

## Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement

### Lower Thames Crossing – TR010032

[London Borough of Havering]

Number		SoCG reference	The brief concern held by Havering which will be reported on in full in the WR and LIR	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
1	Local Resident Discount Scheme (LRDS)	2.1.31	Concern that the LRDS is not available to Havering residents.	Havering needs to be referred to in the draft DCO as a Local Authority whose residents will be eligible for the LRDS.	Not resolved.
2	Section 106	2.1.24, 2.1.78, 2.1.85, 2.1.84, 2.1.80, (order of appearance in the Statement of Common Ground)	S106 offers very little recompense to Havering residents for the disruption during construction.	<p>The wording of the Section 106 has been agreed and is now subject to being formally signed and sealed.</p> <p>The Applicant took the decision to remove Community Funds and SEE Strategy from the S106 Heads of Terms and to place these in the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR). Havering continues to have concerns about the</p>	High.

				<p>content of the Community Funds and SEE Strategy and the position of the Council is set out in its Deadline 9 submission.</p> <p>Concerns around suitable mitigation for schools remain, including the lack of detail concerning Road Safety Education in SACR002 as well as the lack of mitigation/compensation for disruption to travel to/from school during construction periods.</p>	
3	Upminster Cemetery	2.1.21	Severe adverse impacts have been identified by Havering on this facility and surrounding businesses during the 10 month closure of Ockendon Road.	Compensation for the disruption is required. Diversion routes need to be made resilient to ensure journey time reliability for trips to the cemetery.	Not resolved.
4	Draft Development Consent Order	2.1.6.	Removal of the words “reasonable” and “best endeavours” in line with consented M25 J28 DCO required for the revisions of all control documents.	Redrafting required.	Not resolved.

			Protective Provisions for LHA vehicular and non-vehicular networks required.		
5	Mitigation	2.1.21, 2.1.24, 2.1.39, 2.1.45,	The ES and Planning Statement defines the impacts of the scheme extensively but mitigation is not provided on the basis of the national need for the scheme. This is considered unacceptable by Havering, particularly where severe adverse impacts are identified.	Clear mitigation interventions need to be agreed with Havering.	Not resolved.
6	Wider Network Impacts	2.1.39, 2.1.41	The proposed Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan (WNIMMP) provides no mechanism for funding any necessary mitigation for Havering. There are insufficient monitoring points in Havering. The decision-making mechanism for the provision of mitigation is insufficient.	WNIMMP requires redrafting in consultation and agreement with Havering.	Not resolved.

7	Non- Motorised Users benefits	2.1.70	The connectivity of proposed green infrastructure is lacking. Safe onward links to Folkes Lane and Moor Lane need to be designed and agreed with Havering.	Redesign of onward connections for WCH required.	Not resolved.
---	-------------------------------	--------	--	--	---------------