

1) Comments on Applicant's Document 3.1 - Draft DCO

DPWLG's preferred approach to Requirement 18 of the DCO is set out in the 'Updated Joint Position Statement on Orsett Cock Interchange Requirement' as set out in Appendix D of Thurrock Council's Deadline 9 Submission. It is considered that this approach provides a robust framework to deliver the changes that DPWLG believe will be necessary to maintain the status quo at Orsett Cock and the surrounding road network by reference to the identified Objectives. This will provide the SoS with clear and precise parameters for decision taking purposes.

Whilst DPWLG have residual concerns (see REP8-175) and considers the Applicant's drafting of the Requirement 18 provision (as set out in '3.1 Draft Development Consent Order') to be less robust, DPWLG would no longer maintain its position of outright objection to the draft Order should either version of Requirement 18 be included in the final Order.

2) Comments on Applicant's Document 9.222 - Deadline 9 Hearing Actions

DPWLG note that Paragraph 6.2.7(c) of Document 9.222 states:

the written representations from Thurrock Council and DP World London Gateway make reference to proposed expansion. DP World London Gateway identify that 2.5.2 The Logistics Park is the subject of a proposed second LDO ('LDO2') to extend the life of LDO1 (with an up to-date assessment process) to realise the development potential of the Logistics Park in line with the original and continuing objectives.

This demonstrates that there is substantial proposed development that could impact on the operation of Orsett Cock roundabout, and this is also acknowledged in the joint position statement referenced above. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any such development would need to bring forward any necessary mitigations or interventions on the highways network to account for any related traffic'.

The ExA should note that the above comments are ill informed and inaccurate. LDO2 does not allow a greater quantum of development than LDO1. It simply extends the timescales for that quantum of development to come forward. Indeed, LDO2 permits a decreased quantum of development than LDO1 (750,000 sq.m v 830,000 sq.m). In any case, DPWLG have already mitigated the permitted 830,000 sq.m in line with the obligations imposed on LDO1 (specifically a 11.3% of total cost contribution to the A13 widening scheme (which included improvements to Orsett Cock) and accounted for the total London Gateway development.