct the Project and the by staff going to and from the compounds. An area wide model is needed to capture their routes and the impacts on other road users.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant would direct the Council to the revised oTMPfC submitted at examination deadline 7 which contains changes to paragraphs 2.4.20 and 2.4.21. These strengthen the commitment and mechanism to carry out additional localised junction modelling for construction traffic, to be set out in the Traffic Management Plan, together with details of the hierarchy of interventions to be adopted to address any issues identified.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.		
Local plan growth Growth assumptions in traffic modelling	2.1.38 RRE	London Borough of Havering asked the Applicant to consider planned developments in boroughs, taking into account the housing targets and zones in the Havering Local Plan and the London Plan. At a meeting with the Applicant on 16/1/23, the Council noted that the strategic nature of the modelling did pose a challenge when accounting for local growth, but on 14/5/23 it advised that it considered the matter resolved.	The Project's transport model was built following the principles and processes set out in the Department for Transport's (DfT's) Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG). Growth within the transport model is capped in line with DfT traffic forecasts (TEMPro 7.2) and adjusted locally to account for developments close to the Project that are under construction, have a planning application and planning permission (as of 30 September 2021 for the DCO submission). A high-growth scenario is also undertaken and reported within the Transport Forecasting Package (Appendix C of the ComMA), a copy of which has been provided to the authority dated October 2020. Only developments from local plans that meet these criteria can be included.	Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152] Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (ComMA) [APP-518]	Matter Agreed
Wider Network Impacts					
Wider Network Impacts approach	2.1.39 RRE	London Borough of Havering requested mitigation by the Applicant for traffic impacts indicated by modelling on a number of local roads and junctions plus	The Applicant continues to actively engage with London Borough of Havering regarding the traffic impacts of the Project. As part of this programme it has supplied	Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Wider network impacts on local and strategic roads		<p>the A127. London Borough of Havering is concerned that these locations may already be close to capacity before any increase in traffic due to the Project.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that 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 the Council, particular where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear interventions are requested for agreement with the Council.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its PADS Tracker, Relevant Representation, LIR and WR. In its LIR, the Council added that <i>"There are insufficient monitoring points in Havering."</i></p> <p>The Council discussed its position further during the examination hearings and at a meeting on 14 November 2023. It concurs with the Applicant that this matter cannot be agreed due to the position taken by the Applicant.</p>	<p>outputs from modelling and held appropriate technical meetings, supported by further data assistance where necessary. The DCO application contains the results of further traffic assessments, and presents the traffic conditions on the wider road network. The Applicant considered comments when preparing the DCO application documents for submission to ensure confidence can be provided about the nature of future traffic conditions.</p> <p>The Applicant worked with London Borough of Havering and Transport for London to conduct a series of workshops and modelling exercises to interrogate the impacts of the Project on the wider road network in more detail, led by the outputs from the main scheme modelling which has been shared with authorities. The Applicant is currently in joint discussions with relevant authorities in accordance with licence obligations to work with others to align national and local plans and investments, balance national and local needs and support better end-to-end journeys for road users.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 July 2022, the Applicant explained its approach to Wider Network concerns from Local Authorities before and after the crossing opens. It was explained that the Applicant has assessed</p>	<p>Plan [Document Reference 7.12 (2)]</p> <p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p> <p>Wider Network Impacts Position Paper [REP6-092]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>the wider network impacts of the Project and has considered these against the requirements set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (DfT, 2014), and considers that the adverse transport impacts are acceptable under this policy. Further information on policy compliance can be found within the Transport Assessment. As such, the Applicant is not committing to any direct additional funding for interventions on the wider network through the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing to monitor the impacts of the Project on traffic on the local and strategic road networks. If the monitoring identifies issues or opportunities related to the road network as a result of traffic growth or new third-party developments, then local authorities would be able to use this as evidence to support scheme development and case making through existing funding mechanisms and processes.</p> <p>An updated Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan (WNIMMP) was included in the application, providing information about the proposed traffic monitoring. The Applicant also provided a briefing on the changes made to the WNIMMP since a draft version was</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>shared in the July 2021 Community Impacts Consultation.</p> <p>The traffic impact monitoring scheme will be secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO and would require approval by the Secretary of State, after consultation with relevant local highway authorities, which would begin one year before the tunnel area opens.</p> <p>The Applicant is obligated to work with local highway authorities and others to align national and local plans and investments, balance national and local needs and support better end-to-end journeys for road users (paragraph 5.19 of Highways England: Licence). The Applicant will continue to deliver against this obligation in its collaborative work with local authorities.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant addressed the matter of monitoring location provision: <i>‘The monitoring locations set out in the WNIMMP were selected on the following basis:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Locations situated on the SRN that are geographically close to the A122 junctions as informed by the ‘scale of impacts’ analysis in the Transport Assessment [APP-529] (the nearest and</i> 		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>second nearest junctions on the SRN and major road network (MRN) located adjacent to the junctions with the A122, the A2, the A13 and the M25)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Locations requested for monitoring from local highway authorities following a review of the consultation feedback</i> <p><i>The current locations are set out on page 18 of the WNIMMP. A mechanism allowing for review of the proposed monitoring locations is provided through Requirement 14 in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, whereby an operational traffic impact monitoring scheme must be approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highways authorities (which includes London Borough of Havering). Relevant highways authorities will be able to propose locations for inclusion, which will be considered by the Applicant during the development of the operational traffic monitoring plan. The final decision on inclusion will be made by the Secretary of State through the approval process, as set out in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's representations at the hearings and draws the Council's attention to its Wider Network Impacts Position Paper submitted at examination deadline 6 for further</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			clarification of its approach to Wider Network Impacts. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed.		
<p>Non-Project highway improvements</p> <p>Gallows Corner</p>	2.1.40	<p>London Borough of Havering raised concern about the impacts of any traffic increase at this strategic junction either on its capacity or in hastening deterioration and closure of the flyover.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>As noted above under item 2.1.39, the Applicant has assessed the wider network impacts of the Project and has considered these against the requirements set out in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (DfT, 2014), and considers that the adverse transport impacts are acceptable under this policy. Further information on policy compliance can be found within the Transport Assessment. As such, the Applicant is not committing to any direct additional funding for interventions on the wider network through the DCO.</p> <p>TfL have confirmed the flyover will be removed or replaced by Project opening. A sensitivity test has been undertaken to specifically consider the effects with the flyover removed.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant is proposing to monitor the impacts of the Project on traffic on the local and strategic road networks. If the monitoring identifies issues or opportunities related to the road network as a result of traffic growth or new third-party developments, then local authorities would be able to use this as evidence to</p>	<p>Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan [Document Reference 7.12 (2)]</p> <p>Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>support scheme development and case making through existing funding mechanisms and processes.</p> <p>The cordon data and technical note from the sensitivity test were shared with the Council on 22 November 2022. These demonstrated localised impacts of flyover removal at the junction. The Applicant noted the Council's comments at the meeting on 16 January 2023 regarding TfL's full business case application for renewal of the flyover.</p>		
<p>Local Wider Network Impacts concerns</p> <p>Junction operational impacts</p>	2.1.41 RRE	<p>At a meeting on 19/8/22, London Borough of Havering, with Transport for London, requested further modelling to understand impacts of the operation of junctions in Borough after the Project opens, following up on a point raised in the 2018 Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its concerns in its PADS Tracker and Relevant Representation.</p> <p>In its LIR and WR, the Council raised concerns about the local junction modelling methodology used by the Applicant and <i>"remain unsatisfied with the validity of the modelled outcomes."</i></p> <p>The Council discussed its position further during the examination hearings. It concurs with the Applicant that this matter cannot</p>	<p>At a meeting on 25 August 2022, the Traffic & Economics team agreed to carry out work for key junctions where this would be of value, subject to London Borough of Havering providing an updated list after consideration of the information shown by the latest modelling data cordon shared with both authorities. The results can then be considered in workshops if required. The modelling technical note was shared on 15 February 2023 and the models themselves on 28 February 2023.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's WR, the Applicant stated that <i>'the local junction modelling exercise undertaken by the Applicant for the Council was designed to check, given the flows shown in the LTAM, which junctions may merit further consideration under future Project scoping</i></p>	<p>Localised Traffic Modelling [REP6A-004] Applicant's Comments on IP submissions at Deadline 1 to 3 [REP5-088]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>be agreed due to the position taken by the Applicant.</p>	<p><i>and initiation. The use of traffic data directly from the LTAM forecasts for 2030 was set out clearly in the technical note supplied to the Council. As observed data was not available at the time this work was undertaken in 2022 it was not possible to build and validate 2022 base year local junction modelling at these sites.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant submitted Localised Traffic Modelling at Deadline 1. This sets out the Applicant's approach to localised traffic modelling, where this work has been completed and the criteria that the Applicant has used to determine whether localised traffic models should be produced.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's representations at the hearings and draws the Council's attention to Section 2.2 of the Applicant's Comments on IP submissions at Deadline 1 to 3 submitted at examination deadline 5 for its response to the Council's LIR Appendix 2: Local Junction Impact Assessment Modelling Report. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Socio-economics					
<p>SEE Strategy and Supply Chain</p> <p>Borough-specific employment targets</p>	<p>2.1.79</p> <p>RRN</p>	<p>In its Relevant Representation and PADS Tracker, the London Borough of Havering stated that the Project's Skills, Education and Employment (SEE) Strategy needs to be revised to include Havering-specific targets to secure a proportion of the employment and apprenticeship opportunities for Borough residents.</p> <p>The Council reiterated its position in its LIR and WR, noting in its LIR that <i>"NH proposes to drive the SEE Strategy through the Supply Chain. Havering's experience is that this is not an effective approach, with supply chains not meeting commitments and using "best endeavours" to cover their shortcomings. Havering would seek to work with NH to drive and monitor performance against local targets to realise any benefit for Havering residents."</i></p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>The Applicant has held regular SEE meetings with the Council to develop the strategy and notes the request for ring fencing of social value (in this case sourcing of labour) in the London Borough of Havering. The Applicant' SEE Lead provided an update on SEE workforce figures at the SEE working group meeting on 31 January 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a target of 45% of its workforce based within 20 miles of the Project. This target has been central to the procurement process of the main works contracts. Delivery partners will be required to engage with local job brokerage services and education providers to advertise jobs, and share details of roles for publication through local communication channels.</p> <p>The Applicant also commits to providing at least 1,000 local business leaders across the region with the opportunity to develop the skills needed to bid for work on the Project. This will improve their capability and capacity to gain new work not only on the Project but across the wider region. This will also support the Project's local workforce target.</p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>A skills and employment working group will operate throughout construction. This will provide a forum for the local authority to work with the Applicant to share emerging needs and local priorities and identify other opportunities to maximise local economic benefits.</p> <p>The use of a regional target rather than borough-specific targets is a proportionate way of maximising the use of the local workforce without unduly constraining the delivery of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, ensuring there is a flexible approach to labour market issues.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant explained that it <i>'will be driving the SEE Strategy through Contractors and their supply chains. Each Contractor will have dedicated social impact/social value teams to ensure that meaningful engagement and initiatives are sustained during the delivery of the Programme (evident already within the Borough with Balfour Beatty). The Applicant will be gathering quarterly performance data to assure and evidence supply chain delivery. Continual engagement will take place between the Council, Contractors (supply chain) and Applicant through the Lower Thames Crossing Employment & Skills Working Group, where the Council will</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>have the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Contractors to help inform their annual Employment & Skills plans (e.g. identifying existing local initiatives/areas for support).’</i> Following a meeting on 25 August 2023 it also clarified that ‘<i>The quarterly national skills academy reports provide sufficiently frequent insight into the performance of each [Contractor]. Data is collected monthly and aggregated into a quarterly report which is to be shared with the employment and skills working group. The quarterly reporting takes effect from the Project receiving notice to proceed.’</i> This is in addition to annual reporting.</p>		
<p>Community Fund</p> <p>Community fund</p>	<p>2.1.85</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>In its PADS Tracker, the London Borough of Havering stated that the size of the proposed Community Fund needs to be substantially increased for Havering. This reflects the position adopted following the Applicant’s meetings with local authorities in 2022 and in meetings on 6/2/23 and 21/2/23, during which the Council stated that the proposed fund fell short of responding to the section 106 requests for mitigation. The Council reiterated its position in its LIR and WR.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was not agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023 and continues to engage with the Council regarding the fund in cross-authority working groups. This matter is under discussion pending further negotiations between the Applicant and the London Borough of Havering.</p> <p>In its response to the Council’s LIR, the Applicant noted ‘<i>the request for more funding. This will be considered, including against the Section 106 planning tests, and the Applicant will continue to work with the Council to seek to develop an agreed understanding of the issue and resolution of the concern raised.’</i> At a meeting on 25</p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			August 2023, the Applicant explained that the allocations and amounts set out previously are final, and considered to meet the Section 106 planning tests. As such, the Applicant considers this to potentially be a matter not agreed. The Applicant notes the matter is not agreed but would point out that this does not preclude the ongoing negotiations regarding other Section 106 matters.		
Air quality					
Assessment of likely significant effects Updated air quality assessments	2.1.42	London Borough of Havering noted in the Community Impacts Consultation 2021 that "National Highways are of the view that there are no significant adverse impacts on air quality from the Project during operation, so no mitigation for air quality affects is required." Updated assessments to support this position have been requested and the Council reserves its position until they are shared. In its LIR, the Council noted it was <i>"satisfied that construction related air quality impacts have been identified correctly in general. However, changes in ammonia (NH₃) concentrations at ecological designations as a result of road vehicle exhaust emissions have not been assessed. These can directly affect vegetation. As such, comprehensive</i>	The Applicant has held workshops with local authorities to outline the key changes in environmental data since the original DCO submission. Air Quality was covered in a session on 3 October 2022. In advance of this, a summary of the expected changes was shared on 11 May 2022 and discussed at CIPHAG on 18 May 2022. Full data was included in the DCO submission. In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant provided further technical clarification relating to construction and operational assessments: <i>'The assessment of Nitrogen Deposition effects during the construction phase has considered ammonia emitted by road vehicles. The impact of NH₃ has been considered as part of the air quality</i>	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060] ES Appendix 5.6: Project Air Quality Action Plan [APP-350]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p><i>consideration of air quality effects has not been provided." In addition, it was "considered operational impacts have generally been identified correctly with the exception of consideration of potential NH₃ emission impacts at ecological designations."</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 31 October 2023, the Council flagged its residual concerns about how ammonia impacts had been considered. The Council agreed to review the new information provided along with a post-meeting note, and to consider its position on this matter.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p><i>assessment for both construction and operation as described in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143], paragraphs 5.3.100 to 5.3.106.</i></p> <p><i>The operational assessment of Nitrogen Deposition effects has considered ammonia within the assessment. The impact of NH₃ has been considered as part of the air quality assessment for both construction and operation as described in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143], paragraphs 5.3.100 to 5.3.106. Details on the feasibility of operational phase mitigation and compensation measures for residual nitrogen deposition effects are discussed in ES Appendix 5.6: Project Air Quality Action Plan [APP-350].'</i></p> <p>At the meeting on 31 October 2023, the Applicant explained how the assessment referenced above was structured. A post-meeting note with references was supplied for consideration.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Monitoring</p> <p>Air quality monitoring pre</p>	<p>2.1.43</p>	<p>London Borough of Havering assert that any monitoring proposed will need to include the setting up of permanent noise and air quality monitoring stations at agreed points. This is to maintain current</p>	<p>The Applicant is following the advice of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 with regard to operational air quality monitoring. The Applicant would only propose to undertake monitoring if its</p>	<p>ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143] Code of Construction</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
and post construction		<p>baseline data and to allow them to be used to monitor levels post completion by comparing with the predicted noise/pollution levels.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that 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 the Council, particularly where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear interventions are requested for agreement with the Council.</p> <p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23 September 2022, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of operational air quality monitoring. The Council repeated this position in its LIR and requested a number of technical clarifications including how the monitoring and mitigations would be secured.</p> <p>At the meeting on 31 October 2023, the Council noted the position of the Applicant and the offer to hand over monitors. It agreed to consider the offer and advise whether the matter can be resolved.</p>	<p>assessment predicted significant air quality effects which triggered the requirement for mitigation, which is not the case. The purpose of the monitoring would be to determine when and if the mitigation (for example speed restrictions) can be removed.</p> <p>Using operational monitoring to validate the air quality predictions in the EIA can be challenging as it can be difficult to differentiate the contribution of the Project from the baseline. Weather conditions can also have a significant influence on air quality, and any changes year on year are often strongly related to the weather. An example of this is if NO₂ increased at a given receptor between 2028 and 2029, little confidence could be attributed to Lower Thames Crossing being the cause. Using air quality modelling can quantify the impact as the Applicant is able to control for external variables.</p> <p>Post-completion monitoring is not intended to be provided in this package of works and therefore the Applicant will not commit to it at this stage. However, operational monitoring of impacts is currently being considered by the Project. The Applicant notes that London Borough of Havering have raised this concern in the past</p>	<p>Practice [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>and will provide more information when a decision is made.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant clarified that <i>'details in relation to the monitoring approach during construction will be set out by the Contractors and the air quality monitoring programme which will require approval by the Secretary of State in consultation with local authorities as per the REAC commitments within ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant provided an update at a meeting on 21 February 2023.</p> <p>At a meeting on 31 October 2023, the Applicant confirmed that pre-construction baseline monitoring was being carried out then taken over by contractors during construction as set out in the REAC and reiterated the position that permanent monitoring was not required on the basis of the assessments referenced above. The Applicant advised that it would be committing to offering to hand over the pre-construction baseline monitors (combined noise and air quality) to local authorities for their ongoing use, if desired. The locations may not be appropriate for operational</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>monitoring but authorities would be free to relocate them.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Project design and mitigation</p> <p>Dust management commitments</p>	2.1.44	<p>London Borough of Havering noted in the Community Impacts Consultation 2021 that the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Guidance LA 105 (Air Quality) states that '<i>The construction dust assessment shall be used to inform the best practice mitigation measures in the EMP depending on whether the project has a high or low dust risk potential</i>'. The Council requests justification of the selected dust mitigation measures set out in the REAC, more specifically, that they correspond to a high-risk site.</p> <p>In line with the above guidance, the on-site and off-site inspections should be daily. As such, commitment no. 1 under REAC ref. AQ005 should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>In line with the above guidance, a record of complaints / exceptional dust events should be kept, as measures to monitor mitigation effectiveness. The Council would also require detailed actions that will be taken, should a dust complaint be</p>	<p>The good practice measures in the REAC, such as those set out in REAC Commitments AQ001 to AQ005, would apply across all of the Project. Implementation of these measures is not subject to the findings of any risk-based analysis.</p> <p>That should not be confused with the Applicant's proposed approach to dust and particulate monitoring which would have regard for a risk-based approach having consideration for the details of the specific packages of work within the site boundaries and the location of receptors around the site. Should monitoring be required, the monitoring locations will be approved by the Secretary of State in consultation with the relevant local authority. This is to ensure the monitoring effort is focused, proportionate and linked to the action requirements set out in REAC Commitment AQ008, triggered by an alert system when a predetermined site action level approved by the Secretary of State in</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>submitted. These should be included in the REAC.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that 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 the Council, particular where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear interventions are requested for agreement with the Council.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>consultation with the relevant local authority, is reached.</p> <p>REAC Commitment AQ008 provides for the detail of dust monitoring to be approved by the Secretary of State in consultation with the relevant local authority. This would include approval for the frequency of monitoring or, where required, for continuous particulate monitoring. Actions taken to resolve the situation in the event that alert systems are triggered will be recorded in a site logbook and the relevant local authority notified of the event and actions by telephone or email, as soon as is reasonably practicable, after or during the dust event. Complaints regarding dust events will be recorded and managed in accordance with the proposed Community helpline, enquiries and complaints procedure, set out in Section 5.2 of the CoCP.</p>		
Cultural heritage					
<p>Archaeology</p> <p>CoCP and archaeology</p>	2.1.45	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted the inclusion of some of the past recommendations on archaeology in the new version of the REAC, but felt the CoCP currently still has less robust archaeological coverage than it would expect and would welcome further</p>	<p>Archaeological interests will primarily be controlled by means of site-specific written schemes of investigation. The Applicant proposes that the DCO would include a requirement to the effect that no part of the authorised development is to commence until, for that part, a site-specific written scheme for the</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)] ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>discussion with the Applicant to address this.</p> <p>It noted that as cultural heritage is excluded from the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) process and instead delegated to a separate Archaeological Mitigation Strategy - Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (AMS-OWSI), it advises that it is key that management of important archaeological remains uncovered during the Project is included in the CoCP. This is so that stakeholders are aware of the obligations and processes in this area and any implications from these on the wider EMP sphere and construction programme. Information around the timetabling of investigations, key receptors and different options for managing remains for example, should be included in the CoCP at this stage.</p> <p>The Council continues to recommend that it would be appropriate to include detailed protocol for unexpected archaeological discoveries in this section of the CoCP, to reflect what is now included in the REAC, and the DCO condition.</p> <p>In its PADS Tracker, the Council notes that the ES and Planning Statement defines the impacts of the scheme extensively but mitigation is not provided on the basis of</p>	<p>investigation of areas of archaeological interest, reflecting the relevant mitigation measures set out in the draft AMS-OWSI, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation by the undertaker with the relevant planning authority on matters related to its function. This allows for the Council to be directly involved in the archaeological mitigation process.</p> <p>The REAC (which is now proposed to be directly incorporated into the CoCP) provides further commitments. The draft AMS-OWSI presented in ES Appendix 6.9 includes details of specifically identified measures to mitigate the impact to known heritage assets and a range of generic mitigation measures from which appropriate mitigation would be applied for currently unknown heritage assets that could be physically damaged by construction.</p> <p>Consideration for cultural heritage is not excluded from the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) process. Those cultural heritage mitigation measures committed to within the REAC will be worked into later iterations of the Environmental Management Plan as set out as a DCO requirement to the effect that no part of the authorised development is to</p>	<p>OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)] Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>the national need for the scheme. This is considered unacceptable by the Council, particular where severe adverse impacts are identified. Clear interventions are requested for agreement with the Council.</p> <p>At the meeting with the Applicant on 20 February 2023, the Council advised the matter could potentially be agreed once the security of provisions in the draft AMS-OWSI are clarified.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council noted that <i>"Mitigation is proposed to be subject to forthcoming documents, including an AWSI, currently in draft. The fact that this document is yet to be drafted and will not be subject to the scrutiny during the Examination is unsatisfactory to LB Havering."</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council noted progress with emerging scope for handling unexpected finds, options to rebury and avoid harm. The Archaeological Clerk of Works being on the scheme was felt to give reassurance about on-site supervision during construction.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>commence until a EMP (Second Iteration), substantially in accordance with the CoCP, for that part has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation by the undertaker with the relevant planning authority where the EMP (Second Iteration) must reflect the mitigation measures set out in the REAC.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the draft DCO contains requirements to the effect that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any archaeological remains not previously identified which are revealed when carrying out the authorised development must be retained <i>in situ</i> and reported to the relevant planning authority as soon as reasonably practicable from the date they are identified. • No construction operations are to take place within 10 metres of such for a period of 14 days from the date of any such notice served unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State. • If the relevant planning authority determines in writing that the archaeological remains require further investigation, no construction operations are to take place within 10 metres of the remains until provision 		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>has been made for the further investigation and recording of the remains in accordance with details to be submitted in writing to, and, unless otherwise agreed by the Secretary of State, approved in writing by, the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>This allows for Havering and other stakeholders to be directly involved in the mitigation process for previously unidentified archaeology. As the draft DCO includes requirements to secure the mitigation of previously unidentified archaeology, the Applicant does not intend to duplicate or complicate this with a repeat commitment in the CoCP.</p> <p>The Applicant held a meeting with London Borough of Havering on 20 February 2023 during which it was emphasised that the draft AMS-OWSI would be written in consultation with the Council. Requirement 9, paragraph 1 of the draft DCO secures accordance with this document.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR and WR, the Applicant repeated its position and provided further details about mitigation, including noting:</p> <p><i>'The Applicant strongly disagrees with the comments regarding the status and scrutiny of the dAMS-OWSI. ES Appendix 6.9: Draft Archaeological Mitigation</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-367] was submitted with the application. Its status and purpose and scope are clearly defined in Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 (pages 3 to 5) of the document.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant also referred to the method by which the draft AMS-OWSI is secured as noted above within this entry.</p> <p>At the meeting on 27 October 2023, the Applicant discussed the security of the fieldwork and control documents referenced above, noting that there would be one Archaeological Clerk of Works per contractor alongside a cross-project historic environment manager appointed by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Outstanding archaeological investigations</p>	<p>2.1.46</p>	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that although cultural heritage surveys have been carried out along many parts of the route, Havering's archaeological advisors are still awaiting important investigations into the Ockendon Channel and further trenching both in and north of Thames Chase Forest. These will be important in managing impacts on specific, high significance assets and may</p>	<p>For Ockendon Channel, the Applicant's palaeolithic specialists have updated their assessment based on further work within the area of the Ockendon Channel. The draft AMS-OWSI will be updated in consultation with London Borough of Havering's archaeological advisors to set out appropriate mitigation prior to consent.</p> <p>For Thames Chase Forest, the boundary of the Project to the north of Thames Chase Forest has reduced and the impact is</p>	<p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)] ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>lead to further recommended updates to the CoCP. The Council further noted it is particularly concerned that managing important middle Palaeolithic remains associated with the North Ockendon Channel (NOC) would necessitate complicated archaeological investigations parallel with the creation of the deep M25 link road cuttings and that physical and programme constraints may compromise that work if it is not planned for.</p> <p>At the meeting with the Applicant on 20/2/23, the Council accepted the principles for working with the Project to address outstanding investigations. It considered the matter potentially agreed once a multi-disciplinary meeting is held to understand impacts at North Ockendon following changes to the compound layout. As of 14/5/23, the Council was considering its position with its archaeological advisor. The Council repeated its concern about "outstanding questions around significance at a handful of areas that have not yet been subject to archaeological evaluation (e.g., Thames Chase Forest, Ockendon Compound) and there is a major outstanding question around the Ockendon Channel, a large, buried middle palaeolithic feature located at or near the proposed M25 junction site."</p>	<p>derived from a gas diversion running close to the existing M25, so no further trenching is required.</p> <p>The Applicant held a meeting with London Borough of Havering on 20 February 2023 to discuss its approach to investigations, followed by a multi-disciplinary meeting about North Ockendon on 17 May 2023. In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant referred to the progress above, within this SoCG entry, and added:</p> <p><i>'The presence of important Middle Palaeolithic remains has been identified and assessed within ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [AS-044]. The importance of these buried archaeological remains, and the complexity of the mitigation is reflected in the approach to the proposed mitigation and is set out in more detail in the AMS-OWSI [APP-367] and will be developed further with LBH's archaeological advisors.</i></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><i>Within Thames Chase Forest the vast majority of the landed is wooded, so the Applicant took the decision not to remove trees to facilitate trial trenching prior to the Project being consented. The small area of open land was not trenched as it is located immediately adjacent to the Thames Chase Forest Visitor Centre. Furthermore,</i></p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060] ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council noted the fieldwork planned to be carried out at post-consent at the NOC site, but requested the Applicant provide security to ensure it starts early enough to analyse finds and liaise with engineers.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council welcomed the dAMS-OWSI and REAC updates at examination deadline 7. It advised that this matter could not be agreed at the time of this final SOCG but anticipated its concerns would be fully addressed at examination deadline 8, when the Applicant is due to submit a proposed Palaeolithic Addendum. The Council notes the continued constructive engagement between its archaeological specialist and the Applicant’s specialist.</p>	<p><i>the Thames Chase Forest is located adjacent to the existing M25. Previous M25 widening schemes have been subject to archaeological investigations and as a result, the nature of the archaeological resource in this area is well understood.</i></p> <p>The Applicant also provided a breakdown of investigations and data on significance at North Ockendon/M25 compound as recorded in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>At the meeting on 27 October 2023, the Applicant explained that more technical and desk-based assessment work has been done at this stage than on similar projects. The value of North Ockendon Channel has been determined. Large trenches would be needed for fieldwork so must be dug post-consent. Historic England have accepted the overall methodology at a project scale. The Applicant was to consider a further commitment to address concerns about the timing of this work.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the paragraphs 6.4.41 to 6.4.44 of the dAMS-OWSI have been updated at examination deadline 7 to specifically note and secure the fieldwork at North Ockendon Channel as a two stage mitigation process, starting with the excavation of test pits a minimum of 10m x</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>10m to the depth to which the Project has potential to impact the deposits. The second stage is an iterative development of the first stage with further works determined by the outcomes of the first stage. For each stage, in accordance with the dAMS-OWSI, the Council (in its capacity as the Local Planning Authority) will approve the method statement developed with the Contractor to ensure the works meet the aims and objectives of the SSWSI, for which the Council is a formal consultee. Any comments from the Council on the SSWSIs will be included with the submission of each SSWSI to the Secretary of State for approval. Paragraphs 7.2.19 to 7.2.24 of the dAMS-OWSI additionally require that the Council signs-off to confirm that the relevant works have been completed in compliance with the relevant SSWSIs.</p> <p>The Council is also a beneficiary of new REAC commitment CH009, introduced at examination deadline 7, that further secures the two stage mitigation process where there is a high potential for survival of Palaeolithic land surfaces and other significant deposits, such as at NOC.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to continue routinely engaging with the Council about this matter in advance of formal consultation/approval.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>It has also commenced early conversations with the Contractor and external specialists to ensure the fieldwork plans are suitably accommodated. The Applicant stands by the two stage process and the scrutiny offered to the Council to ensure it will be carried out successfully.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments, so concurs that this matter cannot be fully agreed at this time. It welcomes the Council's constructive engagement and submitted a Palaeolithic Addendum document at examination deadline 8 (as Annex C: Outline Palaeolithic Written Scheme of Investigation of the dAMS-OWSI), and updated it at deadline 9, to provide further clarifications.</p>		
<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Redesign of works to protect archaeology</p>	<p>2.1.47</p>	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that Folkes Lane, Franks Farm, North Ockendon Conservation Area and others are sites where planned ancillary works may affect important remains, and where a redesign of their impacts may be appropriate.</p> <p>At the meeting with the Applicant on 20/2/23, the Council accepted the methodology proposed. As of 14/5/23, the Council is considering its position with its archaeological advisor.</p>	<p>At Folkes Lane, the works to complete a gas diversion require a pond to be constructed for ecological mitigation. This is close to an area of archaeological interest. Time has been allocated within the construction programme to allow archaeological investigation to inform the detailed design of the pond and any additional drainage.</p> <p>At Franks Farm, it is proposed that multi utility works follow the route of an existing 11kV high voltage underground cable. This will ensure that any areas of disturbance to</p>	<p>ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>The Council noted design concerns again in its LIR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>potential buried archaeological remains is kept to a minimum. However, this is an archaeologically sensitive area, recorded as Warley Franks Manor, so archaeological mitigation will be required and this is set out in the draft AMS-OWSI.</p> <p>At North Ockendon Conservation Area, the ancillary works within the conservation area comprise multi utility works along Ockendon Road. The road already contains a number of utilities and routing the multi utility works along the road will ensure the minimum impact to any potential buried archaeological remains. However, the conservation area is archaeologically sensitive, so archaeological mitigation will be required and this is set out in the draft AMS-OWSI.</p> <p>The Applicant held a meeting with London Borough of Havering on 20 February 2023 and explored the potential to alter works and undertake further investigations in consultation with the Council within its proposed methodology.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant referred back to item 2.1.15 in this SoCG which states <i>‘requirement 9 of the draft DCO addresses the management and delivery of archaeological mitigation in line with the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy – Outline Written Scheme of</i></p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>Investigation (AMS-OWSI), which prominently states that the first principle of mitigation is to preserve or protect archaeological remains wherever possible.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Protection of archaeological finds</p>	2.1.48	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that although the DCO provides a high-level obligation regarding reporting and protecting unexpected discoveries, the detail of how this would operate in practice is something that the Council continues to recommend is set out in appropriate detail in the CoCP.</p> <p>The Council notes REAC ref CH006 as offering a protocol by which to preserve key remains in situ and CH007 and 008 to monitor and manage such work, which should be for the duration of the Project lifetime. It remains though that these aspirations are not always reflected appropriately elsewhere in the consultation documents.</p> <p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed subject to corrections to the text explaining its position, including relocation of items concerning North Ockendon Channel to matter 2.1.46.</p>	<p>The presence of important Middle Palaeolithic remains has been identified and assessed within ES Chapter 6. The importance of these buried archaeological remains, and the complexity of the mitigation is reflected in the programme and is set out in more detail in the draft AMS-OWSI</p> <p>The DCO establishes the required process as explained above under item 2.1.45. The detail for any required investigation and recording of previously unidentified archaeological remains would be developed on a site-specific basis in collaboration with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>The REAC items are not 'aspirations'. They would be legally binding commitments required under the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed, having made the changes requested.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)] ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)] ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Archaeology Archaeological evaluation prior to DCO application	2.1.49	In its response to the 2020 Supplementary Consultation, London Borough of Havering expressed concern that the appropriate level of archaeological evaluation is not going to be completed ahead of the DCO application. This work was due to commence in August 2019 but did not commence until December 2019. It is imperative that stakeholders have the opportunity to review this work ahead of the application being submitted. At the meeting with the Applicant on 20 February 2023, the Council accepted the matter had been addressed. At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.	Reports on the completed programme of archaeological evaluations have been shared with heritage stakeholders. The original DCO application was withdrawn. A summary of these reports is included as an appendix within ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage. There are multiple reports, each of several hundred pages, so they may not be included in their entirety within the ES but will be available on request. The Applicant held a meeting with London Borough of Havering on 20 February 2023 and confirmed that this was a historic concern following the preparation of reports for the new DCO application. The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Agreed
Archaeology Desk-based archaeological assessment	2.1.50	In its response to the 2020 Design Refinement Consultation and subsequent comments on the draft ES, London Borough of Havering has remained concerned that there continues to be a lack of evidence and detail from a completed archaeological desk-based assessment for the scheme. There is also a lack of information from archaeological trials trenching. The Council would like to see further information on this before the DCO application is submitted.	A meeting was held on 17 February 2022 with London Borough of Havering, their specialist advisor from the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service. At this meeting their advisor agreed with the Applicant that following discussions with other key heritage stakeholders the desk-based assessment would be treated as a "fixed in time" document that would not be updated. However, the concerns made by the Council and other stakeholders have been considered. ES Chapter 6: Cultural	ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)] ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116] Draft DCO [Document	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>At the meeting with the Applicant on 20/2/23, the Council advised the matter could potentially be agreed once the security of provisions in the draft AMS-OWSI are clarified. It accepted that the desk-based assessment is now a fixed document from a point in time before the revised ES Cultural Heritage chapter was completed and submitted with the DCO application. As of 14/5/23, the Council was considering its position with its archaeological advisor.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council stated: <i>"LB Havering is content not to recommend further desk-based archaeological assessment work to accompany a decision. However, the EIA assessments of significance and harm in general are not always convincingly articulated.</i></p> <p><i>For example, significance is ascribed to individual artefacts made as spot finds and recorded in museums without considering what wider, as yet unexposed along the route, activity those spot finds are likely to represent in many cases.</i></p> <p><i>Significance assessment should be grounded in national, regional and local research framework questions lead on from there to a clear link with the chosen mitigation approach.</i></p>	<p>Heritage and ES Appendix 6.9: Draft AMS-OWSI have been revised extensively since the previous DCO application submission and has taken into account the concerns of key heritage stakeholders including the advisor to London Borough of Havering. The revised approach was presented to Historic England, Essex Place Services and GLAAS (the London Borough of Havering's advisors) at a meeting on 24 May 2022 and was received positively.</p> <p>The Applicant held a meeting with London Borough of Havering on 20 February 2023 during which it was emphasised that the draft AMS-OWSI would be written in consultation with the Council. Requirement 9, paragraph 1 of the draft DCO secures accordance with this document.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant referred to item 2.1.49 and this item in this SoCG and stated: <i>'The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been informed by the Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment [APP-351 to APP-354] which utilised regional research frameworks when assigning value (significance) to archaeological assets and also considered the archaeological potential of findspots. Furthermore, findspots are being taken into account when designing detailed</i></p>	<p>Reference 3.1 (11)] Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment [APP-351 to APP-354] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p><i>Archaeological field evaluation has covered a great extent of the scheme impact areas in the borough and provided very useful information on significance to inform a management strategy."</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council discussed the research agenda and assessments of significance proposed by the Applicant. It confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p><i>archaeological mitigation measures. The Applicant notes that since January 2020, a significant amount of archaeological work has taken place and the assessment has been developed using best practice for assessing heritage assets with unknown archaeological potential (i.e. through a combination of desk-based assessment, non-intrusive field assessment such as geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching). Across the Project, over 4,000 archaeological trial trenches were excavated between November 2019 and November 2021. The data from the trial trench evaluation supersedes the findspot data across much of the Order Limits within Havering. Across the Project as a whole, following trial trench evaluation it can be argued that findspots have proven to be a relatively poor indicator of archaeological potential in comparison to other methods, primarily cropmark analysis.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant considers that the assessment of value (significance) of heritage assets is therefore robust.'</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Applicant described the strategy for deciding the research value of excavating and a research agenda that has been developed across the region, together with</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			the plan to develop mitigation for each site based on the assessment of significance and impact. The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.		
<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Section 106 request for archaeological finds storage and presentation</p>	<p>2.1.84</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of contributions towards high quality archaeological finds storage and presentation.</p> <p>The Council reiterated this request and proposed <i>"Delivering public heritage mitigation, including a combined public archive and heritage centre"</i> in its LIR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 27 October 2023, the Council stated that the approach being adopted missed an opportunity for a joint heritage centre across the region, and reiterated its request for a central archive and strong public digital offer with a network of local sites to accommodate the changing outputs from the Project.</p> <p>The Council considered the Applicant's responses at a meeting on 21 November 2023. It concurs with the Applicant that this matter cannot be agreed due to the position taken by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The Applicant is considering a variety of options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant advised that <i>'paragraph 8.7.1 of the draft AMS-OWSI [APP-367] states: "The Project is likely to provide scope for additional and more complex reporting, through for example a period or regional journal, stand-alone 'monograph' publication and/or popular publication. In addition, popular publications that include, for example, reconstruction drawings and non-technical summaries could be provided to make the results of the onsite mitigation recording more publicly accessible. A programme and strategy for the publication, and public dissemination of the results of the archaeological programme of works will be provided in the updated project design." Annex A of the draft AMS-OWSI also sets out a strategy for Public Archaeology and Community Engagement.'</i></p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060] Draft AMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>The Applicant emphasises that the draft AMS-OWSI described above remains under ongoing regular discussion with local authorities and will be updated as the proposals are refined.</p> <p>At the meeting on 27 October 2023, the Applicant reiterated the provisions of Annex A of the draft AMS-OWSI which include community archaeology proposals to share finds during construction. The document also refers to the professional obligation to store finds. The Applicant has worked with Historic England and the Arts Council to investigate a potential regional archaeological centre but this work does not form part of the Project or DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the difference between what it has offered and the Council's expectations. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		
Landscape and visual					
<p>Project design and mitigation</p> <p>Approach to tree/hedge mitigation</p>	<p>2.1.87</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>At a meeting with the Applicant on 3/2/23 and through its specialist report, London Borough of Havering welcomed the establishment of an advisory group to help inform decision making throughout the duration of the Landscape and</p>	<p>The Applicant provided a comprehensive response to queries in the meeting and through a follow-up email on 31 March 2023.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
and landscape management		<p>Environmental Management Plan, which would be to the point of establishment of habitat. The Council would welcome the opportunity to be a part of this, especially in relation to the Thames Chase Community Forest and surrounding land parcels.</p> <p>Satisfactory clarification was provided around matters including tree/hedge impacts and mitigation, visual impacts, woodland planting species mix (notably at Thames Chase) and assessment of veteran trees at the meeting and through follow-up email.</p>			
Terrestrial biodiversity					
<p>Planning</p> <p>Omission of SINC from documentation</p>	2.1.51	<p>At Scoping Opinion stage, London Borough of Havering flagged that the ES must recognise that the railway corridor close to the route is identified as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).</p> <p>At 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering expressed concern that the Applicant appears to have omitted two SINC that are identified in the emerging Local Plan, these are Folkes Lane woodland SINC and Tylers Wood SINC. They are also omitted from the Large Scale Land Use maps. It should also</p>	<p>Information was shared about SINC included in Project assessments at meetings with London Borough of Havering on 24 January 2022, 21 February 2022, 4 April 2022 and 20 April 2022. Twenty-seven SINC are being assessed by the Applicant, including the ones previously flagged as missing or subject to change by London Borough of Havering. The initial discrepancy was due to flaws in GiGL desk study data sets. The resubmitted DCO will take account of these and any revised impacts since 2020.</p> <p>On 21 February 2022 the Applicant confirmed that Folkes Lane Woodland and</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>be noted that North Ockendon Pit will be upgraded to a Metropolitan SINC. In addition, there are a number of other SINC's that appear to have been omitted from the land use plans including Codham Hall West, Tomkyns East Pasture, Foxburrow Wood and Jermain's Wood.</p>	<p>Tyler's Wood lay outside the Order Limits and would suffer no habitat loss.</p>		
<p>Impacts</p> <p>Level of impact at selected SINC's</p>	<p>2.1.52</p>	<p>On 21/2/22, the Applicant advised 7 SINC's have been flagged as being adversely affected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jermain's Wood • Codham Hall Wood SINC and ASNW • Frank's Wood ASNW • Ockendon Railsides SINC • Thames Chase Community Woodland • Fields south of Cranham Marsh • North Ockendon Pit. <p>London Borough of Havering expressed concern at the number of SINC's directly impacted by the Project and requested reconsideration of Order Limits. On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>	<p>At a meeting on 4 April 2022 the Applicant confirmed impacts had been removed at these sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jermain's Wood – Previously the Order Limits included parts of the SINC site in error, but these have now been revised to exclude the SINC. • Fields south of Cranham Marshes – after review it was found that the mapping was showing an error, and the Order Limits had no overlap with the SINC. The mapping has now been updated to reflect this – the Order Limits now sit outside the SINC boundary. <p>London Borough of Havering welcomed the reductions made. Mitigation will be planned for impact on or loss of habitat across the Project, and to create new habitats that are designed to link up existing habitats across the Project and region.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			A major reduction in the impact at North Ockendon Pit has been agreed with the Council under item 2.1.53 "Level of impact at North Ockendon Pit".		
Impacts Level of impact at North Ockendon Pit	2.1.53	<p>London Borough of Havering expressed concern at the level of impact on North Ockendon Pit, half of which is to house a temporary construction compound CA14, when alternative land appeared to be available nearby.</p> <p>London Borough of Havering welcomed the reductions made at the SINC but stressed that this did not equate to endorsement of the new location, which is addressed under item 2.1.20 "M25 compound changes at North Ockendon", above. As of 14/5/23, the Council is considering its position with its ecological advisor.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>	<p>On 4 April 2022 the Applicant confirmed that after review, the compound has been moved to an arable field to the west. A small strip along the southern edge of the SINC is still within the Order Limits so utilities can be installed in a trench for the compound.</p> <p>This change has benefited the ecological habitat of the SINC and been positive for the relationship with a landowner who will retain a field that was going to be used for mitigation of the SINC land. On 20 April 2022 the Applicant explained 90% of this SINC land use has now been removed but utility constraints preclude a practicable alternative to the remaining strip.</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed
Project design and mitigation Section 106 request for SINC loss mitigation	2.1.96 DL1	<p>London Borough of Havering has requested mitigation in the form of section 106 contributions to off-set loss of SINC which are being mitigated by woodland that is to be delivered at Hole Farm in Brentwood. The contribution would be used to extend and enhance existing SINC within the London Borough of Havering.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided an update at a meeting on 21 February 2023. The impact is being mitigated as per the Council's comment. The impact on SINC has also been reduced as described under items 2.1.52 "Level of impact at selected SINC" and 2.1.53 "Level of impact at North Ockendon Pit".</p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060] ES Figure 2.4: Environmental</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>The Council has confirmed that the sites in question are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Codham Hall Wood SINC and ASNW • Frank's Wood SINC and ASNW • Ockendon Railsides SINC • North Ockendon Pit SINC • Thames Chase Community Woodland SINC <p>In its LIR, the Council stated: <i>"Despite embedded mitigation, LB Havering requires bespoke compensation for the permanent loss of SINC and seeks to ensure that sufficient compensation is provided. Havering recommends that the construction compound [(M25 compound, North Ockendon)] would be an appropriate single location for the creation of compensatory brownfield habitats with low nutrients which could also act as a buffer for the retained SINC habitats."</i></p> <p>In Issue Specific Hearing 10 on 19 October 2023, the Council reported that sufficient clarity had been provided regarding the level of compensation and mitigation required to consider this matter agreed.</p>	<p>There is no national policy support that requires compensation for impacts on local sites. Paragraph 5.31 of the NPSNN states consent should not be refused due to impacts on local sites.</p> <p>The Applicant has clarified the type and location of mitigation proposed for the sites identified by the Council to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Codham Hall Wood SINC and ASNW (Borough Importance): Mitigation woodland planting at Folkes Farm, immediately adjacent to the west of Codham Hall Wood West. • Frank's Wood SINC and ASNW and (Borough Importance): Mitigation woodland planting at Folkes Farm, immediately adjacent to the west of Codham Hall Wood West. • Ockendon Railsides SINC (Borough Importance): Mitigation open mosaic habitat creation immediately adjacent to the west of Ockendon Railsides SINC • North Ockendon Pit SINC (Metropolitan Importance): Impacts have been reduced to small section of temporary habitat loss during construction, along the southern and west edges. These areas would be reinstated as soon as 	<p>Masterplan [Document Reference 6.2 ES Figure 2.4 Sections 1 and 1a (4), Section 2 (5), Section 3 (4), Section 4 (2), Section 9 (6), Section 10 (4), Section 11 (3), Section 12 (3), Section 13 (3), Section 14 (3)]</p> <p>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [Document Reference 6.7 (7)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>construction activity in that area had been completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thames Chase Community Woodland SINC (Borough Importance): Mitigation woodland planting immediately south of Thames Chase Community Woodland SINC. <p>The Applicant explained why bespoke mitigation was not being provided for North Ockendon pit in its response to the Council's LIR:</p> <p><i>‘The impact of the Project on North Ockendon Pit Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) relates to a proposed upgrade to an existing footpath which runs along the southern and western edge of this site. Footpath FP151 runs along the southern boundary and joins FP254 at the western corner which then runs north along the western boundary. During surveys to inform the Project design and impact assessment, these were found to be heavily overgrown with vegetation and difficult to navigate. The Project proposal is to upgrade these footpaths to bridleways, which may be surfaced using a hoggin-type aggregate. The alignment of the public rights of way would not change. The 7.3% of the SINC area reported in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity [APP-146], would be subject to vegetation</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>clearance and surfacing with inert hoggin substrate. Following the surfacing of the bridleway, vegetation would be allowed to regenerate naturally to the edge of the path with the path itself offering an area free from vegetation to support invertebrates and enable reptiles to bask in the transition between vegetated cover and exposed sunnier areas. The assessment of likely significant effects from the Project to North Ockendon Pit SINC therefore concluded that the site would be subject to a temporary reversible impact which would not adversely affect its integrity. This effect would therefore constitute a slight adverse effect which is not significant.</i></p> <p><i>Approximately 2.0ha of open mosaic habitat would be created immediately adjacent to Ockendon Railsides SINC on its western edge. This would avoid a net loss in open mosaic habitat in close proximity to North Ockendon Pit SINC.</i></p> <p><i>This area of habitat creation is detailed in ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan [APP-167], with its long-term management secured in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP1-173], Section 7.7.’</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.		
Material assets and waste					
Assessment methodology Clarification of targets for waste diversion from landfill	2.1.54	The London Borough of Havering noted in its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation that Table 2.6 of the Outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP) reflects Table 6.1 of Outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP), providing more detail of management route for categories of waste. The Borough welcomed targets for 95% diversion from landfill although it was not clear how targets (tonnages and % of anticipated management) for recovery/recycling and disposal have been derived. E.g. 485,000m ³ (inc. 15,000m ³ 'contaminated) excavation material identified in Section C 'Roads North', plus 799,000m ³ (inc. 6,000m ³ 'contaminated') from Section D 'Roads North'. Total inert to landfill 63,150m ³ plus 1.2Mm ³ 'diversion from landfill' requiring recovery. Also, 14,700m ³ contaminated material goes to 'recovery/recycling' and 6,300m ³ contaminated material to 'off-site disposal'. A meeting was held with the Applicant on 23/2/23 and the report supplied in advance welcomed the Applicant's response to	Targets have been derived from professional judgement as well as reviewing construction information and practices gathered from other projects of national significance such as HS2, Thames Tideway, Crossrail and the Olympics, in particular the level of recycling/recovery performance achieved on these projects. The forecast waste data supporting ES Chapter 11 and the oSWMP is presented based on the contract areas, which comprise Kent Roads, Tunnels and Approaches, and Roads North of the Thames, providing an indication of where the waste will be generated. Details on the waste management infrastructure used during the Project would be detailed in the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP), to be developed post consent. In addition, an Excavated Materials Assessment (ES Appendix 11.1) has been carried out to identify the capacity of potential receiver sites following the application of the screening criteria. This demonstrates the variety of potential receiver facilities that could be available to	ES Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment [APP-435] ES Appendix 11.5: Waste Assessment Supporting Data [APP-439] ES Appendix 2.2: Annex A: oSWMP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 Annex A (4)]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		date. On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.	accept the Project’s wastes and will form the framework for Contractors to select receptor sites, identify new alternative receiver sites or reassess previously excluded potential sites, subject to such sites meeting the criteria established in this document. The methodology applied in the environmental assessment provides a standardised approach for identifying third-party potential receiver sites available to the Project. The meeting on 23 February 2023 included explanation of the targets and their basis.		
Project design and mitigation Proximity principle and sustainability of disposal	2.1.55	The London Borough of Havering noted in its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation that the oMHP seeks to apply the ‘proximity principle’ to aggregates supply, and so should also apply the proximity principle to waste requiring off-site management, which would reflect the stated principle of minimising road miles and impact on the local road network and the National Planning Policy for Waste. The Materials Handling Plan to be produced by the Contractors should identify the actual locations where waste requiring off-site management will be dealt with. While the proximity principle applies to mixed municipal waste being recovered or disposed of at one of the nearest	A list of existing third-party waste management facilities within Essex, Kent and the East London Waste Authority study area has been provided in the appendices of ES Chapter 11. All the sites listed in ES Appendix 11.3 have been taken from the Environment Agency datasets and are appropriately permitted to accept the anticipated wastes generated by the Project. This demonstrates the variety of facilities available to the Project. The final selection of the receiver sites for surplus excavated materials would be carried out by the contractor using the screening criteria presented in ES Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment. The screening criteria takes into consideration the proximity of the site,	ES Appendix 11.1: Excavated Materials Assessment [APP-435] ES Appendix 11.3: List of Third party Offsite Waste Infrastructure Receptors [REP1-166] ES Appendix 11.5: Waste Assessment Supporting Data [APP-439]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>appropriate installations, the spirit of the principle should also be applied to other types of waste, particularly given wider objectives of reducing unnecessary vehicle movements and associated impacts including emissions.</p> <p>The Borough welcomed REAC commitment MW012 "Contractor to identify re-use sites that meet HE sustainability criteria" and stated that this should include the proximity principle in its criteria.</p> <p>On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>	<p>forecasted greenhouse gas emissions in transportation and handling of material and alternative mode of transport capabilities. Details on the types and quantities of waste anticipated to be generated by the Project are provided in ES Appendix 11.5.</p> <p>REAC Commitment MW012 commits the Contractors to using the screening criteria presented in the Excavated Materials Assessment (ES Appendix 11.1) when selecting receiver sites for managing surplus excavated material. The screening criteria account for proximity by setting a distance of 20km from the Order Limits. If the potential receiver site is within the 20km area, it passes with a green score. If a site is not within 20km but has an alternative transport option available (rail or river), it passes, scoring amber. If the site is not within 20km and only accessible by road, it scores red.</p> <p>A meeting was held with the Council on 23 February 2023 to provide further clarifications.</p>		
<p>Project design and mitigation</p> <p>Waste commitments in the REAC</p>	2.1.56	<p>The London Borough of Havering requested in its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation that there could be more clarity over how REAC MW013 targets apply given there is apparent inconsistency between the target of 90% recovery of non-hazardous</p>	<p>The updated assessment of likely significant effects on landfill capacity detailed in ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste will now assume the worst-case scenario achieving a minimum recovery of 70% (by weight).</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>construction, demolition & excavation waste (is this by weight or volume?) and the expectation of the appointed Contractor to achieve a minimum recovery rate of 70% by weight. The targets applied are noted as broadly consistent with the Waste Management Plan for England, with its target of recovering at least 70% by weight of such waste by 2020. The Borough supported the requirement under MW011 for contractor to achieve diversion of 95% by weight of inert excavation materials for off-site management from disposal in landfill.</p> <p>On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>	<p>Targets have been derived from professional judgement as well as reviewing construction information and practices gathered from other projects of national significance such as HS2, Thames Tideway, Crossrail and the Olympics, in particular the level of recycling/recovery performance achieved on these projects.</p> <p>The 90% recovery of non-hazardous construction waste is by weight. REAC Commitment MW013 will be updated to reflect this.</p> <p>A target of 90% recovery of non-hazardous construction waste (by weight) has been set as a stretch target. England has been meeting the 2020 target of recovering at least 70% of non-hazardous construction & demolition waste for a number of years, with recovery rates of 90% and above since 2010.</p> <p>REAC Commitment MW011 will be updated and the term ‘seek’ will be removed to strengthen the commitment to achieve a target of 95% (by weight) of inert excavated materials diverted from final disposal in landfill.</p> <p>REAC Commitment MW0015 also commits to diverting 70% of hazardous waste from landfill. The 90% recovery target relates</p>	<p>ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 11 (2)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			to non-hazardous construction & demolition waste. A meeting was held with the Council on 23 February 2023 to provide further clarifications.		
Assessment methodology Details of demand for aggregates to inform planning	2.1.88 DL1	In its report prior to a meeting with the Applicant on 23/2/23, London Borough of Havering noted that the Material Assets Assessment (ES Appendix 11.4) quantifies the amount of primary and recycled and secondary aggregates that will be used in the sections of the scheme. The ES does not consider the significance of the effect of consumption of primary aggregates on aggregates reserves and landbanks (land won) or supply (marine via wharves) – but applies the target of 70%-99% material recovery as (substitute for primary materials) to determine no significant effect. There is no identification of reserves/sites that could be expected to supply primary aggregates. Clarification was requested regarding the calculation of landbanks in the ES, which appeared inaccurate as it should be a function of the 10 year average of sales divided by permitted reserves (which indicates landbanks are larger). It was accepted that the source of primary aggregates used in construction will be dependent of contractual arrangements,	In the meeting on 23 February 2023, the Applicant explained that the DMRB LA 110 requirements differ from IEMA guidance on landbank calculations. As agreed, a Local Aggregates Assessment was shared on 4 April 2023. The meeting also clarified that the information detailed in Table 11.3 in ES Chapter 11 was taken from the published local aggregates assessments and aggregates monitoring reports. With respect to the calculations of the 10 years sales figures provided in Table 11.3, these figures are not ones that the Applicant has calculated and were published figures detailed in the local aggregates assessments and aggregates monitoring reports. This matter is under discussion pending London Borough of Havering's consideration of the information supplied. In light of the Council's LIR, the Applicant considers that this matter is potentially agreed.	ES Chapter 11: Material Assets and Waste [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 11 (2)] Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>but identification of potential sources would be helpful. The Council recommended that the ES should also assess the significance of the effect of estimated consumption of primary aggregates by the scheme on aggregates reserves in the ES Study Area (in line with IEMA Guide to Materials & Waste in EIA).</p> <p>The Council noted that this matter will remain under discussion until a Local Aggregates Assessment note is shared.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council observed that a variety of queries, including <i>"Consideration of the effect on permitted reserves and landbanks of primary aggregates"</i> had been <i>"addressed satisfactorily"</i> to date.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>			
<p>Project design and mitigation</p> <p>Prioritising use of rail to transport materials</p>	<p>2.1.89</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>In its report prior to a meeting with the Applicant on 23/2/23, London Borough of Havering noted that the potential for direct rail links has been investigated and determined not viable in the oMHP. It identifies that several sites that may supply the scheme have rail paths for delivery of rock and multi-modal options including rail imports to facilities, onward by road to project, use of ports on the north side of the Thames for river transport, and conveyors within the Order Limits. The</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		Council stated it was content this issue had been adequately addressed.			
Noise and vibration					
Assessment of likely significant effects Updated noise assessments	2.1.57	In the Community Impacts Consultation 2021 London Borough of Havering requested updated noise assessments. On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.	The Applicant has held workshops with local authorities to outline the key changes in environmental data since the original DCO submission. Noise and vibration was covered in a session on 3 October 2022. In advance of this, a summary of the expected changes was shared on 11 May 2022 and discussed at CIPHAG on 18 May 2022. Full data was included in the DCO submission.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Monitoring Noise monitoring pre and post construction	2.1.58	London Borough of Havering assert that any monitoring proposed will need to include the setting up of permanent noise and air quality monitoring stations at agreed points. This is to determine that the current baseline data are then maintained so that they can be used to monitor levels post completion to compare with the predicted noise/pollution levels. Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23 September 2022, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of operational noise monitoring. At the meeting on 31 October 2023, the Council noted the position of the Applicant and the offer to hand over monitors. It	Operational noise monitoring will be reviewed in ongoing environmental assessment work and will be guided by DMRB LA 111. Where there are likely to be significant effects, evaluation works would be proposed to consider the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures as described in Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. The Applicant provided an update at a meeting on 21 February 2023. At a meeting on 31 October 2023, the Applicant confirmed that pre-construction baseline monitoring was being carried out then taken over by contractors during construction as set out in the REAC and reiterated the position that permanent	ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [APP-150] ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>agreed to consider the offer and advise whether the matter can be resolved.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council advised that this matter was agreed in respect of operational monitoring but that during construction, it requires monitoring at two receptor locations CN125 and CN126 that are both affected by a significant exceedance of Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL), in order to reach agreement.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>monitoring was not required on the basis of the assessments referenced above. The Applicant advised that it would be committing to offering to hand over the pre-construction baseline monitors (combined noise and air quality) to local authorities for their ongoing use, if desired. The locations may not be appropriate for operational monitoring but authorities would be free to relocate them.</p> <p>With respect to the request for monitoring at CN125 and CN126, the Applicant directs the Council to Table 12.35 of ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration page 119-122. At construction noise receptor CN 125, unmitigated reasonable worst case construction noise levels are predicted to have a moderate or greater impact during the daytime, evening and night-time periods above SOAEL; and for construction noise receptor CN126, unmitigated reasonable worst case construction noise levels are predicted to have a moderate impact during the daytime, evening and night-time periods above SOAEL. However, with Best Practicable Means (BPM) measures and noise and vibration REAC controls in place as set out in Table 12.35 and the ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP6-038], these</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>impacts would not constitute a significant effect.</p> <p>There are currently three pre-construction baseline noise monitors installed on Ockendon Road near receptor locations CN125 and CN126. Also as set out in REAC commitment NV009 within the CoCP, the Contractor will undertake noise and vibration monitoring during construction of which the locations will be identified in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities to ensure that the mitigation measures suggested are working effectively and will comply with the terms of the Section 61 consents. Under REAC commitment NV002, the Contractor will be required to prepare a Noise and Vibration Management Plan for each part of the construction works subject to Section 61 controls (REAC NV004) for consideration by the relevant local planning authorities. Therefore, the Applicant does not intend to commit to noise monitoring at receptor locations CN125 and CN126.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.59	In the Community Impacts Consultation 2021 London Borough of Havering requested that with regards to Table 4.2 Consents and permits that may be required	CoCP Table 4.2 provides for Section 61 control over construction works universally, so this is covered by default.	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Section 61 agreements		in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), Section 61 agreements should be in place for works outside core hours, Sunday work and works that are described or deemed to be 'noisy'.		ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	
Project design and mitigation Section 106 request for noise mitigation	2.1.82 DL1	<p>Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation for severe adverse noise impacts during construction.</p> <p>The Council provided further detail in its LIR response:</p> <p><i>"LB Havering considers the DCO requirements acceptable from a noise and vibration perspective, subject to agreement of the matters above. These include, specifically:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Securing a set of mitigation measures to deal with noise and vibration impacts on the Ockendon Road Diversion Route.</i> <i>• Securing manned monitoring at CV42 and CV44 on the first day of work on structures RWN000082 and RWN000085 to inform effective mitigation.</i> <i>• Securing appropriate noise and vibration mitigation in relation to the M25 Compound to minimise its impacts on the residents of North Ockendon."</i> 	<p>The Applicant is considering a variety of options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant explained the construction noise mitigations in place, including:</p> <p><i>'Commitments made within ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan</i></p> <p>[REP1-157] under REAC item NV009 (Noise and Vibration Monitoring) require monitoring be undertaken, with NV001, NV002 and NV004 securing the need for further noise assessment once exact specifics of the working practices and programme are fully understood in consultation with the relevant local authorities.</p> <p><i>REAC commitment NV017 (Vibration from Piling) specifically covers the issue of vibration from piling and the mechanisms in place to control this. These requirements would be consulted on, and where</i></p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p> <p>ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [APP-150]</p> <p>ES Figure 12.2: Construction Traffic Noise – Affected Links [Document Reference 6.2 ES Figure 12.2 (2)]</p> <p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>At the meeting on 31 October 2023, the Council welcomed the mitigation provided by reducing the Ockendon Road closure duration to 10 months but expressed concern about the lack of other measures. Clarity was requested on the bunding and screening at North Ockendon. The Council noted the Section 61 and construction phase engagement planned and welcomed the plans to police performance and ambition to reduce road closure duration.</p> <p>The Council requested further input into construction traffic monitoring locations at this stage. It agreed to consider the information provided and advise whether the matter can be resolved.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p> <p>The Council welcomed the clarifications provided by the Applicant regarding vibration monitoring and Section 61 agreements. It will note the new information and commitments provided regarding screening at North Ockendon.</p> <p>The Council welcomed the opportunity to discuss potential construction traffic monitoring locations in accordance with the oTMPfC.</p>	<p><i>appropriate included within the scope of any CoPA s61 applications made under NV004 with London Borough of Havering. The need for monitoring will be considered during the drafting of the Section 61 applications.'</i></p> <p>With respect to noise impacts on the Ockendon Road diversion route, the Applicant stated:</p> <p><i>'Construction traffic impacts on the wider road network are temporary in nature, only occurring for the duration of the works in that area. As detailed within ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [APP-150] significant effects associated with construction traffic have been identified within the ES but these predominantly occur on local minor roads around the Project, where the existing flows are low; as detailed on ES Figure 12.2: Construction Traffic Noise – Affected Links [APP 310].</i></p> <p><i>As such, minimising the duration of the closure of Ockendon Road is a valuable way to reduce the impacts described by the Council.'</i> The capping of the closure to 10 months is addressed in this SOCG under item 2.1.25, above.</p> <p>The Applicant also stated <i>'the roads presenting the potential for significant impacts tend to be lower speed roads, with</i></p>	<p>Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>impacts occurring at properties directly adjacent, which when coupled with the temporary short-term nature of the impacts, means that provision of physical noise mitigation such as low noise surfacing and acoustic screening are not considered to be sustainable or proportionate measures.</i></p> <p><i>Specific control of construction traffic noise is therefore implemented through the ability to actively monitor and manage the flows around the network, allowing route changes and other control measures to be implemented to alter flow patterns of construction traffic where problems are identified. This would be managed through measures in the oTMPfC.'</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 31 October 2023, the Applicant explained that in response to construction vibration concerns raised at Issue Specific Hearing 8, the Applicant has agreed to amend the wording of REAC commitment NV017 to cover controls for more general construction vibration activities (not just piling), and REAC commitment NV015 to cover actions in the event of a noise and vibration monitoring exceedance. This was published at examination deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant explained the REAC controls and use of Section 61 agreements to</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>manage noise without removing flexibility for contractors prior to detailed design, at which point the Council would be engaged.</p> <p>The Applicant reiterated the provisions for monitoring the impacts of temporary traffic management in the oTMPfC and offered further dialogue on potential monitoring locations to cover the Ockendon Road closure.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Applicant reported that changes to the REAC would be introduced at examination deadline 8 to benefit North Ockendon residents by improving the management of construction activities and the value screening at the M25 compound.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
Population and human health					
<p>Worker transport</p> <p>Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) governance</p>	2.1.60	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering questioned several aspects of the governance of the draft FCTP as presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wording of para 1.1.7 suggests that the Travel Plan Manager (TPM) will report on the 'effectiveness' of the FCTP. Effectiveness is not defined 	<p>Text has been provided in Section 6.4 of the FCTP explaining how the hub locations, and the specific details of their operation (such as set down and pick up locations) would be agreed with the relevant local highway authority and/or public transport operator and would follow the relevant approval processes. Additional text is also provided separately, setting out</p>	<p>Framework Construction Travel Plan [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of the TPM is welcomed, but the lack of commitment to the TPM being a person of sufficient seniority and gravitas within Highways England and the Project management team to operate at the level of the Joint Operations Forum (JOF) is not. It is suggested will operate at Director level. The Borough's view is that the TPM must be of this level of influence to avoid dilution of the very intent of the FCTP within the overall framework of the LTC project The Borough notes that no assessment of operation of the Travel Hubs, including that in the Havering area at Upminster has been provided. The Borough would wish to be satisfied that local highway and environmental issues will not occur at this location. <p>In its LIR, the Council noted that <i>"The oTMPfC and the FCTP operate in parallel but isolated structures. An overarching Traffic Manager and overarching Travel Plan Coordinator will be appointed with the only formal link between these and their supporting organisations and processes at the Joint Operations Forum of senior managers (the JOF). At a practical level this is not a workable structure; decisions</i></p>	<p>the estimated level of transport impacts at the Upminster hub.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant noted that <i>'a Traffic Manager and Travel Plan Manager would be appointed. The Applicant envisages that informal communication would occur between those on the TMF and Travel Plan Liaison Group (TPLG), in particular the Traffic Manager and Travel Plan Manager. In addition, a formal route is established through the Joint Operations Forum (JOF).'</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 12 October 2023, the Applicant drew attention to the Terms of Reference for the TPLG that were published at examination deadline 5 along with updates to the Code of Construction Practice relating to the JOF. The documents clarify interactions between different stakeholders and groups and mechanisms for dispute escalation. The Applicant also noted that the FCTP requires "a suitably qualified person with relevant experience" to occupy the Travel Plan Manager role.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's outstanding concern regarding the seniority criteria above. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>	<p>F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060] Code of Construction Practice [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p><i>taken on either area will affect the other with potential adverse consequences."</i></p> <p>At the meeting on 12 October 2023, the Council stated that it would reserve its position until after submission of comments at examination deadline 6. The Council reiterated the need for effective relations between the different parties managing issues and measures to reduce the number of issues that have to be escalated to the JOF.</p> <p>The Council confirmed at a meeting on 16 November 2023 that this matter could not be agreed due its concern that the seniority and gravitas of the Travel Plan Manager role remained insufficiently robust in the FCTP.</p>			
<p>Worker transport</p> <p>Net zero targets in the FCTP</p>	2.1.61	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted the initial proposals for targets and felt the lack of commentary on zero net carbon travel solutions was stark. The suggestion that only outcomes which result in a 'substantial shortfall' against target will be reported into the Travel Plan Liaison Group (TPLG, upon which the Borough sits) escalation process is felt to fundamentally miss the point of the supervisory role the TPLG plays. Circumstances change and the TPLG should be a position to set more</p>	<p>A new sentence has been added in Section 10.3 of the FCTP stating that where targets were being met early, more challenging ones would be set to strive for greater levels of sustainability.</p> <p>Charging points for electric vehicles has been moved to a tier 1 measure in Section 8.2. A reference to REAC documents with regard to vehicle emissions commitments has been added.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant advised:</p>	<p>Framework Construction Travel Plan [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p> <p>Appendix E, Carbon and Energy Management Plan [Document Reference 7.19 (4)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>challenging targets by agreement rather than simply reacting to failure of matters that are perceived as substantially off-course.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council noted "it is unclear how the Construction Travel Plan will substantially support carbon reduction given the high percentage of car borne trips to the construction compounds by workers. (M25 Compound trips 75% by car)."</p> <p>At the meeting on 12 October 2023, the Council welcomed EV charging being elevated to tier one. It remained concerned that parking could be increased without restraint and asked if a separate process could be implemented after the Site Specific Travel Plan (SSTP) approval to dissuade the contractor from increasing parking spaces. It recommended the FCTP be tightened further in this regard.</p> <p>The Council confirmed at a meeting on 16 November 2023 that this matter could not be agreed due its concern that the wording in the FCTP and explanations given were not sufficiently robust to address the risk of unrestrained parking growth or shuttle hubs being unable to access land required for successful operation.</p>	<p><i>'The car mode shares as detailed in paragraph 5.4.9 of the Framework Construction Travel Plan [APP-546] are the baseline mode shares which have been applied within the Applicant's transport model, and as noted in paragraph 5.4.10 are "considered to be a conservative assumption of the likely use of sustainable modes to access the compounds". Chapter 7 of the Framework Construction Travel Plan sets out areas where targets will be developed within each of the Site Specific Travel Plans, and this includes reducing the number of single occupancy car trips and increasing trips by sustainable modes. Targets in both these areas would support the reduction in carbon from the Project's construction workforce.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, Contractors are incentivised to minimise travel emissions as these count towards their agreed carbon targets (commitment CBN11 in Appendix E, Carbon and Energy Management Plan [APP-552]). A further commitment is that the delivery partners are to promote the use of active transport for personnel to and from the compounds and to provide managed electric charging facilities for e-bikes at each compound, in covered</i></p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p><i>cycle parking areas, to satisfy demand (CBN10).'</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 12 October 2023, the Applicant highlighted how targets are linked to managing car park spaces and that targets would be issued for comment from stakeholders in advance of being presented to the Secretary of State. The Applicant made an update at examination deadline 5 to align shuttle buses to staff shifts and public transport times, to bolster a reduced need for parking. Paragraph 6.4.3 recognises the need for agreements with railway station operators etc when locating shuttle hubs and the FCTP is not explicit that hubs will always be at station. The Applicant has considered further changes to the FCTP regarding parking but is satisfied with the content as it stands. This matter is under discussion pending the Council's consideration of the information provided.</p>		
<p>Worker transport</p> <p>TPLG principle and site / regional targets</p>	2.1.62	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering welcomed the TPLG concept, however noted the framework presented at Plate 4.2 indicates an indirect link between the site-specific travel plan targets and the overall FCTP targets policed by the TPLG. In its view, this must be a direct link. It is</p>	<p>The Applicant appreciates the Borough's support for the concept in principle and can confirm the diagram has been updated to give a direct link between site-specific and Project-wide targets, and an explanation included to define the difference between the solid and dashed line.</p>	<p>Framework Construction Travel Plan [Document Reference 7.13 (6)] Comments on LIRs - Appendix</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>appreciated that individual sites may have circumstances that require the targets to be flexible in their application. Each site specific travel plan must make a direct and measurable contribution to the overall set of targets.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council repeated concerns about accountability for and consistency of targets overseen by the TPLG.</p> <p>At a meeting on 16 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant noted <i>'the FCTP sets out a framework and overarching principles for the future SSTPs. This approach would provide the flexibility required to respond to and adapt to changing conditions over the duration of the Project. As set out in the FCTP, all targets will be developed and included within the SSTPs in consultation with the relevant highway and local planning authorities. No part of the authorised development is to commence until a SSTP for the construction of that part, which is substantially in accordance with the FCTP, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State.'</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>	<p>F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	
<p>Worker transport</p> <p>FCTP control of utilities staff</p>	<p>2.1.63</p>	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted the FCTP establishes the concept of utility logistics hubs (ULHs). Whilst these are noted as being necessary to ensure that utilities diversions for the Project are achieved in a timely manner, it is not clear what degree of control the FCTP will place on utilities staff and their contractors in terms of sustainable travel.</p>	<p>As stated in paragraph 2.1.5 of the FCTP, the FCTP sets out guidance for developing Site-Specific Travel Plans (SSTPs) for each construction compound, or compounds where these are closely located with similar levels of accessibility. This includes the Utility Logistic Hubs (ULHs) required for Statutory Undertakers to carry out the utility-specific works. The SSTPs will be developed by the contractors as set out in the Requirements</p>	<p>Framework Construction Travel Plan [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>The Council repeated its concerns in its LIR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 16 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed. However, it wished to record the significant contractual challenge it believes the Applicant will face in ensuring the utility supply chain meets the required standards.</p>	<p>and produced following the latest guidance and best practice. The SSTPs will be subject to review (and approval) by the Secretary of State (SoS), in consultation with relevant local planning authorities. In its response to the LIR, the Applicant stated it <i>‘would be ultimately responsible for all works delivered under the DCO, including work undertaken by statutory undertakers.</i></p> <p><i>In relation to the Council’s concerns regarding lack of control mechanisms for utility works, the active participants in the TMF include the utility companies responsible for delivering relevant aspects of the Project and the local highway authorities. With several contractors involved in the Project’s execution, the Traffic Manager’s role within the TMF framework ensures a robust and integrated approach to managing temporary traffic measures. Moreover, the Traffic Manager acts as a single point of contact and adopts an integrated approach to address the specific traffic management requirements of each contractor involved in the works. More detailed information on the Traffic Manager’s role can be found in paragraphs 3.3.14–3.3.19 of the oTMPfC’.</i></p> <p>At a meeting on 12 October 2023, the Applicant reiterated the confirmation above</p>	<p>Havering [REP2-060]</p> <p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			<p>that it was responsible for all work related to construction of the Project, including utilities and their suppliers carrying out project work.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.</p>		
<p>Worker transport</p> <p>FCTP technical details</p>	<p>2.1.64</p>	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering welcomed the TPLG concept and the FCTP's mention of behaviour change, but queried a number of details of the operation of the overall FCTP with the Applicant including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the FCTP does indicate that each site compound will have a contractor developed Travel Plan (TP) there is no recognition that personnel may move between sites during the working day. Alternatively, if this type of movement is not going to occur, the FCTP does not make that clear • The FCTP identifies its key theme as minimising adverse traffic. It however suggests only that “behavioural change” will be explored. It is clear that changing travel behaviour of the workforce will be an essential element of the management of construction traffic impacts and therefore would 	<p>The Applicant provided a number of answers including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new section has been added at the end of Section 5.4 which set out details around inter compound movements for the workforce. It is expected that the level of demand for inter compound movements would be minimal. The workforce would generally attend the compound associated with their worksite and travel along the haul road where movements are required. • As set out in paragraph 7.1.4, the Project-wide targets within the FCTP have been categorised as changing the modal split (e.g. higher proportion journeys by bicycle) and travel behaviour (e.g. reducing the need for travel). This sets out the high-level aspirations for the SSTP targets, which will be refined as appropriate for each construction area and 	<p>Framework Construction Travel Plan [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p> <p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>appear to be an essential element of the FCTP rather than “something to be explored”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifications around Public Right of Way interfaces, relevance of bus routes, terminology, application of coordinators to contractors or sites, worker catchments and accommodation <p>At a meeting on 16 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed. However, it wished to record that it would be important to monitor the inter-peak travel between sites and would continue to engage with the Applicant regarding potential construction traffic monitoring locations.</p>	<p>compound, to be developed further as ‘SMART’ targets. Targets categorised as 'Influencing travel behaviour' have been identified as reducing the distance and need to travel. While this has been developed as much as possible (for example through the provision of worker accommodation, trip consolidation and reduced travel to the enterprise office) the extent to which this can be rolled out is still relatively constrained given the type of work and activity required onsite at the compound locations. Therefore, the main focus for the target categories falls under 'changing the forecast modal split'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple changes and clarifications were relayed to the Borough on 25 May 2022 addressing the FCTP. <p>At a meeting on 12 October 2023, the Applicant referred back to the answers above and noted that the oTMPfC governs the management of Public Rights of Way during construction. Bus information is focused on hubs, but the SSTPs will go further to cover what is at the "front door" of each compound. Each SSTP would have a coordinator. The Worker Accommodation Working Group (WAWG) would cover accommodation matters.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.		
<p>Worker transport</p> <p>Hierarchy of interventions in the FCTP</p>	2.1.65	<p>In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that where the FCTP and site-specific measures are described in para 3.2.11 no attempt is made to provide or commit to establishing a hierarchy of interventions. It is clear that single occupancy car travel could be one of two bands – either it attracts the most attention because the travel plan is designed to reduce this to the lowest level possible or conversely it could be the area in which the lowest effort is directed due to aggressive pursuit of the other activities which reduce car travel to the highest degree possible. The FCTP needs to make this distinction.</p> <p>At a meeting on 12 October 2023, the Council noted concern about the achievability of aspirations in the FCTP.</p> <p>At a meeting on 16 November 2023, the Council advised that it would reserve its position pending confirmation of whether the FCTP has targets for multi-modal transport or intent to develop them as part of the SSTPs.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that this matter cannot be</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.2.12 of the Framework Construction Travel Plan sets out the broad categories which have been considered suitable for the Project at this stage. These are further set out in Chapter 8 under a tiered system, in line with the size and existing levels of accessibility and location of a particular compound. This method has been applied to take into account the measures that would be possible to successfully implement at each construction area or compound. Section 7.2 states that targets with regard to reducing single occupancy vehicle trips would seek to increase the share of multiple-occupancy car trips made to construction areas and compounds, through car-sharing incentives. In turn, this will be supported through the provision and promotion of public transport, workforce transport, and walking/ cycling to increase the number of trips made using sustainable modes.</p> <p>At the meeting on 12 October 2023, the Applicant referred back to information provided about tiering of measures and the expectation that some roles may not even require travel (e.g. hybrid working). The</p>	<p>Framework Construction Travel Plan [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p> <p>Code of Construction Practice [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		agreed because it believes there remains a lack of sufficient certainty and targets in the FCTP.	<p>Applicant is confident that the interventions now adopted and the Terms of Reference for the TPLG and revised CoCP demonstrate that aspirations are reasonable. It was emphasised that the FCTP contains measures to review and escalate issues and did not create a "closed shop" process.</p> <p>Regarding multi-modal targets, the Applicant would direct the Council to paragraph 7.1.5 of the FCTP which list aspirations around which targets would be set, as set out in paragraph 7.1.4. Aspirations B, C, D and E have relevance to multi-modal transport. As the document explains, this is deemed an appropriate approach at this stage. Paragraphs 7.1.2 and 7.1.7 explain the constraints on setting targets at this stage.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		
<p>Cross-river WCH and sustainable travel</p> <p>Cross river walking,</p>	2.1.66	In its response to the 2018 Statutory Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that strategic transport improvements will be required, including better north/south public transport connectivity.	The Project provides additional connectivity, including for public transport, for north south movements across the Thames, including at the Dartford Crossing, which is forecast to see journey time reliability increase, and journey times reduce as a result of the Project.	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
cycling and public transport opportunities		The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.	It should be noted that the Applicant has also set up a Sustainable Transport Working Group involving local authority stakeholders to investigate sustainable travel and cross-river connectivity enhancements that could be delivered in future to complement the Project. The Group has proposed several local priorities and opportunities for feasibility studies for future funding applications (as stated in the Sustainable Transport Complementary Measures report of March 2021). Should the Project gain consent, the Applicant will also use the STWG up until opening as a forum to engage Local Authorities and operators to build awareness and develop improvements to existing commercial services and potential new services to make best use of the opportunities provided by the new crossing. The Applicant considers that supporting this collaboration between Local Authorities on both sides of the Thames is the most effective and sustainable solution.		
WCH/active travel – design Request for WCH bridge	2.1.67	In its response to the 2021 Community Impacts Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted the proposals for pedestrians and cyclists to navigate junction 29 of the M25 on the northern side rather than the southern side of the	Following stakeholder feedback and a review of the proposed WCH provision, the Applicant has added a WCH bridge west of junction 29, connecting the A127 carriageway footways between Moor Lane and Folkes Lane to the Project. This was consulted on in the 2022 Local Refinement	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
west of M25 junction 29		<p>junction which was originally proposed as part of the Supplementary Consultation. The Borough had concerns that it will remain very challenging for residents to access this new route from the southern side of the A127 Carriageway as it can only be accessed by an uncontrolled crossing point at the Front Lane junction with the A127. It requested that the Order Limits are extended westwards to allow for the provision of a safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. It should be noted that cyclists can access NCN 136 from the A127 at the junction with Hall Lane and it is important that this route remains accessible for cyclists once the Project becomes operational.</p>	<p>Consultation and the Applicant notes that the Borough "fully supports" and "welcomes" the proposed bridge.</p>		
<p>WCH/active travel – design</p> <p>Closure of uncontrolled crossing west of M25 junction 29</p>	2.1.68	<p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that with a new bridge in place over the A127 at Front Lane/Moor Lane, this will negate the need for the uncontrolled crossing point that exists at the junction of the A127 with Front Lane. This is regarded as an extremely dangerous crossing point for pedestrians (a collision between a car and a gas main recently occurred at this junction) which the Council believes should be “stopped up” as part of the creation of the new crossing point further east. The Applicant is strongly</p>	<p>The Project has provided an alternative safe crossing provision for all WCH. The decision to stop-up the existing uncontrolled staggered shared use crossing is not considered to be a decision for the Applicant to take because the Project's proposed bridge improves the current offer in terms of safety and access regardless of whether other crossings exist. This would need to be led by London Borough of Havering engaging with Transport for London as the highway authority responsible for the crossing. The Applicant has advised London Borough of</p>	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>encouraged to work with Transport for London to ensure this can be delivered as part of the Project.</p> <p>The Council is strongly of the view that the Order Limits should be significantly extended further west along the A127 in order to accommodate this “stopping up” of the uncontrolled crossing point at the junction of the A127 and Front Lane, which is a natural desire line for WCH users.</p>	<p>Havering that Transport for London have raised initial concerns about unintended consequences (e.g. jumping the barriers unpredictably to maintain the existing desire line) should this crossing be closed. There are no plans to close this crossing.</p>		
<p>WCH/active travel – design</p> <p>Location of WCH bridge west of M25 junction 29</p>	<p>2.1.69</p>	<p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that whilst a safe crossing of the A127 is clearly welcome, it has previously brought to the attention of the Applicant that it would be more desirable for such a crossing to be located at the junction of the A127 and Front Lane which is considered a more natural desire line for WCH users.</p> <p>It was noted that the Applicant has indicated that the proposed location has been chosen as a result of discussions with horse riders, land take matters, utilities investigations and desire line. However the Council has previously requested a note setting out the rationale for the crossing location in further detail, and this is yet to be received. It also suggested that this rationale should have been included as part of the consultation material so that</p>	<p>A note summarising the optioneering of the proposed crossing of the A127, to the west of the M25 junction 29 has been shared with Havering following the consultation, on 1 July 2022. This outlined why the crossing was needed, the selection process for its location and why a grade separated crossing is proposed at that location rather than at the A127 junction with Front Lane. There are no plans to change the bridge location.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>residents could understand the reasoning for it. It is disappointing that this has not taken place.</p> <p>As a result, Havering requests that the crossing is located at the junction of A127 and Front Lane.</p> <p>On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>			
<p>WCH/active travel – design</p> <p>Approaches to WCH bridge west of M25 junction 29</p>	<p>2.1.70 RRE</p>	<p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering noted that whilst the footbridge allows safe access across the A127 itself, it remains concerned that the approach paths leading up to the proposed bridge remain in an unsuitable condition for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. The Council would like to see the Project include proposals to improve Moor Lane and Folkes Lane, which is necessary if they are to accommodate significant numbers of WCH users and connect the existing off-road paths. Further details have been supplied to the Applicant.</p> <p>Notwithstanding its separate request for the bridge to be moved, the Council considers that the Order Limits should be extended further north at the junction of Folkes Lane/A127 to accommodate a section of Folkes Lane where improvements need to be made. Equally,</p>	<p>The Applicant proposes to provide a safe crossing for WCH across the A127 in light of the necessary changes needed at M25 junction 29 in order to maintain connectivity, and provide for the north-south desire line whilst not unduly impacting on WCH journey time. This connects to the existing shared use cycle/footway routes along the A127, and access to Moor Lane and Folkes Lane. It is noted that improvements to Moor Lane and Folkes Lane may be needed to upgrade existing WCH provision. However, although improvements may be achievable on Moor Lane, this may not necessarily be the case for Folkes Lane, due to factors including the narrow road and overlapping properties. The Applicant has investigated the opportunity to include these as part of designated funding whereby a feasibility study was needed to assess potential improvements to these existing WCH routes, for implementation prior to the</p>	<p>Health and Equalities Impact Assessment [REP7-144]</p> <p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p> <p>Deadline 6 Submission - Written summary of oral comments made at Issue Specific Hearings 8, 9 and 10 [REP6-145]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>they should be extended further south at the junction of A127/Moor Lane so that similar improvements can be made.</p> <p>The Council reiterated this issue in its PADS Tracker and Relevant Representation. On this basis, Havering cannot fully support the statement that the Applicant states that the proposed scheme is compliant with the National Policy Statement for National Networks on this matter.</p> <p>The Council restated its position in its WR and LIR.</p> <p>During the meeting on 1/9/23, the Council raised a variety of concerns about the viability and risks of accepting provision of improvements to the approaches to the A127 Folkes Lane bridge through the designated funds process. On principle, the Council indicated it would be unable to proceed on this basis and requested that the proposal be delivered as part of the Project and secured through the DCO.</p> <p>The Council presented its concerns at the examination hearings, notably Issue Specific Hearing 10, for which it gave a written summary:</p> <p><i>“The Council has held discussions with the Applicant on this over a number of months and welcomes the initial feasibility work</i></p>	<p>Project opening. The study started and a workshop was held with the Council on 8 March 2023 to take feedback on the initial proposals, including an off-road WCH route parallel to Folkes Lane.</p> <p>In its response to the Council’s LIR, the Applicant added that <i>‘the assessment of traffic-related severance is presented in Section 7.3 of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment [APP-539] for both construction and operational phases of the Project. No specific locations have been identified within London Borough of Havering where additional mitigation is considered necessary. Section 7.5 relates specifically to active travel and the PRow that would be affected during construction and operation phases. Key points to note in paragraph 7.5.17 include that the impact on footpaths (including roadside footways), cycleways and bridleway links along the route of the Project has been reduced, in so far as reasonably practicable, through the design process; and that the general approach to mitigation includes constructing new PRowS before closing any existing PRowS, where reasonably practicable.’</i></p> <p>A brief discussion of the study findings was held at a meeting on 25 August 2023 and in detail on 1 September 2023. The</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p><i>that the Applicant has undertaken. This feasibility work has looked at the potential for a dedicated NMU route but has now indicated to Havering that should the Council wish to progress the project further, an application through Designated Funds would have to be submitted. The Applicant has indicated that the route would not be delivered as part of the LTC project.</i></p> <p><i>The Council is of the view that, given the new footbridge is being implemented to mitigate the impact of the LTC project, the NMU route should be installed as part of the project.</i></p> <p><i>The Council considers Folkes Lane to not be suitable for a significant increase in NMUs.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant's own feasibility work has indicated that the 85 percentile for the road is 41mph in a 30 mph road and 21% of vehicles are Goods vehicles."</i></p> <p>The Council concurs with the Applicant that this matter cannot be agreed due to the position taken by the Applicant to exclude the requested work from the Project.</p>	<p>Applicant noted that as stated in the LIR, improvements to the approaches to the A127 Folkes Lane bridge had not been identified as mitigation required for policy compliance and will not form part of the Project to be secured by the DCO. Designated funds are the only funding method that the Applicant can offer to enable such work.</p> <p>The Applicant has noted the points raised during the examination hearings and has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed due to the differing positions taken.</p>		
WCH/active travel – design	2.1.71	<p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering welcomed the announcement earlier in the year by the Applicant</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant appreciates the Borough's engagement.</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
WCH strategy		<p>concerning proposed connections for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders along the Project route.</p> <p>It noted that Officers have been in discussions with the Applicant concerning the feasibility of a new cycle route between Upminster and Brentwood. The Borough is pleased that designated funds have been allocated to commission a feasibility study into this route and looks forward to working with the appointed consultant as this study develops.</p>			
<p>Lighting</p> <p>Design of bridge between Dennis Road and Footpath 252</p>	2.1.72	<p>At 2018 Statutory Consultation, London Borough of Havering requested sufficient time to review the final design for the proposed new footbridge between Dennis Road in Thurrock and Public Footpath 252 in Havering, with appropriate illumination/lighting prior to submission of the DCO.</p> <p>At a meeting on 16 November 2023, the Council noted the reasons for the decision not to light the bridge but considered this did not encourage year-round use or use other than for leisure. It stated that consideration should be given to the adoption of modern wildlife-friendly alternative options such as illuminated surface markings and low level lighting. It concurs with the Applicant that this matter</p>	<p>The bridge is at a relatively early design stage. It was noted that lighting may not be relevant given the very rural location.</p> <p>At a meeting on 9 November 2023, the Applicant confirmed that the bridges at this location, in common with similar bridges on the project and other rural footpaths, will not be illuminated. However, ducts will be provided to allow for any future cabling by others. The Applicant notes that additional design challenges would apply to any lights applied to the bridge spanning railway.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's views on lighting alternatives. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so has concluded that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		cannot be agreed due to the position taken by the Applicant.			
<p>WCH impacts during and after construction</p> <p>WCH impacts during and after construction</p>	2.1.73	<p>In its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, London Borough of Havering requested further information showing the specific impacts on Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) for Havering. The Applicant has agreed to provide quantitative analysis on routes that are being permanently closed, diverted and new routes created. The Council looks forward to receiving this information.</p> <p>The Council provided detailed observations regarding WCH and Design matters in its LIR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 30 November 2023, the Council noted and welcomed the responses provided to date. However, it advised that a number of concerns remained such as the duration and commencement of PRoW closures, and the timing of alternative routes opening for use, which are sometimes after the closure could have started. Therefore the Council advised that this matter cannot be agreed, but it would welcome further dialogue regarding this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided listings of these impacts with accompanying maps on 8 August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant compiled detailed responses for the issues raised in the LIR and shared these on 15 September 2023. This was followed by discussion in a technical meeting with construction and WCH specialists on 9 November 2023. A further meeting was held on 10 November 2023 to discuss construction issues at which further information was shared, followed by additional background notes issued on 21 November 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed. The Applicant welcomes the opportunity to continue dialogue regarding this matter.</p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p>	Matter Not Agreed
Project design and mitigation	2.1.80	In its Relevant Representation and PADS Tracker, the London Borough of Havering stated that the Section 106 Heads of	The Applicant provided draft Heads of Terms for comment on 23 September 2022 and provided a detailed update to the	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Section 106 request for overall mitigation	RRN	<p>Terms document does not give the Council surety that the Applicant can satisfactorily manage the impacts of the scheme, and offers very little recompense to Havering residents for the disruption during construction.</p> <p>The Council repeated its requests for improved surety of mitigation in its LIR and WR.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council reported that due to the differences between the level of mitigations requested and what had been offered by the Applicant in the form of a Section 106 agreement or changes to DCO commitments, this matter could not be agreed.</p>	<p>Council's response of 26 October 2022 at a meeting on 21 February 2023.</p> <p>With regard to the Council’s comments that it remains concerned about the impacts of the Project, the need for mitigation and surety provided by the Section 106 Heads of Terms in this regard, it should be noted that the mitigation referred to in the Environmental Statement is secured directly through the legally binding Requirements of the DCO rather than a Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) presented within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), sets out the mitigation measures arising from the environmental impact assessment process. The delivery of these measures would be legally secured under Requirement 4 of Schedule 2 to the DCO.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the mitigations already proposed and secured as referenced above, the Applicant will continue to consider the justification for any additional measures proposed by the Council during negotiations, to be secured through a Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant believed that this was potentially a matter agreed in respect to the explanation of the essential mitigation secured by the DCO Requirements and</p>	<p>Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)] Section 106 Agreements - Heads of Terms [REP4-144]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			control documents, and that specific requests are considered individually elsewhere in this SOCG. The Applicant notes the difference between what it has offered and the Council's expectations. The Applicant stands by its existing position, so concurs with the Council that this matter cannot be agreed.		
Road drainage and water environment					
Assessment methodology Sequential and Exception Test	2.1.91 DL1	In its report in advance of a meeting with the Applicant on 2/3/23, the Council raised queries about elements of the Flood Risk Assessment including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for the Sequential and Exception Test to consider all other sources of flooding following changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in July 2021. Certain paragraphs also appear not to be referenced. Incorrect references to the London Borough of Havering Lead Local Flooding Authority acting as such for Brentwood Borough Council when this is not the case The Flood Risk Assessment states that no flood defences are present within the section of the scheme within 	At the meeting with the Council on 2 March 2023 and in the follow-up notes, the Applicant addressed the concerns as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that groundwater and surface water sources are assessed within the Flood Risk Assessment, groundwater flood risk is limited, and surface water risks vary. An explanation was provided as to how the NPPF is reflected. Erroneous references to Brentwood Borough have been identified for correction. Amendments are to be made to recognise "no formal flood defences". The corrections will be made in errata or document changes as appropriate.	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Havering. Whilst there are no formal flood defences (defined by the Environment Agency), de facto flood defences are likely to be present.</p> <p>The Council confirmed the matter was agreed in an email on 4 October 2023.</p>			
<p>Project design and mitigation</p> <p>Surface water flood risk</p>	<p>2.1.92</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>In a meeting with the Applicant on 2/3/23, the Council raised concerns about a specific watercourse (DI-1N14ZZZ2) that had been scoped out of the hydromorphology assessment. The Council recommended the ditch diversion should be given further consideration to minimise culverting and ensure changes to the gradient to not cause increase flooding or maintenance burdens.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council repeated its observation that <i>"watercourse DI-1N14ZZZ2: New diversion and culvert (on Sheet 42 of the drainage plans) has been scoped out of the hydro morphology assessment. This is likely to be acceptable considering the characteristics of the ditch. However, the watercourse diversion should be given further consideration to minimise culverting and ensure changes to the gradient do not cause increase flooding or maintenance burdens."</i></p>	<p>At the meeting on 2 March 2023 and in the follow-up notes, the Applicant confirmed that further topographical surveys are being undertaken to verify the watercourse diversion. Results will be shared with the Council.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant confirmed that <i>'further consideration is being given to the diversion of watercourse DI-1N14ZZZ2. Topographical surveys of the watercourse are being undertaken to verify the watercourse diversion design'</i>.</p> <p>At a meeting on 30 November 2023, the Applicant confirmed that it is undertaking further investigations and topographic surveys are largely complete, but it is still awaiting access to the Network Rail land in order to survey the existing culvert. This information would be used to inform the detailed design of the watercourse diversion.</p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>On 29 November 2023, the Council advised that it had been expecting the Applicant to review the design of the culvert and determine whether a more sympathetic design could be achieved, while also reporting the outcome of the topographic survey. At a meeting on 30 November 2023 it acknowledged the explanation provided by the Applicant to date but confirmed that as more detail on the proposed solution and topographic survey would not be available at the time of concluding the SOCG, this matter cannot be agreed. The Council welcomes the opportunity to review more details when they become available.</p>	<p>The DCO design has provision for a watercourse diversion which seeks to maintain the existing east to west flow path. The diversion channel has been designed as a mixture of open channel and pipe/culvert. Unfortunately, due to the requirement for the proposed Project alignment to cross beneath the M25, and the nature of the surrounding topography, a culvert/piped solution must remain the reasonable worst case within the DCO application. In parallel, the Project is working with the landowner to ensure the interlinked irrigation requirements for Manor Farm are met in line with REAC commitment RDWE016. The Applicant will strive to reduce the amount of culverting/piping post-consent during the detailed design phase but an optimum solution cannot be presented until holistic design has been undertaken.</p> <p>The Applicant is keen to supply outcomes from the topographic survey and design efforts as soon as practicable, but these were not available at the time of concluding the SOCG, so it concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
<p>Assessment of likely significant effects</p> <p>Groundwater flood risk</p>	<p>2.1.93</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>In its report in advance of a meeting with the Applicant on 2/3/23, the Council noted '<i>Consideration of groundwater flood risk is considered reasonable</i>'.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Matter Agreed</p>
<p>Project design and mitigation</p> <p>Surface water drainage</p>	<p>2.1.94</p> <p>DL1</p>	<p>In its report in advance of a meeting with the Applicant on 2/3/23, the Council raised queries about surface water drainage including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> '[The] <i>proposed minimum discharge rate of 1l/s is considered to be too low and could increase the risk of blockages. Further consideration should be given to whether the discharge rate is appropriate or whether mitigation measures are required to manage the blockage risk.</i>' '<i>It is proposed that the basins are designed for the 100 year + 20% climate change event with a sensitivity check for the 40% climate change event. However, based on the lifetime of the scheme, the basins should be designed for the 100 year + 40% climate change rather than using this as a sensitivity test.</i>' 	<p>At the meeting with the Council on 2 March 2023 and in the follow-up notes, the Applicant addressed the queries as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was explained that recent technical innovations mean this can be kept lower and 1l/s remains adequate The drainage design was to the standard at the time of 100 year + 20% uplift for climate change. There was an update to the climate change guidelines in May 2022, which recommended an allowance of 40%. This rainstorm has been simulated and the design tested to check the capacity of the retention ponds and basins. Notes of the simulation were shared. <p>Several minor clarifications were also provided in the meeting.</p> <p>In its response to the Council's LIR, the Applicant acknowledged the work</p>	<p>Comments on LIRs - Appendix F - London Borough of Havering [REP2-060]</p> <p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>At the meeting, the Council confirmed it was broadly satisfied with the discharge rates following the explanation provided.</p> <p>In its LIR, the Council acknowledged that "the Applicant has confirmed that the basins have been re-designed to manage the 100 year + 45% climate change, in accordance with the latest guidance." However, it restated its concern about the 1l/s discharge rate being considered too low.</p> <p>On 29 November 2023, the Council advised that it required the latest drainage calculations for the revised climate change allowances to be in a position to agree this matter was fully resolved. At a meeting on 30 November 2023 it acknowledged the explanation provided by the Applicant to date but confirmed that as the supporting data would not be available at the time of concluding the SOCG, this matter cannot be agreed. The Council welcomes the opportunity to review the data when it becomes available.</p>	<p>undertaken regarding the 100 year + 45% climate change design:</p> <p><i>'The drainage design was undertaken to accommodate the climate change recommendation applicable at that time (a 20% uplift in rainfall intensity on the 1 in 100 year storm). There was an update to the climate change guidelines in May 2022, which recommended an allowance of 40% to 45% uplift in rainfall intensity to the 1 in 100 year storm. These rainstorms have been simulated and the drainage design tested to check the capacity of the retention ponds and basins. The modelling results demonstrate that all of the drainage ponds have sufficient capacity to accommodate the runoff generated without overtopping.'</i></p> <p>However it noted that <i>'with regard to the proposed minimum discharge rate to surface watercourses from the highway drainage system recent technical innovations mean this can be achieved without risk of blockages. The discharge rates proposed are in accordance with local planning policy requirements to limit discharges of runoff from new areas of impermeable land cover to the 1 in 1 year greenfield rate or 1l/s (whichever is higher).'</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			At a meeting on 30 November 2023, the Applicant confirmed that there has been no update to the drainage calculations since the DCO application submission. The climate change resilience within the drainage design remains as per the previously shared information. Requirement 8 of the draft DCO requires SoS sign off of the detailed drainage scheme following consultation with the relevant planning / flood risk management authority. The Applicant is keen to supply calculations for the revised climate change allowances as soon as practicable, but these were not available at the time of concluding the SOCG, so it concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.		
Project design and mitigation Pollution	2.1.95 DL1	In its report in advance of a meeting with the Applicant on 2/3/23, the Council noted <i>'The risk of increased pollution from both routine runoff and accidental spillage has been considered and mitigation proposals are general considered to be appropriate.'</i>	Noted.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Climate					
Project design and mitigation Section 106 request for	2.1.83 DL1	Following consideration of the draft Section 106 Heads of Terms shared on 23/9/22, London Borough of Havering requested mitigation in the form of contributions towards meeting carbon targets in Havering's Climate Change Action Plan.	The Applicant considered a variety of options to address the Council's requests and provided a detailed update at a meeting on 21 February 2023. Section 106 discussions resumed at a meeting on 25 August 2023.	Appendix E, Carbon and Energy Management Plan [Document]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
Borough carbon target funding		<p>At a meeting on 16 October 2023, the Council stated that the continued relevance of this request was under review.</p> <p>At a meeting on 21 November 2023, the Council confirmed this matter was resolved and agreed because it elected not to pursue this request in the latest Section 106 discussions. The Council has, however, provided separate comments on the Applicant's Carbon and Energy Management Plan and the proposals contained therein.</p>	The Applicant notes the Council's satisfaction that this matter is resolved and agreed.	Reference 7.19 (4)]	
Protective Provisions					
<p>Drainage</p> <p>Protective provisions: drainage and flooding</p>	2.1.74	<p>London Borough of Havering requested suitable protective provisions for drainage and flooding, including liabilities and maintenance responsibilities, to be established in the DCO and confidence that this will be fulfilled.</p> <p>In its report in advance of a meeting with the Applicant on 2/3/23, the Council noted "Maintenance of drainage features would be carried out in accordance with DMRB and the maintenance schedule is robust. It is also proposed that a specific maintenance plan for the scheme would be worked up as part of the design. Highways England would be obliged to carry out maintenance in accordance with DMRB and the maintenance plan. If there is a</p>	At a meeting on 15 February 2022, London Borough of Havering clarified their concerns and the Applicant noted that the DCO wording had been revised and improved. The Applicant shared the draft Schedule 14 wording and, as noted by London Borough of Havering in its response to the 2022 Local Refinement Consultation, is awaiting the opinion of London Borough of Havering's legal team before a meeting can be scheduled to determine if the wording gives sufficient confidence. Draft DCO Schedule 14 was shared in August 2022 to further assist London Borough of Havering, plus Part 7 of the Flood Risk Assessment and a	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.6: Flood Risk Assessment Part 7 [APP-466]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>concern that this would not be done then Havering could request annual submissions of maintenance activities completed, against the maintenance plan. This would require additional resources from Havering, however." At the meeting the Council acknowledged any resourcing support would be linked to wider section 106 requests.</p> <p>The Council reiterated the request for suitable protective provisions in its Relevant Representation. On 14/5/23, the Council advised that it considered the matter resolved.</p>	<p>summary of the drainage commitments on 13 September 2022.</p> <p>At a meeting with the Council on 2 March 2023, it was confirmed that a REAC commitment secures the maintenance requirements schedule referenced by the Council in its report.</p>		
Assets Protective provisions: other maintenance	2.1.75	At a meeting on 15/2/22, London Borough of Havering requested clarity on the maintenance liability for the new WCH bridge to be built over the A127 at Moor Lane/Folkes Lane and technical engagement with the highways team regarding its installation and commissioning.	The Applicant has confirmed that TfL would be responsible for the bridge owing to its position across their highway. Full highways technical engagement will take place between the Applicant, TfL and London Borough of Havering when the development process reaches appropriate maturity.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Assets Protective provisions: highways and new structures	2.1.76 RRN	The London Borough of Havering has a number of concerns regarding the current drafting of the draft Development Consent Order. The document lacks any Protective Provisions for Havering in terms of maintenance of new structures (Part 3 Streets, Article 10 subsection 5). The Council would wish to see Protective	<p>The Applicant introduced a draft side agreement at a meeting on 5 December 2022 and has considered the detailed comments provided by the Council on 5 March 2023 regarding its content.</p> <p>The Applicant's initial position was that the proposed DCO already provides protection for local highway authorities (LHAs),</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>Joint Local Highway Authority</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>Provisions drawn up for the protection of the Local Highway Authority regarding vehicular and non-vehicular highways.</p> <p>The current side agreement drafted by the applicant does not provide the surety that local highways will be protected. It is noted that the applicant does not wish to see this side agreement scrutinised by the Examining Authority. The Council believes that this is an inappropriate approach.</p> <p>At Examination deadline 1, the Council advised that <i>"There is precedence for such protective provisions, such as those included in The A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Development Consent Order 2021. That is a DCO applied for by NH which included protective provisions in favour of the local highway authority (Somerset County Council) both in respect of vehicular and non-vehicular highways. A side agreement has been the subject of discussion with NH which contains some of the protective provisions required but not all of them."</i></p> <p>The Council supplied a set of draft protective provisions at examination deadline 2, having previously shared these with the Applicant and other local highway authorities (LHAs).</p>	<p>including London Borough of Havering, by including approval powers and maintenance functions directly within the works powers – for example see Articles 9 and 10 of the draft DCO. These provisions make a discrete set of protective provisions unnecessary. Statutory undertakers do not have those protections directly built into the order powers so do need separate protection. The draft DCO then enables the Applicant and the LHAs to enter into agreements fleshing out the protections within the Order. A side agreement is a more appropriate and suitable instrument and the best place to deal with the detail to address specific circumstances in respect of different LHAs. Given that side agreements may contain terms that are bespoke to the LHA concerned and some of which may give rise to commercial sensitivities, it is appropriate and necessary to keep the contents and terms of the agreements confidential. The existence of the proposed agreement and the status of negotiations is not confidential and can be disclosed to the ExA. During the examination LBH could also raise matters which are not covered by the agreement, which they think should be provided by the Applicant. This approach struck the right balance, in the Applicant's</p>	<p>Response to Applicant's Deadline 4 Submission REP4-094 [REP6-142]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant’s Response	Application Document Reference	Status
		<p>The Council reiterated its position in its WR.</p> <p>In its examination deadline 6 submission, Joint Local Highway Authority Response to Applicant's Deadline 4 Submission REP4-094, the Council submitted proposals for further variations felt necessary by the Local Highway Authorities.</p> <p>At a meeting on 29 November 2023, the Council advised that this matter cannot be agreed due to the Applicant’s protective provisions not including all the provisions set out in the joint response. The Council will submit a further joint reply on this matter at examination deadline 8.</p>	<p>view, between transparency of the examination process and any commercial sensitivity of third-party negotiations.</p> <p>The Applicant did consider that the proposed side agreement provided sufficient and appropriate protection for the local highway network and proposed to continue to engage with LBH in respect of the proposed side agreement in an attempt to resolve any outstanding concerns.</p> <p>At Issue Specific Hearings 3 & 7, the Applicant announced that, following feedback from LHAs including LBH and to ensure that the ExA had sight of the Applicant’s view on LBH’s preferred set of protective provisions, it would be inserting protective provisions for the benefit of LHAs into the draft DCO. These will include a mechanism for design input, the provision of detailed information, a requirement to remedy defects in a 12-month period, plus others relating to road safety and the transfer of land. The Applicant supplied its protective provisions at examination deadline 4. The Applicant supplied further revised protective provisions with the draft DCO at examination deadline 7. These notably cover the provisions originally intended to form part of a side agreement, which the</p>		

Topic	Item No.	London Borough of Havering Comment	The Applicant's Response	Application Document Reference	Status
			Applicant believes will no longer be necessary for these purposes. The Applicant notes the Council's comments and stands by its existing position, so concurs that this matter cannot be agreed.		

Appendix A Engagement activity

Table A.1 Engagement activities between the Applicant and London Borough of Havering since the DCO application was submitted on 31 October 2022

Date	Overview of engagement activities
2 November 2022 to 30 November 2023 (21 instances)	Regular approx. fortnightly meetings to discuss general progress and selected SoCG issues. Including 21 February 2023 section 106 requests discussion.
14 and 16 November 2022	DCO Briefing
14 November 2022	Schools engagement meeting to resolve SoCG matters
25 November 2022	Ecology and biodiversity briefing for local authorities
16 January 2023	Traffic modelling meeting to resolve SoCG matters
3 February 2023	Landscape & visual meeting to resolve SoCG matters
7 February 2023	Meeting with council Leader, cabinet members and officers including discussion of Ockendon Road closure
20 February 2023	Cultural heritage meeting to resolve SoCG matters
23 February 2023	Material assets and waste meeting to resolve SoCG matters
23 February 2023	Land and property meeting to resolve SoCG matters
2 March 2023	Flooding and drainage meeting to resolve SoCG matters
3 May 2023	Flooding and drainage meeting notes email including additional information, to resolve SoCG matters
17 May 2023	Skills, education and employment meeting to resolve SoCG matters
17 May 2023	Construction multi-disciplinary meeting to resolve SoCG matters including impacts at North Ockendon
19 May 2023	Multi-site visit to resolve SoCG matters including construction impacts on Ockendon Road, South Essex Crematorium, schools and concerns about access to Folkes Lane woodland
15 June 2023	Land and property meeting to resolve SoCG matters
20 June 2023	Noise and vibration meeting to resolve SoCG matters
3 July 2023	Built heritage meeting to resolve SoCG matters
21 July 2023	DCO and side agreement meeting to resolve SoCG matters
25 August 2023	Section 106 meeting to review heads of terms
1 September 2023	Designated funds meeting to resolve SoCG matters
27 September 2023	Meeting to introduce the council Leader, cabinet members and officers to the Contractor's senior leadership
12 October 2023	Framework construction travel plan meeting to resolve SoCG matters
20 October 2023	Section 106 meeting to review heads of terms
27 October 2023	Section 106 meeting to review heads of terms

Date	Overview of engagement activities
27 October 2023	Cultural heritage meeting to resolve SoCG matters
27 October 2023	Built heritage meeting to resolve SoCG matters
31 October 2023	Noise & vibration and air quality meeting to resolve SoCG matters
3 November 2023	Section 106 meeting to review heads of terms
9 November 2023	WCH design and construction impacts meeting to resolve SoCG matters
10 November 2023	Construction impacts meeting to resolve SoCG matters
27 November 2023	Section 106 meeting to review heads of terms
30 November 2023	Flooding and drainage meeting to resolve SoCG matters

Appendix B Glossary

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Department of Transport	DfT	The government department responsible for the English transport network and a limited number of transport matters in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland that have not been devolved.
Design Manual for Roads and Bridges	DMRB	A comprehensive manual which contains 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 the highway authority. For the A122 Lower Thames Crossing, the Overseeing Organisation is National Highways.
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'.
Electric Vehicle	EV	Electric vehicles are vehicles that are either partially or fully powered on electric power.
Environment Agency	EA	A non-departmental public body of Defra, established under the Environment Act 1995. It is the leading public body for protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales. The organisation is responsible for wide-ranging matters, including the management of all forms of flood risk, water resources, water quality, waste regulation, pollution control, inland fisheries, recreation, conservation and navigation of inland waterways.
Environmental Impact Assessment	EIA	A process by which information about environmental effects of a proposed development is collected, assessed and used to inform decision making. For certain projects, EIA is a statutory requirement, reported an Environmental Statement.
Environmental Management Plan	EMP	For the Project, a plan setting out the conclusions and actions needed to manage environmental effects as defined by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standard LA 120. The CoCP is the equivalent of the first iteration of the EMP (EMP1). The contractor's EMP would be EMP2 and the end of construction EMP would be EMP3.
Environmental Management System	EMS	N/A
Environmental Statement	ES	A document produced to support an application for development consent that is subject to Environmental

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		Impact Assessment (EIA), which sets out the likely impacts on the environment arising from the proposed development.
Framework Construction Travel Plan	FCTP	A document which sets out a framework to reduce the impact of the Project's construction workforce on the road network as a result of travel to and from construction areas and compounds (including Utility Logistic Hubs). The FCTP sets out proposed ways in which this would be done, including by reducing single occupancy vehicle trips and encouraging sustainable and active travel.
Flood Risk Assessment	FRA	An assessment of the risk of flooding from all flooding mechanisms, the identification of flood mitigation measures, and identification of actions to be taken before and during a flood.
Footpath	FP	A footpath is a type of thoroughfare that is intended for use only by pedestrians and not other forms of traffic such as motorised vehicles, bicycles and horses. They can be found in a wide variety of places, from the centre of cities, to farmland, to mountain ridges.
Frequency	N/A	Sound consists of vibrations transmitted to the ear as rapid variations in air pressure. The more rapid the variations in air pressure, the higher the frequency of the sound. Frequency is defined as the number of pressure fluctuations per second and is expressed in Hertz (Hz).
Greater London Authority	GLA	The Greater London Authority (GLA), colloquially known by the metonym "City Hall", is the devolved regional governance body of Greater London. It consists of two political branches: the executive Mayoralty (currently led by Sadiq Khan) and the 25-member London Assembly, which serves as a means of checks and balances on the former. Since May 2016, both branches have been under the control of the London Labour Party. The authority was established in 2000, following a local referendum, and derives most of its powers from the Greater London Authority Act 1999 and the Greater London Authority Act 2007.
Good practice	N/A	In the context of the Project, standard approaches and actions commonly used to avoid or reduce environmental impacts of infrastructure development. These are typically applicable across the whole Project.
Greenspace information for Greater London	GiGL	GiGL is a Community Interest Company that acts as the official custodian of environmental records for London boroughs and the City of London.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service	GLAAS	Part of Historic England's London Local Office, providing advice for the whole of Greater London, with the exception of the City of London and the London Borough of Southwark who have their own archaeological planning advisers.
Ground investigation	GI	Several levels of investigation from desk-based research to onsite sampling to evaluate challenges related to soil/ground.
Heavy Goods Vehicle	HGV	A large, heavy motor vehicle used for transporting cargo.
Heritage asset	N/A	A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
Highways Agency	HA	Precursor to Highways England. No longer exists but still mentioned in reference to previous projects or in older documents.
Highways England	HE	Former name of National Highways.
Historic England	N/A	The public body that looks after England's historic environment. An executive non-departmental public body of the UK Government sponsored by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, and the Government's advisor on heritage.
Joint Operations Forum	JOF	The JOF is an executive level forum made up of National Highways and its Contractors. National Highways will establish and chair a JOF, attended by senior representatives from the Contractors.
Landfill	N/A	A site for the disposal of waste materials.
Local plan	N/A	A Local Plan sets out local planning policies and identifies how land is used, determining what will be built where. Adopted Local Plans provide the framework for local development across England.
London Highway Assignment Model	LoHAM	A strategic model representing routeing and congestion of motorised highway trips using London's highway network.
Local Planning Authority	LPA	A local planning authority is the local authority or council that is empowered by law to exercise statutory town planning functions for a particular area of the UK. May also be referred to as 'local authority'.
Local Impact Report	LIR	A report in writing giving details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the local authority's area (or any part of that area).
Local Residents' Discount Scheme	LRDS	Accounts that offer discounts on road user charges but are subject to location-based eligibility criteria.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Local Road Network	LRN	The Local Road Network is that portion of the Road Network for which a Local Government is responsible and is eligible for funding from the State Government to operate and maintain.
Lower Thames Area Model	LTAM	Transport model designed to forecast impacts of providing additional road based capacity across the River Thames at locations at or east of the existing Dartford Crossing.
M25 junction 29	N/A	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.
M25 Motorway	M25	Orbital motorway that encircles most of Greater London.
Materials Management Plan	MMP	N/A
National Cycle Network	NCN	A series of traffic-free paths and quiet, on-road cycling and walking routes that connect to every major town and city.
National Grid Electricity Transmission	NGET	A UK company that builds and maintains the electricity transmission network in England and Wales.
Nitrogen dioxide	NO2	A reactive gas introduced into the environment by natural causes, including entry from the stratosphere, bacterial respiration, volcanos, and lightning. It is also introduced by the emissions of internal combustion engines burning fossil fuels.
National Policy Statement	NPS	There are 12 designated National Policy Statements (NPSs), setting out government policy on different types of national infrastructure development, including energy, transport, water and waste. NPSs provide the framework within which Examining Authorities make their recommendations to the Secretary of State.
National Policy Statement for National Networks	NPSNN	The NPSNN sets out the need for, and Government's policies to deliver, development of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects on the national road and rail networks in England. It provides planning guidance for promoters of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects on the road and rail networks, and the basis for the examination by the Examining Authority and decisions by the Secretary of State.
New Roads and Street Works Act 1991	NRSWA	N/A
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

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		extensions, major road projects, etc. that require a development consent under the Planning Act 2008.
Non-hazardous waste	N/A	Any waste not defined as 'hazardous' under the Hazardous Waste Directive (91/689/EEC).
Non-motorised user(s)	NMU	Users of non-motorised vehicles (eg cyclists, horse riders) and pedestrians
Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	oLEMP	A document which outlines the proposed management of the landscape and ecological elements of the A122 Lower Thames Crossing.
Outline Materials Handling Plan	oMHP	A document which sets out the approach and high-level principles for handling construction materials and waste on the Lower Thames Crossing Project, both inside and outside the Order Limits.
Outline Site Waste Management Plan	oSWMP	The Outline Site Waste Management Plan (oSWMP) sets out the overarching principles and procedures that would be applied for the management of waste during the construction phase of the Project.
Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction	oTMPfC	The outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) has been produced to provide an outline framework and principles that will be applied for the design and management of construction traffic management and transport logistics for the Lower Thames Crossing Project.
Open space	N/A	Open space is defined in section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 as 'any land laid out as a public garden, or used for the purposes of public recreation, or land being a disused burial ground'.
Overhead line	OHL	An electrical conductor, suspended on towers or poles, used for transmission and distribution of electrical energy. It consists of one or more conductors (commonly multiples of three).
Passenger Car Unit(s)	PCU	A metric to allow different vehicle types within a traffic model to be assessed in a consistent manner.
Planning Inspectorate	PINS	An executive agency of the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. The Planning Inspectorate deals with planning appeals, national infrastructure planning applications, examinations of local plans and other planning-related and specialist casework in England and Wales.
Project Manager	PM	The person with lead responsibility for a project or a workstream within a project.
Public Right of Way	PROW	A right possessed by the public to pass along routes over land at all times. Although the land may be owned by a private individual, the public may still gain access across that land along a specific route. The mode of transport allowed differs according to the type

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		of Public Right of Way, which can consist of footpaths, bridleways and open and restricted byways.
Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments	REAC	The REAC identifies the environmental commitments that would be implemented during the construction and operational phases of the Project if the Development Consent Order is granted, and forms part of the Code of Construction Practice (Application Document 6.3, ES Appendix 2.2).
Road Investment Strategy	RIS	The Government's long-term strategy to improve England's motorways and major A roads. The first RIS (known as RIS 1) was published in 2015 and covers the period 2015-2020. A second RIS (RIS 2) was published in 2020 and covers the post-2020 period.
Site of Importance for Nature Conservation	SINC	Locally designated nature site protected through the planning system. See also 'LNR' and 'SNCI'.
Secretary of State	SoS	The Secretary of State has overall responsibility for the policies of the Department for Transport.
Site Specific Travel Plans	SSTPs	Site Specific Travel Plans will be developed by contractors in respect of the sites which they are responsible (either an individual construction area or compound, or a number of construction areas and compounds where these are closely located with similar levels of accessibility), following the latest policy advice and best practice documents.
Site Waste Management Plan	SWMP	A document which sets out how resources will be managed, and waste controlled during the Project. Plans usually involve recording the amount of waste that will be produced and details the proposed methods of waste disposal.
Skills, Education and Employment (SEE) Strategy	SEE Strategy	The Skills, Education and Employment Strategy introduces how National Highways aim to provide long-term benefits to communities close to the Project through new jobs and work, higher skills and education. It also begins explains how National Highways will set the standard for construction in a low carbon world. This document will be revised every two years throughout the delivery of the Project to remain current and responsive to local and national needs.
Small and Medium Sized Enterprise	SME	The UK definition of SME is generally a small or medium-sized enterprise with fewer than 250 employees. The EU also defines an SME as a business with fewer than 250 employees, a turnover of less than €50 million, or a balance sheet total of less than €43 million
Social Impact Assessment	SIA	N/A

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Social Value Framework	SVF	The Project's Social Value Framework is reflective of local needs and priorities and sets out the wider opportunities that are realised through the way the crossing is designed and built. It also aligns with the Government's Social Value Model, published December 2020.
Statement of Common Ground	SoCG	A Statement of Common Ground is a written statement containing factual information about the proposal which is the subject of the appeal that the appellant reasonably considers will not be disputed by the local planning authority.
Strategic Outline Business Case	SOBC	First stage of drawing together evidence pertaining to a transport scheme, focusing on the strategy or reasons why change may be required.
Strategic road network	SRN	The core road network in England managed by National Highways.
Supplementary Planning Guidance	SPG	Documents which provide supplementary information in respect of the policies in current or emerging Local Plans or national policy.
Sustainable Drainage System	SuDS	A drainage system designed to reduce the potential impact of new and existing developments with respect to surface water drainage discharges.
Sustainable Travel: Active, Responsible, Safe	STARS	TfL's accreditation scheme for London schools and nurseries. STARS inspires young Londoners to travel to school sustainably, actively, responsibly and safely by championing walking, scooting and cycling.
Sustainable Transport Working Group	STWG	A stakeholder group set up by National Highways to develop and deliver improvements to integrated sustainable transport infrastructure, including maximising use of the River Thames and improving connectivity and accessibility for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.
National Planning Framework	NPF	The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
The Third Road Investment Strategy	RIS3	RIS3 sets out the government's aims and proposals for investment in the strategic road network from 2025 to 2030.
Thames Chase Community Forest	TCCF	An area of forest open to the public on the Essex/London border, maintained and improved for the benefit of wildlife and residents.
Trip End Model Presentation Program	TEMPro 7.2	The version of the DfT traffic forecasts used to cap growth within LTAM.
Transport for London	TfL	The integrated body responsible for London's transport system

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Tilbury Link Road	TLR	An option considered, following PRA in developing the preliminary design for Statutory Consultation.
Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent	tCO ₂ e	A metric relating to emissions of carbon dioxide and the resultant climate change impact adopted by the UN.
Traffic Management Forum	TMF	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.
Traffic Management Plan	TMP	The approach to carrying out temporary traffic management for the safe construction of the Project. It will also explain management measures available to the Contractor to reduce the impact on the local community (including journey time reliability, access, and safety).
Transport Analysis Guidance	TAG	National guidance document produced by the Department for Transport.
Travel Plan Liaison Group	TPLG	A group set up by National Highway to administer the Framework Construction Travel Plan.
Transport Assessment	TA	A document that sets out assessments of the transport implications of development, and Transport Statements are a ‘lighter-touch’ evaluation to be used where this would be more proportionate to the potential impact of the development (i.e. in the case of developments with anticipated limited transport impacts).
Tunnel boring machine	TBM	Machine used to excavate tunnels with a circular cross-section.
UK Power Networks	UKPN	An energy network operator. Owns and maintains the electricity cables in South East England, the East of England and London.
United Kingdom Accreditation Service	UKAS	The United Kingdom Accreditation Service is the sole national accreditation body recognised by the British government to assess the competence of organisations that provide certification, testing, inspection and calibration services
Utilities Logistics Hub	ULH	The ULH receives, stores and distributes the plant machinery and materials for specific utility works.
Walkers, cyclists and horse riders	WCH	Walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
Web-based Transport Appraisal Guidance	WebTAG	Former name given for the Department for Transport’s web-based multi-modal guidance on appraising transport projects and proposals, now known as Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG).

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan	WNIMMP	A plan detailing the operational traffic impact monitoring to be implemented to comply with DCO requirements.
Worker Accommodation Report	WAR	The Worker Accommodation Report (Application Document 7.21) sets out the estimated number of workers at the peak construction phase of the Project who would require temporary accommodation, what type of accommodation these workers are anticipated to seek and where, and a consideration of this demand in the context of supply and the operation of the accommodation market
World Health Organization	WHO	The WHO is a specialised agency of the United Nations that is concerned with international public health.
Waste and Resources Action Programme	WRAP	A registered charity which works with businesses, individuals and communities to achieve a circular economy through helping them reduce waste, develop sustainable products and use resources in an efficient way.
Written Scheme of Investigation	WSI	Sets out the scope, guiding principles and methods for the planning and implementation of archaeological assessment.

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