

## Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (Updated 15<sup>th</sup> December 2023)

### Lower Thames Crossing – TR010032

London Gateway Port Limited, LG Park Freehold Limited and LG Park Leasehold Limited (collectively referred to as DP World London Gateway (DPWLG))

Number	Principal Issue in Question (PIQ)	SOCC Reference	The brief concern held by DPWLG which will be reported on in full in Written/Oral Representations	What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
1	Transport Impact Assessment – Insufficient assessment work on local highway junctions	Table 2.1, Item 2.1.1 & 2.1.3	<p>The impact at the A13/A128 Orsett Cock junction and the A13/A1014 Manorway junction has not been fully or properly assessed within the submission documents. These junctions are located on a critical route to the DP World London Gateway Port (the Port) and Logistics Park (the Park), consequently a full understanding of the transport impact on this local highway network is required.</p> <p>Subsequent assessment by the applicant and other parties (including Thurrock Council) has confirmed a considerable lack of convergence</p>	<p>The Applicant submitted further information at Deadline 1 (Report Refs: REP1-187, REP1-189 and REP1-190) which includes the results of microsimulation modelling at the A13/A128 Orsett Cock junction and the A13/A1014 Manorway junction. However, this does not address the key areas of concern. Notably, it highlights the inadequacies of and inconsistencies with LTAM.</p> <p>This information is needed to identify suitable mitigation solutions provided to prevent accessibility and operational issues to the Port and Park. The mitigation solutions can be agreed but the means by which they should be secured, if found to be necessary, is a matter for further consideration.</p>	It was expected at the beginning of the examination that full details of the required highway works on the network would be finalised and agreed by the end of the examination. It is unfortunate that the applicant was unable to complete this work.

			<p>between LTAM and local junction models.</p>	<p>Further assessments have been provided at D6 and 6a (REP6A-004 and 0006 for the applicant, REP6A-013 and REP6A-014 for Thurrock and REP6A-009 for DPWLG) which show there is a lack of convergence between the various model outputs and therefore the impact on access to the Port is unresolved in modelling terms.</p> <p>Further physical (and potentially significant) changes are required to Orsett Cock Interchange to ensure that it accommodates traffic changes arising from the proposed development. Such works would allow more confidence in the outcomes of the applicants modelling in respect of OC Interchange, Manorway Interchange, M25 J30 and access from the ports generally.</p> <p>It is agreed this should be secured by way of an appropriately worded Requirement.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

2	Transport Impact Assessment – Lack of detail on other connected transport networks	Table 2.1, Item 2.1.1 & 2.1.3	The Transport Impact Assessment does not consider the traffic impacts during (planned/ unplanned) closures of the Dartford Crossing. The closures occur frequently and would create further congestion implications along the A13 (specifically at junctions A13/A128 and A13/A1014) once the LTC is operational. The A13 is a critical route to the accessibility of the Port and Park.	<p>The Applicant has not submitted any additional information. As such, this issue remains outstanding.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment should have been updated to consider and assess the implications of anticipated Dartford Crossing closures (based on robust evidence of the frequency this event occurs), and the congestion impacts on local highways once the re-routing of traffic during such events occurs. Suitable mitigation solutions should be provided to prevent accessibility and operational issues to the Port and Park. The mitigation solutions can be agreed but the means by which they should be secured, if found to be necessary, is a matter for further consideration.</p>	We see no reason why this information could not have been addressed at Examination. As it has not, the impact of the LTC remains unresolved.
---	--	-------------------------------	--	--	--

3	Likely significance of impacts	Table 2.1, Item 2.1.2	Increased traffic on the A13 (specifically at and in the vicinity of the junctions noted above) will likely result in significant adverse traffic impacts for the Port and Park.	<p>The Applicant has not submitted any additional information. As such, this issue remains outstanding.</p> <p>The absence of an agreed and final model of the impacts of the scheme on the A13 leaves this issue unresolved. A full breakdown of DPLWG view on the implications of this is provided at REP6A-009.</p>	<p>We see no reason why this information could not have been addressed at Examination. As it has not, the impact of the LTC remains unresolved.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this a draft Reg 18 provision is being discussed with the applicant which goes some way to securing a scheme of improvement at Orsett Cock Junction and has the potential to contribute to resolution of this issue.</p>
4	Economic Impact Assessment – Insufficient assessment of the impact on the operations of the Port and Park and other NSIPs	Table 2.1, Item 2.1.2	The congestion on the A13 highway (specifically at the A13/A128 and A13/A1014 junctions) as a result of the proposed LTC has the potential to constrain operations at the Port and Park and consequently create negative economic impacts. These impacts have not been considered as part of the submission documents.	<p>The Applicant has not submitted any additional information. As such, this issue remains outstanding.</p> <p>An Economic Impact Assessment, which considers the net benefits and net negatives of the proposed LTC for the Port and Park, needs to be undertaken once the further Transport Assessment work is provided (Items 1 and 2 above), as this will detail the operational impacts.</p>	Our understanding is that opportunity no longer exists to address this issue within the Examination period

5	Policy Assessment – Insufficient consideration and assessment of relevant national and regional policy documents.	N/A	<p>The Applicant provided a response at D6 to the Ports’ Joint Statement on the Compliance of the LTC Scheme with Ports Policy Made at D3 (Document 9.135).</p> <p>The Applicant’s response does not provide an adequate assessment of the Project against ports and marine related policy. It ignores the failings of the Applicant’s own transport modelling work regarding overall journey time savings and makes assertions regarding potential transport and economic benefits to the ports that are not supported by any evidence.</p> <p>As such, DPWLG maintains that the Applicant has failed to properly consider relevant national and regional policy, namely NPS for Ports (2012), the UK Marine Policy Statement (2011), and the South East Inshore Marine Plan (2021), despite the potential for the LTC</p>	<p>Whilst the Applicant (in Document 9.135) has sort to address matters raised in the Ports’ Joint Statement, the Applicant should have provided an assessment of the scheme against the relevant national and regional policy documents in an ‘Accordance Table’ as an addendum to document ‘7.2 Planning Statement’, similar to that provided by the Applicant for NPS for National Networks; NPS for energy Infrastructure; Draft NPS for National Networks; and Local Authority Policy.</p> <p>The NPS for Ports and Marine Policy documents were considered as ‘important and relevant considerations’ during the Examination of the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm DCO application. As such, there is precedent to consider these documents in cases where a DCO application has the potential to affect the operations of major ports.</p>	It is our understanding that sufficient opportunity no longer exists to resolve differences with the applicant regarding the interpretation of these policies
---	---	-----	---	--	---

			Project to impact adversely on the Port and Logistics Park at London Gateway.		
6	Draft wording of DCO Regulation 18 requirement	To be inserted once amended SOCG agreed	There are some fundamental concerns about the Applicant's proposed drafting (as submitted at D9). These concerns are as set out in the Joint Position Statement submitted by POTL / DPWLG / TBC / TEP at D9.	We refer to Appendix 1 of the Joint Position Statement submitted by POTL / DPWLG / TBC / TEP at D9.	It is our understanding that sufficient opportunity no longer exists to resolve differences with the proposed drafting of the DCO Regulation 18 requirement