



Lower Thames Crossing

5.4.4.7 Final Agreed Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways and (2) Kent County Council (Tracked changes version)

Deleted: Draft

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

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

Volume 5

DATE: December 2023
DEADLINE: 9A

Deleted: November

Deleted: 7

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032
Application Document Ref: TR010032/APP/5.4.4.7

VERSION: 5.0

Deleted: 4

Revision history

Version	Date	Submitted at
1.0	31 October 2022	DCO Application
2.0	18 July 2023	Deadline 1
3.0	31 October 2023	Deadline 6
4.0	17 November 2023	Deadline 7
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) Kent County Council.~~

Deleted: a Draft

Deleted: with matters outstanding.¶

~~The Applicant and Kent County Council consider~~ that this Statement of Common Ground is an accurate description of the matters raised by Kent County Council and the status of each matter, based on the engagement that has taken place to date.

Deleted: considers

Deleted: Draft

~~Both parties have reached agreement on the position of the status of all 185 matters. Of the 185 matters contained within, 85 matters are agreed and 100 are not agreed, leaving no matters outstanding (noting that two matters have been superseded by scheme changes and these have been marked with a strikethrough and not included in these figures).~~

This version of the SoCG has been submitted at Examination Deadline ~~9A~~. The Applicant and Kent County Council have been working together to produce this document.

Deleted: 7

On behalf of the Applicant

<u>Name</u>	
<u>Position</u>	
<u>Organisation</u>	
<u>Signature</u>	

On behalf of Kent County Council,

<u>Name</u>	
<u>Position</u>	
<u>Organisation</u>	
<u>Signature</u>	

Deleted: , however given resource pressure,

Deleted: have not had the opportunity to review and formally agree to all of the positions set out in Table 2.1 (Matters).

Lower Thames Crossing

5.4.4.7 Final Agreed Statement of Common Ground between (1) National Highways and (2) Kent County Council (Tracked changes 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
Appendices	234
Appendix A Engagement activity	235
Appendix B Glossary	237

List of tables

	Page number
Table 2.1 Final position on Matters.....	3
Table A.1 Engagement activities between the Applicant and Kent County Council since the DCO application was submitted on 31 October 2022	235

Deleted: The Applicant has taken a conservative view when setting out the status of each matter and has provided commentary in its response to set out where Matters Under Discussion are considered to have the potential to move to either 'Agreed' or 'Not Agreed'. ¶
A high-level overview of the engagement undertaken since the DCO application was submitted on 31 October 2022 is summarised in Table A.1 in Appendix A.
Page Break

Deleted: Draft

Deleted: 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 Movement of outstanding matters 2¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶
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 Movement of outstanding matters 2¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶
1.2 Principal Areas of Disagreement 1¶
1.3 Terminology 1¶
2 Matters 2¶
2.1 Movement of outstanding matters 2¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶
1.3 Terminology 1¶
2 Matters 2¶
2.1 Movement of outstanding matters 2¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶
2 Matters 2¶
2.1 Movement of outstanding matters 2¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶

Deleted: ¶
2.1 Movement of outstanding matters 2¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶

Deleted: ¶
Appendices 234¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶
Appendix A Engagement activity 235¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶
Appendix B Glossary 237¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Table 2.1 Matters 3¶

Deleted: ¶

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 Kent County Council, and where agreement has not been reached.
- 1.1.3 This final version of the SoCG has been submitted at Examination Deadline 9A.

Deleted: – in the Applicant's view –

Deleted: Where matters are yet to be agreed, the parties will continue to work proactively to reach agreement and will update the SoCG to reflect areas of further agreement.

Deleted: 7

1.2 Principal Areas of Disagreement

- 1.2.1 On the 19 December 2022 the Examination 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 This SoCG should be read in conjunction with the Kent County Council PADS Tracker.

Deleted: <#>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. ¶

Deleted: matters

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 and the parties are in agreement.

Deleted: , and 'Matter under discussion' where these points will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.

2 Matters

2.1 Final position on matters

~~2.1.1 A summary of engagement undertaken between the Applicant and Kent County Council is summarised in Table A.1 in Appendix A.~~

~~2.1.2 The outcome of this engagement is presented in Table 2.1, which details and presents the matters that are either agreed or not agreed between the Applicant and Kent County Council.~~

~~2.1.3 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, and 'DLX' indicates a new matter added during examination at/around that deadline.~~

~~2.1.4 In Table 2.1, relevant issues relating to the dDCO articles and Requirements in Schedule 2 to the dDCO have been identified under the heading 'DCO and Consents'.~~

~~2.1.5 Following submission of the previous version of this SoCG between the Applicant and Kent County Council, 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.~~

~~2.1.6 At Examination Deadline 9A there are 185 matters, of which 85 are agreed and 100 not agreed.~~

~~2.1.7 Following changes to the scheme, Matter 2.1.5 and 2.1.6 have been removed from the SoCG as they relate to a component (the proposed Thong Lane Car Park) that has now been removed from the scheme.~~

~~2.1.8 This is the final Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Kent County Council.~~

Deleted: Movement of outstanding

Moved down [1]: <#> SoCG between the Applicant and Kent County Council, 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.¶

Deleted: <#>Following submission of the previous version of this Draft

Deleted: At Examination Deadline 7 there remains 186 matters of

Deleted: Applicant considers 59

Deleted: , 44

Deleted: and 83 remaining under discussion.¶
The following changes have been made

Deleted: Deadline 6

Deleted: Deadline 7:

Deleted: <#>2.1.178 (Terrestrial Biodiversity – pre-construction surveys) – this matter was mistakenly considered 'agreed' and has since been amended to 'under discussion'¶
2.1.165 (Construction – Delivery Booking) – this was mistakenly recorded as 'agreed' and has now been confirmed 'not agreed'¶

Moved (insertion) [1]

Table 2.1 Final position on Matters

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
DCO and Consents					
Responsibility	2.1.114 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council does not consider that it is clear precisely which parts of the authorised development will be transferred to it as highway authority (e.g. roads, bridges, LEMP works etc), and requests a table/matrix of Schedule 3 Part 5 (list of road closures, classification of roads) and Schedule 1 (relevant part of the authorised development) of the draft Development Consent Order to assist with understanding which parts of authorised development are to be transferred to KCC in order to inform any side agreement discussions.</p> <p>Additionally, Kent County Council requests clarification on which roads in the Classification of Roads Plan relate to what Authorised Works and what works and new assets KCC will ultimately be responsible for.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that Article 10 in the draft DCO deals with the construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures. In summary, the assets intended for transfer to Kent County Council (KCC) as the local highway authority are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carriageway / footway Surfacing on the 2 Thong Lane bridges as well Brewers Road Bridge; • Carriageway / footway surfacing, new road bridge and associated assets & earthworks on the new link road south of the A2 that joins Hever Court Road and Halfpence Lane and the new alignment of Thong Lane; and • Upgraded and new PRoW. <p><u>The Applicant has submitted Protective Provisions as part of the draft DCO which set out the proposed approach to asset transfer and management.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding this the Applicant recognises that KCC has nt been</u></p>	<p><u>Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</u></p> <p><u>Classification of Roads Plans [Document Reference 2.11 (6)].</u></p>	<p>Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>,</p>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Draft Development Consent Order [REP6-010] Classification of Roads Plans [REP4-070]

Deleted: [AS-038]

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to KCC's review...

Deleted: [APP-041]

Deleted: and further engagement between

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			able to confirm agreement on these matters during the examination period.		
Consent Process	2.1.115 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that there is a clear gap in the Draft Development Consent Order, in terms of implementation of mitigation and the relationship of the documents identified within the Control Plan is not clear.	As noted by the Council , the Control Plan is described as a 'mitigation route map' or a framework for mitigating, monitoring and controlling the effects of the Project. It is presented in Plate 1.1 (and Plate 14.1) in the Introduction to the Application. Section 14 of the Introduction to the Application describes the Control Plan or 'mitigation route map'. Table 14.1 explains where, in the DCO, the provision of each document identified in the Control Plan is legally secured and the process and stage in the delivery of the Project that they will be secured (during both the construction and operational phases of the Project). The rest of Section 14 of the Introduction to the Application provides a detailed explanation of the purpose and process of preparation of each individual Control Plan document. By way of example, mitigations measures identified for construction are set out in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP),	Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)] Introduction to the Application [REP4-002] Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)] Mitigation Route Map [REP4-203]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: parties

Deleted: representor

Deleted: [AS-038]

Deleted: Draft Development Consent Order [REP6-010]

Deleted: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP6-038]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>which is to be legally secured through draft DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 4 and delivered through Environmental Management Plan 2 (EMP2), which is required to be substantially in accordance with the CoCP.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this provides a clear relationship between the control documents submitted as part of the application and their implementation through the DCO.</p> <p>To support this, the Applicant has also produced a Mitigation Route Map which clearly identifies where mitigation is secured.</p>		
Consent Process	2.1.116 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council considers that the discharge of requirements under the Draft Development Consent Order will place a very considerable resource burden on the Council as a relevant highway authority. As such, Kent County Council considers that a mechanism that ensures National Highways will reimburse KCC with the costs of resourcing additional work is necessary, but that this in not currently clear within the</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises concern raised by KCC and has <u>developed Protective Provisions for the process of transferring assets</u>, along with proposals for officer resourcing (via Officer Contributions) within a <u>Unilateral Undertaking</u>.</p> <p>The draft DCO proposes the Secretary of State is the appropriate discharging authority for the DCO Requirements. This is for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.3a-i on pages 67 & 68 of the</p>	<p><u>Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</u></p> <p><u>Explanatory Memorandum to the DCO [Document Reference 3.2 (7)]</u></p> <p><u>Section 106 Agreements - Heads of Terms [REP4-144]</u></p>	<p>Matter <u>Not Agreed</u></p>

- Deleted:** Under Discussion
- Deleted:** shared a draft Highways Side Agreement
- Deleted:** [AS-038]
- Deleted:** and
- Deleted:** draft Section 106 Agreement
- Deleted:** Draft Development Consent Order [REP6-010] Explanatory Memorandum to the DCO [REP6-012]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		draft DCO and other documents.	Explanatory Memorandum to the DCO. However, as set out in the draft DCO the relevant highway authority will be consulted as part of the process of discharging a number of the Requirements.		
Planning and Policy	2.1.117 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council is concerned about the failure to include a 'time limit' within which development must 'commence' within the draft DCO. As currently drafted, Kent County Council consider that the DCO will allow unlimited time for the discharge of pre-commencement requirements.	The Applicant notes that the draft Development Consent Order sets a time limit on the start of works (Article 2) as follows: ' <i>The authorised development must begin no later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date that this Order comes into force.</i> '. The Applicant notes that Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order sets out a series of Requirements, a number of which are required to be discharged prior to commencement, and include obligations to consult specific authorities or statutory bodies.	Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Agreed
Technical Approval	2.1.158 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers that the Applicant has not addressed the issue of undertaking the Kent County Council Technical Approval procedure. This has proven to be an issue on other schemes led by National Highways where Kent	The Applicant considers that Article 10 of the draft DCO addresses this concern and it sets out that highway works carried out on the local highway network must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the relevant local highway authority.	Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
This matter remains under discussion subject to KCC's feedback on proposed Officer Contributions and Side Agreement for the discharge of requirements.

Deleted: Draft Development Consent Order [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		County Council has not been provided with full details of the proposals and are being expected to adopt structures which Kent County Council would not accept from a private developer due to the nature of the construction.	The Protective Provisions inserted at Deadline 4 for the benefit of local highway authorities sets out the provisions on handover of assets. <u>These Protective Provisions were subsequently updated at Deadline 7 following feedback from the Local Highway Authorities.</u> The Applicant has also clarified elements of green bridges which would not transfer over to the local highway authority in Article 10. <u>Notwithstanding this the Applicant recognises that KCC has not been able to confirm agreement on these matters during the examination period.</u>		
Protective Provisions	2.1.159 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers that in principle that there is a need to secure Protective Provisions for local highway assets through the DCO itself, as opposed to side agreements with the Applicant, as the Side Agreement process does not allow for scrutiny, nor transparency. It should be noted that whilst Kent County Council is not opposed to entering into a side agreement with the Applicant, its preference would be for	The Applicant has taken the relatively atypical step of including Protective Provisions for local highway authorities (LHAs) following the London Borough of Havering's submission of their preferred set and KCC's support of them. <u>The Applicant's Protective Provisions were</u> submitted to the examination at Deadline 7, as part of the draft Development Consent Order.	Draft Development Consent Order v7.0 [REP5-024]	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>

Deleted: ¶
 A Side Agreement has been shared with KCC along with a draft Section 106 Agreement that are currently under negotiation and relate to the clarification of resourcing required to ensure appropriate technical approval can be achieved. ¶
 This matter remains under discussion pending KCC's consideration of these materials.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: These have been

Deleted: 5

Deleted: v7.0

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		these protections to be secured through the DCO.	<p>The Applicant considers that its proposed Protective Provisions reach an appropriate balance between ensuring local authority input and protection and the delivery of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.</p> <p>The Protective Provisions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mechanism for design input permitted by LHAs on local roads • Provision of "Detailed Information" relating to local road works • A Requirement to use reasonable endeavours to enter into a Detailed Local Operating Agreement • Maintenance period – 12 months from a provision certificate being issued, the Applicant will have to remedy defects or incomplete works • A Requirement to allow for testing of material • A Requirement to carry out road safety audits • A Requirement to transfer land required for road to LHA. 		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Notwithstanding this the Applicant recognises that KCC has not been able to confirm agreement on these matters during the examination period.</u> 		
Need for the Project					
Strategic need	2.1.1	Kent County Council supports the need for the Project. Kent County Council considers that there is an urgent need for a new Lower Thames Crossing that will cater for current and future demand as well as relieving the significant, daily congestion experienced at Dartford and provide greater connectivity north and south of the Thames Estuary to boost both local and national economic productivity.	The Applicant welcomes KCC's consideration of the strategic need for the Project and its role in catering for current and future demand and facilitating local and national economic productivity.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Consultation and Engagement					
Adequacy of pre-submission Consultation Materials	2.1.2	Kent County Council's position on the adequacy of consultation is set out in its Adequacy of Consultation Representation.	<p>Since the previous DCO submission was withdrawn, the Applicant has undertaken further consultation (summer 2021; spring 2022) and detailed engagement.</p> <p>The Applicant is satisfied that it has provided enough detailed information about environmental and traffic impacts for consultees to</p>	Kent County Council's Adequacy of Consultation Representation [AoC-009]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			understand the proposals and their impacts, allowing them to provide meaningful feedback during the consultation period.		
Route selection, modal alternatives & assessment of reasonable alternatives					
Route selection Route Alignment	2.1.3	Notwithstanding issues relating to the effects of the Project on the wider network set out elsewhere in this SoCG, Kent County Council agrees that the proposed route alignment is appropriate.	Noted.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Design – road, tunnels, utilities					
Design Reduction of lanes along M2/A2	2.1.4	Kent County Council is concerned that reducing the A2/M2 eastbound carriageway from four to two lanes from the Gravesend East junction to just past the Lower Thames Crossing junction could cause capacity issues for both users of the Lower Thames Crossing and M2/A2 corridor and require re-assessment of the traffic model to determine the impact.	The Applicant considers that it is normal practice to reduce the number of lanes through a junction to cater for traffic leaving before and re-joining after the interchange. The section of the M2/A2 where this happens has two new additional parallel lanes in both direction which takes some of the existing local traffic. This section has fewer requirements for vehicles to change lanes which also helps with providing a free-flow experience.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Design	2.1.185 (DL-6)	The Applicant's Deadline 3 revised Transport Assessment	The Applicant has now provided additional information regarding	Deadline 3 revised Transport	Matter Agreed .

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers that this matter is now Agreed.

Deleted: rejoining

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Frontage Road Capacity		<p>[REP3-112] (Plate 7.3) for the PM peak 2045 now shows a significant increase in volume / capacity ratios along the A2 eastbound frontage road between the intersections of Gravesend East (A2 / Valley Drive) and the Three Crutches (A2 / M2 / A289).</p> <p>KCC would appreciate if the Applicant could provide additional information regarding vehicle speeds and flows on this corridor.</p>	vehicle speeds and flows on this corridor, although it is recognised that KCC will need to review this information in order to resolve concerns related to changes to volume / capacity ratios along the A2 eastbound frontage road between the intersections of Gravesend East (A2 / Valley Drive) and the Three Crutches (A2 / M2 / A289).	Assessment [REP3-112]	
Access Thong Lane Car Park – Principle	2.1.5	<p>Kent County Council supports the principle of the proposed new car park at Thong Lane, following use of the A2 compound.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that that the location of the A2 compound lends itself to being left as an additional car park facility as a legacy of the project, noting that current car parks are at capacity, and a car park situated here would be ideal for basing cyclists and equestrian visitors and should contain facilities for horse boxes.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the use of the A2 compound as an operational car park is appropriate, and has been designed to appropriate standards for the benefit of its users, KCC, and Shorne Woods Country Park.</p> <p>Routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH) have been connected to and from the car park as far as technically possible (within the site constraints).</p> <p>A new bridleway leads into the proposed car park from the west and a new direct entrance (bridleway) to Shorne Woods Country Park has been provided via a Pegasus crossing on Thong Lane.</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		Kent County Council notes that this should include a shared user route that is tied into Shorne Woods Country Park in order to be effective.			
Design Thong Land Car Park – Detail	2.1.6	Kent County Council considers that further discussion should be undertaken to agree on the detailed design, facilities, access and setting for the proposed car park.	The Applicant notes that the outline design of the new car park has been developed through engagement with KCC. Details of the car park are outlined in the Design Principles, Clause No. S2.11. As set out in the Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's Question 13.1.8, the Applicant considers that a third party would manage and operate the car park and the facilities within it, which would be delivered through a separate planning application.	Design Principles [REP6-046]	Matter Under Discussion
Hares Bridge	2.1.160 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers the omission of improvements to bring Hares Bridge up to cycling / equestrian standard is considered a negative impact of the PRoW proposals for the Project. Hares Bridge currently meets pedestrian requirements but is inadequate for cycle and equestrian use.	Due to technical complexities and constraints associated with the upgrade of the existing bridge over High Speed 1, the Applicant did not consider it viable to modify this structure. This bridge would require extensive structural work including widening and/or replacement to provide adequate shared provision to the	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		It is a key link in the NMU network; the layout of which may encourage use that it was not designed to support and is unlikely to be adequately mitigated by a sign requiring cyclists to dismount. Cycle dismount signs are not permitted in current standards, as they are not inclusive, as disabled people often cannot dismount.	latest design standards and guidance. The Applicant notes that alternative routes are available further east.		
PRoW Construction and Monitoring	2.1.161 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers that construction will have a negative impact on existing leisure / recreation PRoW use, with the prolonged closure of PRoW within the red line boundary of the Project. These effects will need to be monitored effectively.	Impacts on PRoWs within the Order Limits to the south of the River Thames during construction are described in Table 13.64 of ES Chapter 13: Population and Human Health. The table provides details relating to the estimated duration of effects together with likely changes in journey length for users. Diversions are proposed for the majority of routes. The table concludes moderate adverse impacts in relation to six PRoWs as a result of the increase in likely length of route during the construction phase. For PRoWs NS167, NS174, NG17/1, the Project would aim to install new routes and open these to the public within a month of closing the	ES Chapter 13: Population and Human Health [APP-151] oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Health and Equalities Impact Assessment [REP3-118] Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [[REP6-048](#)]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>existing route, thereby reducing negative impacts on existing leisure/recreation routes (for example in order to maintain connectivity between Shorne Woods Country Park and residential areas to the west during the construction phase). This is secured in the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC).</p> <p>There are four PRowS for which no diversion route has been provided and which would be closed for long periods of time. These are sections of NS164 and NS165, plus Footpaths NG7 and NG8 which are located near the South Portal and for which new routes would not be available until towards the end of the construction phase. PRow user surveys established the nature of PRowS and their usage by WCH; the surveys indicated that the majority of PRowS crossed by the Project route (which included NS165 and Footpath NG7 as representative routes within this area) have a low level of usage.</p> <p>Section 7.5 of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment considers the impacts of the Project in relation to active travel. Table</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>7.18 concludes the assessment of health outcomes for active travel during construction as neutral, and notes that in instances where no diversions are proposed, alternative routes remain available for the local community to use, such that impacts on existing leisure and recreational use are not considered to be significant.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has agreed to provide monitoring equipment at three locations as requested by KCC, and to provide funding for route promotion and engagement activities via a commitment (SACR-023) added to the SAC-R at Deadline 8.</u></p>		
Restoration of PRoW	2.1.162 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers that the effects on users of PRoW during the construction phase is more likely to be prolonged or permanent if PRoW are not restored to pre-construction standard or better.	The Applicant notes that Project Design Report Part E sets out the preliminary design for PRoWs and permissive paths including diversions, resurfacing/upgrades, crossings and designations; and the Design Principles sets out how the Applicant and Delivery Partner must consider and accord with design guidance/standards as set out in PEO.01 to PEO.13.	<p>Project Design Report Part E [APP-512] Design Principles Document Reference 7.5 (7),</p>	Matter Agreed

Deleted: As a result of the various factors described above, no monitoring of usage of PRoWs has been proposed during construction.

Deleted: Design Principles [[REP6-046](#)]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Segregated Routes	2.1.163 (DL-6)	<p>Kent County Council notes that the Applicant states that <i>"Defining the widths/surfacing will be undertaken at the detailed design stage. Specific WCH design principle can be found within Table 4.1 Project-wide design principles: Connecting people, within the Design Principles (APP-516). All WCH routes will be designed to the latest design standards and guidance listed under Clause No. PEO.04"</i>.</p> <p>KCC is disappointed that the three bridges in question are proposed to include 3m shared pedestrian/cycle routes, as LTN 1/20 National Cycle Infrastructure Guidance consistently seeks to avoid shared use cycle routes. Kent County Council consider that high quality segregated routes for pedestrians and cyclists should be provided and that a minimum width should be secured in order to ensure there is enough width for segregated facilities.</p>	<p>LTN1/20 National Cycle Infrastructure Guidance when referring to cycle routes states: <i>"5.5.3 Where a route is also used by pedestrians, separate facilities should be provided for pedestrian and cycle movements. However, away from the highway, and alongside busy interurban roads with few pedestrians or building frontages, shared use might be adequate (see Chapters 6 and 8). Such facilities should be designed to meet the needs of cycle traffic, however – including its width, alignment and treatment at side roads and other junctions"</i>.</p> <p>This is reinforced by: <i>"6.5.6 Shared use may be appropriate in some situations, if well-designed and implemented. Some are listed below: Alongside interurban and arterial roads where there are few pedestrians"</i>.</p> <p>The routes in question are interurban routes with relatively low pedestrian numbers expected; based on site observations they are lower than 300 per hour. Table 6-3 of LTN1/20 states that <i>"Recommended minimum widths for shared use routes carrying up to</i></p>	Design Principles Document Reference 7.5 (7)	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>300 pedestrians per hour Cycle flows: Minimum width Up to 300 cyclists per hour 3.0m wide / Over 300 cyclists per hour 4.5m wide".</p> <p>The widths of the WCH routes for the three green bridges in the south are secured through the Design Principles as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S1.17 Brewers Road green bridge (Work No. 1D): WCH provision, comprising a 3m shared pedestrian/ cycle route and a 3.5m horse-riding route. • S2.12 Thong Lane green bridge south (Work No. 1H): WCH provision, comprising a 3m shared pedestrian/cycle route and a 3.5m horse-riding route. • S3.18 Thong Lane green bridge north (Work no. 3B): WCH provision on the west side within the planting zone, comprising a 3m shared pedestrian/cycle route and a 3.5m horse-riding route. WCH provision on the east side within the planting zone, comprising a 3m shared pedestrian/cycle route and a 3.5m horse-riding route. <p>Surveys (Pedestrian and cyclists count) have been undertaken, and</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			are summarised in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Population and Human Health, Table 13.24. Using shared use routes in these locations is appropriate and in accordance with LTN1/20. Further, the widths of the shared use routes are in compliance with LTN1/20 in light of the number of cyclists surveyed per hour.		
Construction					
Construction traffic impacts Use of the River Thames for Construction Transport	2.1.7	Kent County Council considers that use of the river to transport construction materials/waste would reduce the construction impact of the site on the highway network, if taken at face value. Following engagement, Kent County Council agrees that despite this, factors involved in the logistics and overall demand for movement of materials means that to import materials to the construction compounds south of the River Thames via existing ports is not favourable.	The Applicant agrees with the principle that, at face value, importing and exporting materials via the river could reduce the number of trips on some of the network. However, the Applicant considers that in this case, to import materials to the construction compounds south of the River Thames via existing ports is not favourable, due to the reliance on the local road network and no direct access to construction compounds. The construction of direct access between the river to construction compounds is constrained by the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar.	Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 2.2, Annex B: Outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B (5)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 2.2, Annex B: Outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP) [REP5-050]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			The Project's earthwork balance estimate indicates little demand to transport excavated material offsite south of the river. This is detailed in the outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP).		
Road alteration and maintenance Road Asset Maintenance	2.1.8 RRE	Kent County Council is concerned about damage to the local road network as a result of HGV construction traffic (and higher volume of general use during operation) and suggests that the Project should support the strengthening of certain roads before construction. Kent County Council has identified the necessary works required, and suggests that this work is undertaken prior to construction, rather than relying on pre- and post-construction surveys to inform the condition. Kent County Council considers that improved signage that routes strategic traffic onto more suitable routes and, more importantly, improvements to those other routes, would mitigate this. Kent County Council is seeking funding and consider that this	<p>The Applicant agrees with the principle of mitigating significant adverse effects related to the Project, and considers that joint inspections are a good way forward. The Applicant considers that details of the approach should be agreed subject to KCC's programme/plan of capital works.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has added provisions to the oTMPfC (at Deadline 7) which include the requirement for pre-commencement joint inspections of access routes and long-term diversion routes. This requirement will also indicate that, where agreed by the joint inspections, National Highways would use all reasonable endeavours to ensure the implementation of works to those routes such that their condition is suitable for the anticipated use during construction.</u></p>	<p><u>Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</u> <u>Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</u></p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant continues to engage with KCC to agree an appropriate approach to monitoring and mitigating potential effects.¶
Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [REP6-048]

Deleted: of £2.55m to proactively strengthen the highway network (supported by £1.15m from KCC) as per the programme provided to the Applicant,

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>should be secured through a Requirement of the DCO or the Section 106 (S106) Agreement. KCC considers that a condition survey to be undertaken before and after Lower Thames Crossing construction is insufficient to address concerns about the impact of the increased loading due to construction traffic on the Local Road Network, even with funding to return the network to its previous condition following the construction period.</p> <p>The assets should be pre-emptively strengthened by the Applicant prior to the start of the construction period to prevent asset failure.</p>	<p><u>The Applicant confirms that as set out above, the proposed works form part of the TMP and therefore fall under the remit of works that the Undertaker has explicitly agreed to fund – Paragraph E.10.1 of the oTMPfC states that National Highways would fund the preparation, implementation and operation of the oTMPfC, including the activities related to the implementation of the TMF. The preparation of the TMPs and the implementation and monitoring of TMP measures would be a requirement of Contractors' appointment and so would be funded by those Contractors. National Highways considers that the addition of this clause commits to the pre-emptive works suggested by KCC. The oTMPfC is secured by draft DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 10 and would be delivered through a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which must be substantially in accordance with the oTMPfC,</u></p>		
<p>Construction traffic impacts Construction Site Traffic Management</p>	2.1.9	<p>Kent County Council is concerned about the about the location of the egress onto the A226 in proximity to the Chalk Road junction and also how this</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that access to the southern tunnel entrance compound would be from the A226 with a left in, right out to minimise the impact of construction vehicles</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Deleted: KCC and the Applicant are engaging in order to develop an approach to identifying where routes that the Project will use for its construction logistics may be known to require short to medium-term asset maintenance activity, and to bring forward a method to deliver works where practicable.¶ The oTMPfC also addresses this issue of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements and local roads. Access routes are outlined in the oTMPfC.¶ KCC has provided an estimate for a mitigation package that the Applicant is currently reviewing ahead of further engagement.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		accounts for the existing right turn bay, and about whether signals are suitable in this location on a high-speed road and bend where visibility may be limited. Kent County Council supports National Highways proposals to ban HGV left turns in this egress.	travelling through Gravesend town centre and more congested and populated areas.		
Construction Traffic Routing	2.1.186 (DL-6)	KCC considers that LTC construction HGVs should be required to travel to/from the strategic road network using only the A226 and A289, to prevent rat running through Shorne and along Pear Tree Lane.	The precise traffic management measures would be discussed with KCC and detailed and designed following appointment of the main contractor as part of the development of the Traffic Management Plans (TMPs) and in line with the controls and commitments in the oTMPfC. The Applicant and the Contractor for the access will work with KCC to identify an appropriate, effective and safe solution based on information from both parties. This can include input from KCC's active travel and public transport teams to ensure safety is considered appropriately, and can build in legacy measures should they be considered appropriate.	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), within Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#) Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), within Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [\[REP6-038\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>Any modifications to road layout would be to KCC standards – this is secured by Paragraph 6.6.6 of the CoCP which states that:</p> <p><i>Access to the works, compounds or ULHs from the strategic or local road network will be designed to meet the requirements for permanent access, as set out in the DMRB or equivalent standards. Any exceptions to this requirement will be discussed at the TMF".</i></p> <p>The oTMPfC identifies a number of illustrative/indicative logistics routes, taking a risk-based approach to choosing and implementing routes that would form part of TMPs, dependent on several factors including but not limited to traffic counts, types of, traffic, WCH interface, nearby points of interest (e.g. schools) and will include engagement with relevant authorities.</p> <p>The oTMPfC sets out that the following routes will be banned for use by the Project-related construction HGVs: Castle Lane; Lower Higham Road between Green Farm Lane and A226; Thong Lane; Pear Tree Lane / The Ridgeway Brewers Road between</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Park Pale and A226; and The Street.		
Construction Traffic Impacts ('rat running') and Remedial Fund	2.1.10 RRE	<p>Kent County Council is concerned about impacts of construction on the wider highway network in terms of traffic displacement, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased demand on the A20/M20 and the local road network by drivers diverting to avoid roadworks. HGVs using local roads to divert away from roadworks. <p>Kent County Council consider that a requirement should be made to ensure the Applicant has a funding package for remedial actions should issues be identified, e.g. Travel Plan targets being breached, the potential need for highway schemes to deter general traffic from rat running through unsuitable rural areas.</p> <p>In the alternative, Kent County Council would accept a Section 106 Agreement for these mitigation measures to be secured.</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared Control Documents such as the oTMPfC and the Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) which include detailed measures for monitoring and interrogating changes to traffic as a result of the Project's construction-phase effect on the road network. This includes a commitment to review performance against targets, and share information with the Traffic Management Forum (TMF), which would then lead to the implementation of remedial measures (if it is agreed that this action is justified).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this precludes the need to add a requirement for a funding package, as the means to delivering additional mitigation is secured by this commitment already. In practical terms, any funding or measures (which may not necessarily require additional funding) would be determined based on the specifics of the effect, including the location, the nature of mitigation needed, duration and</p>	<p>FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)] oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#) ¶
oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>scale of change needed to respond to the effect. This would be determined in consultation with local authorities. Factors influencing the effect may include variables beyond the control or remit of the Project, and as such need to be considered on their own merit and may result in bespoke measures that could be funded by various parties.</p> <p>As such, the Applicant considers that the commitment to appropriate funding is secured. In addition, there is a mechanism within paragraph 10.5.3 of the FCTP that confirms that, should pre-agreed funding require review, this is also considered: <i>'If remedial measures are required at a particular site, these would be proposed as set out in Section 10.4 [of the FCTP]. If the measures agreed require funding in excess of that available, or the funding set aside has been previously exhausted, National Highways and the Contractors will enter discussions to agree the source for funding between them.'</i></p>		
Monitoring - Frequency	2.1.164 (DL-6)	Kent County Council consider that a six-monthly monitoring report should be provided to Kent County Council to	Commitments to monitoring and sharing of construction traffic information (via the TMF) are set	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)],	Matter Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [REP6-048]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		determine whether Travel Plan targets are being met and whether the construction traffic generation is at or lower than predicted.	out within the oTMPfC (paragraphs 2.4.8 to 2.4.24). This confirms that monitoring information would be presented to the TMF through a Monitoring Report on a monthly basis in order to guide actions to resolve non-compliance and to address complaints.		
Monitoring - Methodology	2.1.187 (DL-6)	Kent County Council consider that construction vehicle movements should be monitored to ensure they are adhering to agreed routes. Construction monitoring should also assess the extent to which traffic diverts to "rat runs" on the local road network as a result of delays caused by construction traffic management measures. This should cover both making sure contractor HGVs serving the construction compounds adhere to approved routes, as well as monitoring of other (regular) traffic movements, avoiding construction areas by using unsuitable rural road routes. Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) is likely to be the most appropriate tool as it would enable rat runs to be	Commitments to monitoring and sharing of construction traffic information (via the TMF) are set out within the oTMPfC (paragraphs 2.4.8 to 2.4.24). This confirms that real-time data will be captured, and that the type of monitoring implemented would be selected as part of the TMP on a case-by-case basis, through consultation with the local highway authorities, and could include Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR), traffic flow monitors, and web-based camera systems.	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		identified and also enable the contractor to identify whether LTC vehicles are causing any issues that are being raised by KCC or the public. The key issue for KCC is being able to monitor general traffic and construction traffic, during construction. KCC need to be able to determine whether any issues are caused by LTC traffic.			
Closures and Diversions	2.1.102 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council considers that construction vehicles should be required to use strategic routes wherever possible, and only use the local road network where a strategic alternative is not possible, in order to reduce the impact on the local highway network. A proposed list of routes to be restricted has been shared with National Highways.</p> <p>In addition, Kent County Council considers that a left turn ban for construction related HGVs when exiting the Southern tunnel entrance compound, joining the A226, should be implemented and that HGVs should be prohibited</p>	<p>The oTMPfC identifies a number of illustrative/indicative logistics routes, taking a risk-based approach to choosing and implementing routes that would form part of TMPs, dependent on several factors including but not limited to traffic counts, types of, traffic, WCH interface, nearby points of interest (e.g. schools) and will include engagement with relevant authorities.</p> <p>It is noted that most of the routes identified by KCC as needing to be prohibited from use by the Project's construction vehicles, are already identified as prohibited and this is secured by the oTMPfC (Table 4.4). Of the 10 routes identified by KCC, five have been prohibited (Castle</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR) [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Deleted: [\[REP6-050\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>from passing schools during drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>Kent County Council consider that all vehicles accessing the southern tunnel compound should be able to use Haul Road H18 when it becomes operational. This would reduce the impact on the LRN and in particular benefit the site access junction on the A226, thereby reducing delays to all traffic.</p> <p>KCC consider that construction related vehicles should not be permitted to access/egress from the site compounds during the network's peak hours, in order to retain trips on the SRN and key primary routes. Monitoring is also required to determine how much rat running is occurring and if it is significant, measures should be implemented to deter it.</p>	<p>Lane; Lower Higham Road between Green Farm Lane and A226; Thong Lane; Pear Tree Lane/The Ridgeway, Brewers Road between Park Pale and A226; The Street).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the remaining routes suggested by KCC are unlikely to be used by construction traffic, or are rendered illogical or impossible for use by HGVs as a result of the prohibiting of other routes.</p> <p>It is confirmed that there will be a left-turn ban for construction-related HGVs when exiting the Southern tunnel entrance compound, joining the A226 – this is set out in Table 2.2 of the oTMPfC.</p> <p>The oTMPfC is secured by draft DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 10 and would be delivered through a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which must be substantially in accordance with the oTMPfC.</p> <p>In order to adapt to changes in journey times across the SRN and Local Road Network the performance of traffic management will be monitored and reviewed at the TMF. This monitoring system will capture real-time data to confirm the effectiveness of traffic and</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>vehicle control measures and ensure the arrival and departure times of vehicles from compounds are controlled. Various monitoring measures such as automatic number plate recognition, traffic flow monitors, and possibly web-based camera systems or similar systems will be implemented to capture data on traffic composition, traffic flow, journey times (to a limited extent), and traffic safety (collision) data. The monitoring system will capture and report information related to construction traffic such as compliance with vehicle routing, and incident/accident reporting. Emerging trends and any lessons learnt will be used to adapt existing traffic management and shape any future phases of construction so as to minimise the impact on the travelling public. The Traffic Manager will escalate any changes required that cannot be agreed at the TMF, to the Joint Operations Forum for resolution (Code of Construction Practice, paragraph 4.3.3). The Applicant would seek to maximise the use of the A2 and haul road, subject to availability, to reduce concerns.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>The oTMPfC, Section 2.4 sets out the requirement for Contractors to monitor their vehicle movements. The monitoring system will be used to capture real-time data to ensure compliance with agreed vehicle routeing requirements. The monitoring data will be reported monthly to the Traffic Management Forum, where non-conformances will be addressed.</p> <p>Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC confirms measures that Delivery Partners will need to adhere to in terms of schools (including prohibiting movements past schools during drop-off/pick up times). The Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register (SACR) also commits the Applicant (or Delivery Partners) to develop and provide an educational road safety programme for school aged children for relevant local schools.</p> <p>The Applicant currently anticipates that access from the A2 to A226 would be intermittent depending on phasing, and therefore it is not possible to completely remove an access point from the A226. However, this will be explored further following appointment of the</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Contractor and discussed with relevant stakeholders at the Traffic Management Forum. The Applicant would seek to maximise the use of the A2 and haul road, subject to availability, to reduce concerns.		
Green bridges Definition of Green Bridges	2.1.11	<p>Kent County Council has concerns relating to descriptions of Thong Lane and Brewers Road green bridges given in the draft FCTP and outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) at Community Impacts Consultation in 2021.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that there is a need for bridges that can provide the ecological connectivity across the road and is concerned about the definition of 'lightweight' green bridges with regard to the ability of the habitat to become established and mitigate for the loss of vegetation from the scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees that there is a need for bridges that can provide the ecological connectivity across the road.</p> <p>The term 'lightweight' (see oLEMP) refers to green bridges that include hedgerows, scrub and grassland as minimum (rather than including tree planting and being wooded in nature). Green bridges over the A2 are to be constructed over live traffic which constrains the bridge design.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this level of planting is appropriate to balance ecological and landscape elements of the bridges. Sufficient widths for ecological connectivity have been consulted on with Natural England.</p> <p>A number of Design Principles are secured to ensure that the green bridges are implemented with both landscape and ecological considerations, to ensure sufficient</p>	<p>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [Document Reference 6.7 (7)], Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)],</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: [\[REP4-140\]](#)

Deleted: Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			soil depth and management will be in place to ensure the required planting types will establish and thrive on the bridge.		
Maintenance Maintenance of Green Bridges and Transfer of Assets	2.1.12 RRE	<p>Kent County Council considers that clarification is required on maintenance roles and responsibilities, and potential for transfer of assets, for green bridges and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and Walking, Cycling and Horse riding (WCH) routes.</p> <p>Kent County Council seeks clarification on issues such as agreeing transfer of assets, commuted sums for maintenance, clarity on plans and legal status of routes being provided, and ongoing consultation with the Kent County Council PRoW and Access Service through the detailed design and creation of TMPs.</p>	<p>The Applicant will maintain the structure (up to and including the waterproof layer), as well as bridge parapets and the green element (via third party at the Applicant's cost); the remainder being the responsibility of the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has included Protective Provisions within the draft DCO that set out the process for the transfer of asset responsibility. A Unilateral Undertaking has been provided to secure resourcing for the officer time involved in discharging this requirement.</u></p> <p>▼Maintenance is in line with existing approaches in terms of roles and responsibilities, and so subject to KCC confirmation (and further discussion on transfer of WCH assets), the Applicant considers that this is likely to be a matter agreed in subsequent drafts.</p> <p>Regarding commuted sums – The maintenance of both local highways</p>	<u>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)].</u>	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u> .

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a matter under discussion subject to KCC's review of the oLEMP and Design Principles as part of the DCO application.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Deleted: The Applicant has shared a draft Side Agreement with Kent County Council, and will continue to work with KCC to discuss the transfer of assets and maintenance agreements in relation to WCH routes including resourcing for design input and sign-off (for clarity, this refers to resourcing for the Council's representations for the design stage, and then 'sign-off' via a final certificate to confirm transfer of the asset once works are complete). Financial resourcing of this is covered under the proposed s.106 agreement.¶

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>and the strategic road network (SRN) is funded by the Department for Transport. Local highway funding is mainly based on a formula linked to the total mileage of A roads, B and C roads, and unclassified roads in each area, together with the numbers of bridges, lighting columns, cycleways and footways. This funding is refreshed every few years to take account of changes in road length and number of highway structures. Accordingly, as local highway works are carried out under the DCO, the amount of funding that each local highway authority receives will be amended to recognise these additional responsibilities. Given that this process already exists, it is not appropriate to require the Applicant to provide funding for the maintenance of parts of the local network out of the money given to it to maintain the SRN.</p> <p>Article 10(1) of the draft DCO provides that where a new local highway is constructed, it must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority, who becomes responsible</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>for its maintenance from completion. Article 10(2) makes similar provision for alterations or diversions of existing local roads. Both provisions enable the Applicant and the local highway authority concerned to reach different arrangements for specific maintenance responsibilities, but otherwise the default position is that once the local highway authority is satisfied that the highway has been properly completed, it becomes responsible for the maintenance of these highways just as it is for other public highways in its area.</p> <p>This arrangement is well-precedented for local highway works carried out by the Applicant in connection with Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) schemes. It strikes an appropriate balance between the Applicant's ability to carry out its works, and local highway authorities' duties to maintain public highways in their areas.</p>		
Worker transport Working Hours / Impact on local road network (LRN)	2.1.13	Kent County Council considers construction workforce travel (based on shift assumptions) could risk having a significant impact on the local road	<p>The Applicant notes that working hours are secured in the CoCP at Table 6.1.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that a blanket ban during peak hours</p>	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant and KCC are working on a Side Agreement would provide appropriate provisions in respect of the maintenance period by the Applicant.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		network during peak periods and requires careful management of movements to and from construction compounds.	<p>would not be proportionate – Contractors will need to determine appropriate routes based on where material is procured from, among other factors. Multiple restrictions may lead to a bigger/different issue.</p> <p>At this stage of the Project the specific locations from which the workforce will originate are unknown. However, an assessment has been conducted using modelling data to provide an illustration of the expected origins of workforce trips when traveling to and from the different compounds and Utility Logistics Hubs (ULHs) at the beginning and end of the working day. This approach is considered proportionate and reasonable for this current stage of the Project. As the construction phase progresses, more certainty regarding the origins of the workforce will be obtained.</p> <p>The enforcement of a blanket ban on use of the LRN is not considered an effective method to managing the workforce travel impact, in absence of the data on where the workforce origins will be. Rather, the Project approach to minimising disruptions and traffic impacts on</p>	<p>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p>	

Deleted: ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [\[REP6-038\]](#)
oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#) Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) [\[REP5-054\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>local highways caused by worker and visitor travel will be achieved via establishing a framework that promotes reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips and sustainable and active modes of travel. The detail of this framework is set out in the Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) which aims to establish a comprehensive framework for managing personnel travel to and from construction worksites, compounds, and ULHs during the construction phase of the Project. This includes exploring potential changes in travel behaviours to optimise efficiency and minimise the distance and necessity of travel.</p> <p>The FCTP, along with future Site Specific Travel Plans (SSTPs), which are secured via the FCTP, will be flexible to accommodate changing conditions throughout the Project's construction period. Continuous monitoring and review processes, including regular employee travel surveys at each site, will ensure targets and indicators are assessed and adjusted as needed.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			To provide support and critical review of travel planning efforts, as set out in the FCTP a Travel Plan Liaison Group (TPLG) will be established. This group will be responsible for promoting sustainable travel practices, monitoring progress, and endorsing new initiatives. Regular reviews and audits of the FCTP and SSTPs will be conducted to ensure their effectiveness and measure progress towards the desired goals.		
Construction traffic impacts Temporary Road Widening	2.1.14	Kent County Council notes that temporary road widening on the A226 may be required during construction and is concerned about exactly where this would be, and suggest that the impacts and benefits of retaining it afterwards should be considered.	The Applicant agrees that temporary traffic management measures may be required during construction, including road widening. The Applicant confirms that the length, nature and duration of temporary traffic management measures will be discussed as part of the development of the TMP, which will be developed in consultation with KCC. The Applicant agrees that the impacts and benefits of retaining temporary measures should be considered. The design taken forward will be developed with KCC to identify an	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)],	Matter Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [REP6-048]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>appropriate, effective and safe solution based on information from both parties. This can include input from KCC's active travel and public transport teams to ensure safety is considered appropriately, and can build in legacy measures should they be considered appropriate. As set out under Matter 2.1.9, the works would be in line with DMRB or equivalent standards.</p> <p>As part of this process, the permanent status of works following completion can be discussed using actual experience of its benefits and impacts. KCC would be a member of the TMF which would discuss such detailed matters regularly.</p>		
<p>Worker transport Working Hours / Impact on LRN</p>	<p>2.1.98 (DL-1) RRN</p>	<p>Kent County Council is concerned about working hours. Paragraph 8.6.19 of the Transport Assessment states that the peak period for deliveries to compounds is forecast to be between 08:00 and 09:00. As is a standard condition for most larger developments in the county, a condition/obligation should be applied to any development consent, if granted, that prevents construction trips</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that a blanket ban during peak hours would not be proportionate – Contractors will need to determine appropriate routes based on where material is procured from, among other factors. Multiple restrictions may lead to a bigger/different issue. Rather, the Applicant has set out a mechanism of using a monitoring system to monitor impact of the road network that results from construction related traffic and or traffic management measures.</p>	<p>FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)] Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Deleted: FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		using the local road network in peak hours (08:00–09:00 and 17:00–18:00) when there is existing congestion. Construction worker start/finish times should occur outside of the local (0800–0900 and 1700–1800) network peak hours wherever possible to reduce the impact on the local highway network.	Using this data appropriate mitigation measures will be consulted at the TMF to which KCC will be a consultee. The Applicant also notes that with regards to construction shifts and deliveries, as part of their appointment, Contractors would be required to deliver against the commitments of the Framework Construction Travel Plan (FCTP) which is a Control Document. The FCTP is legally secured by draft DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 11 and delivered through Site-Specific Travel Plans (SSTPs) which must be substantially in accordance with the FCTP. This matter remains under discussion subject to KCC's view on the Applicant's position.		
Worker accommodation	2.1.99 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that onsite accommodation for construction workers (a minimum of 400) should be secured as a Requirement as per modelling assumptions within paragraph 8.6.39 of the Transport Assessment.	Paragraph 8.6.39 of the Transport Assessment states that <i>'for the purposes of assessment, it has been assumed that there would be up to 480 onsite accommodation spaces available for staff to use. However, for most phases and to ensure robustness in the assessment, an accommodation</i>	Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><i>capacity of 400 spaces has been assumed.</i></p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that it would be prudent to add a requirement for a minimum number of bedspaces for onsite accommodation, as that level of accommodation may not be needed (as a result, for example, of strong local recruitment, or preference of Delivery Partners for example).</p> <p>Additionally, the Transport Assessment does not rely on the delivery of onsite accommodation in order to avoid significant impacts. If there were no onsite accommodation spaces, the maximum additional car trips to the site would be 70 in each direction in the AM peak hour and interpeak.</p> <p>This is due to onsite accommodation being prioritised for 24hr shift workers (meaning that the total would be spread over three different working shift patterns, rather than all arriving at the same time) and 'reasonable worst case' assumptions such as a relatively high proportion of trips to site being made by car, and workers travelling to/from site in the busiest period of the morning peak. In reality, it is</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			more likely that the car mode share would be lower and trips in the AM peak would be dispersed over more than a single hour so that even the 70 trips described here are likely an overestimate.		
Monitoring	2.1.100 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council considers that continuous monitoring of construction traffic is required in order to ensure drivers are adhering to permitted routes only, via GPS in-vehicle tracking or Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR). Kent County Council considers that the results should be presented to the Travel Plan Liaison Group along with any remedial measures proposed. Kent County Council considers that this should be secured by a Requirement.</p>	<p>The Applicant is in agreement that continuous monitoring of construction traffic should be undertaken and that this should be shared regularly with the Traffic Management Forum and Travel Plan Liaison Group.</p> <p>Commitments to monitoring and sharing of construction traffic information are already set out within the oTMPfC (paragraphs 2.4.8 to 2.4.24).</p> <p>This confirms that real-time data will be captured, and that the type of monitoring implemented would be selected as part of the Traffic Management Plans on a case-by-case basis, through consultation with the local highways authorities, and could include ANPR, traffic flow monitors, and web-based camera systems. The information would be presented to the Traffic Management Forum through a</p>	oTMPfC Document Reference 7.14 (9)	Matter Agreed

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to KCC's view on the Applicant's position.

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Monitoring Report on a monthly basis in order to guide actions to resolve non-compliance and to address complaints.		
Closures and diversions	2.1.101 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that Paragraph 1.1.2 of the oTMPfC states ' <i>Where traffic signals or similar would be required to facilitate construction movements, such as access to compounds and construction vehicle crossing points, they would be locally controlled to ensure that traffic on the local road network has priority in terms of traffic movements. In addition, when the traffic signals are not required operationally, they would be turned off</i> ' and consider that this should be secured by a Condition.	The Applicant notes that that the TMP, which must substantially accord with the oTMPfC, is legally secured under Requirement 10 in Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO. The oTMPfC is a Control Document and as such this is effectively secured mitigation. The Traffic Management Plans will be consulted on (including with KCC) prior to their submission and approval by the Secretary of State.	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Agreed
Worker Transport	2.1.103 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that construction workers should use strategic routes wherever possible, and only use the local road network where a strategic alternative is not possible, in order to reduce the impact on the local highway network, and that this should be	The FCTP sets out the Project's approach to management of workforce transport to and from the construction compounds. It has not been considered appropriate to prohibit workers' use of specific routes/modes of transport, but workers will be encouraged to use certain routes to access the sites.	FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)
Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Deleted: FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>set out in the Framework Construction Travel Plan. Specifically, Kent County Council considers that Castle Lane, Green Farm Lane and Sole Street should be prohibited for use by construction workers.</p>	<p>It is noted that the routes identified as a concern by KCC are not likely to form part of access routes to construction compounds.</p> <p>In line with this overarching FCTP, Contractors would be required to develop Site-Specific Travel Plans (SSTPs) in respect of the sites for which they are responsible (either an individual construction worksite or compound and Utility Logistics Hub (ULH), or a number of construction worksites, compounds and ULHs where these are closely located with similar levels of accessibility), following the latest policy advice and best practice documents and before the relevant part of the authorised development can commence. KCC will be a consultee in the preparation of SSTPs.</p> <p>The FCTP and future SSTPs are designed to incorporate the flexibility needed to respond and adapt to changing conditions over the duration of the construction of the Project and will require a continuous monitoring and reviewing process. Regular employee travel surveys would be</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>undertaken at each site, reviewing targets and indicators as necessary. A Travel Plan Liaison Group (TPLG) would be established, with the collective responsibility of providing high-level support to, and critical review of, travel planning across the Project. It would support efforts towards achieving greater use and increased uptake of sustainable travel, monitoring and reviewing progress, and agreeing new or amended initiatives. To ensure sufficient progress is being made, the effectiveness of this FCTP and SSTPs would be reviewed, audited and reported to the Applicant by the Travel Plan Manager.</p> <p>A substantial proportion of the workforce will be local, and some of those may live in areas whereby closing certain routes to them would be an unfair disadvantage.</p>		
Worker Transport	2.1.104 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that implementation of a shuttle bus(s) for construction workforce south of the river should be secured by a Requirement and a Condition that includes details to form part of Site Specific Construction Travel Plan (SSCTP) and as a	The Applicant does not consider it necessary to set a condition for the number of seats and trips on a shuttle bus, as this will need to flex depending on demand during the construction period (during which there will be a range of different requirements for the Project to implement to meet targets for	<u>FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</u>	Matter Agreed

Deleted: FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		minimum should include the number of buses, details of their operation (operate at peak shift times, 7 days a week and serve Gravesend Station) (other local railway stations may need to be served depending on location of the compound ULH, and further pick up/drop off locations should be investigated once the workforce has been appointed in order to determine if there is a high demand from one particular area).	sustainable workforce travel in the FCTP). At different phases of the Project, different levels of provision will be needed, but the minimum provision will be determined by the Delivery Partner, controlled by the requirement to meet targets for % of workforce using non-car modes (which are secured by the FCTP). Section 3.4 of the FCTP notes that the service will serve 'Public Transport Hubs' and mentions Gravesend Station by name. Table 9.1 of the FCTP sets out the Project's Action Plan – the key tasks required as a minimum to be achieved across all construction worksites, compounds and ULHs during the Project's construction period – including Item 7 (Organise transport hub shuttle bus services (align with planned shift patterns and workforce numbers) including contractual agreements) which must be implemented within one month of DCO grant.		
Worker Transport Monitoring Mitigation	2.1.105 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that a TPLG should be established which meets on a monthly basis and comprises e.g. public transport providers,	The FCTP sets out that the Project will initiate a TPLG as described by KCC. The Applicant does not consider that this needs to be secured as an additional Requirement within the draft DCO –	Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)] FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>TfL, National Highways and Local Authorities.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that the group should be responsible for providing high-level support to, and critical review of, travel planning across the Project. It would support efforts towards achieving greater sustainable travel, monitoring, and reviewing progress and agreeing new or amended initiatives.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that it requires £2,880 per year to attend this group (where required) and this should be secured via a Section 106 Agreement.</p>	<p>the FCTP is a standalone Control Document and complies with the measures secured under Requirement 11 (Part 1 of the draft DCO Schedule 2). It has been produced in support of the commitments set out in the CoCP (which aligns and feeds into the REAC and subsequent EMP iterations) with regards to how the mitigation and management of environmental effects of the Project would be delivered and maintained.</p> <p>In summary, the measures set out in the FCTP will be secured by way of draft DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 11, to ensure that there is a commitment to their delivery including implementation of the TPLG.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a Unilateral Undertaking that includes officer resourcing contributions for the attendance of the TPLG.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)].</p>	
Worker Transport	2.1.106 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that a minimum of 30% of parking spaces at the compounds and ULHs should have active electric vehicle charging facilities with a minimum of 7kw output.	The Applicant notes that the Carbon and Energy Management Plan sets out at CBN08 that <i>'The Applicant will require Contractors to provide and maintain electric vehicle charging facilities, using zero carbon electricity, for 30% of parking capacity in each compound,</i>	Carbon and Energy Management Plan [Document Reference 7.19 (4)] , FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)] ,	Matter Agreed

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#) FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#) ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [\[REP6-038\]](#)

Deleted: KCC with an estimate for officer resourcing to be secured under a Section 106 Agreement and this remains under discussion pending KCC's consideration.

Deleted: [\[APP-552\]](#)

Deleted: FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><i>increasing this as necessary to satisfy demand.</i></p> <p>This is also referred to in the FCTP (p. 71).</p>		
Worker Transport	2.1.107 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that secure, covered cycle parking is required at all compounds and ULHs, with a proposed provision for 10% of employees, and that a proportion of the spaces should have electric bike charging facilities and an additional proportion should also be able to cater for adapted bikes.	<p>Page 71/72 of the FCTP commits the Project to providing '<i>facilities for walkers and cyclists (secure cycle parking, changing facilities, showers and lockers)</i>' and '<i>Managed electric charging facilities for E-bikes, in covered cycle parking areas, to satisfy demand</i>' and '<i>The provision of cycle training and maintenance for all levels of cyclists, to encourage new cyclists to switch to this form of active travel and promote safely and awareness of cycling travel. This would be linked to local provision (either by local authorities, charities or cycling groups), if available</i>'.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to include a specific level of provision (such as accounting for 10% of the workforce). Sustainable, active and non-car travel is promoted by the FCTP.</p>	<p>Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152] FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)],</p>	Matter Agreed
Construction Traffic Impacts	2.1.108 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council has identified where construction of the LTC will have a negative impact on bus journey times.	The Transport Assessment, Section 8.9, outlines the impacts on public transport during the construction	oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: FCTP [[REP5-054](#)]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>The Transport Assessment [APP-529] Section 8.9, Impacts on the public transport network, sets out the predicted delay to buses during the construction phase, where these are expected to be over two minutes per service per direction. The accumulation of delays on a bus trip increases journey time, requiring adjustment to schedules either to increase the cycle time or to reduce the level of service, both leading to a loss in patronage. Reductions in public transport service level often engender private car trips and reduction in revenue, which both need to be avoided.</p> <p>KCC has taken the information in Transport Assessment, Tables 8.70 to 8.79, identifying affected bus routes in the impacted first 10 phases of construction, and calculating the average delay per trip; the total additional hours; and the associated costs of the impacts. This analysis covers the costs of the known delays to buses, but not potential delays</p>	<p>period (which is broken down into 11 phases for assessment). Mitigation is proposed as part of the DCO application in a number of documents, namely, the Transport Assessment, Section 10.1, outlines the management of impacts during construction including specific mitigation such as the construction of site haul routes to reduce usage on the public network. The section also references the relevant control documents which set out the mitigation measures and mechanisms which would be in place during construction.</p> <p>Notably, the oTMPfC details the mechanisms throughout the document which would be in place (such as the Traffic Management Forum, Section 3.2) which would allow for discussions to take place on matters such as appropriate mitigation for public transport impacts during construction. When developing the TMP, specific measures are outlined to address and minimise the impacts on public transportation, including public transport users and operators; this is set out in Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC. These measures are</p>	<p>Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]</p>	

Deleted: oTMPfC [REP6-048]

Deleted: [APP-529]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>resulting from such things as temporary closure / diversions that have been referred to in the Transport Assessment [APP-529], but which cannot be quantified by National Highways at this stage. For the highest frequency services which are likely to suffer from Thong Lane closure and A226 Contraflow, bus priority should also still be considered.</p> <p>KCC has identified negative impacts on active travel modes, largely in terms of what is not provided by the Project.</p> <p>Kent County Council Public Transport officers have calculated increased costs to Kent County Council bus services of approximately £80k due to delays arising from Lower Thames Crossing construction traffic management measures, as set out in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>For the highest frequency services which are likely to suffer from Thong Lane closure and A226 Contraflow, bus priority should also still be considered.</p>	<p>designed to keep the impacts on public transport users and operators, which includes buses to a minimum, demonstrating a commitment to maintaining the service and accessibility of public transportation during the Project.</p> <p>It should be noted, whilst the Transport Assessment outlines the envisaged impacts based on a possible construction scenario, the actual impacts will only become known once construction commences and monitoring as set out in para 2.4.8–2.4.24 of the oTMPfC is put in place.</p> <p>The results of this monitoring would be discussed within the TMF, as would the development of appropriate mitigation where required at the appropriate time, such as the impacts on bus routes in terms of possible delays due to the Project works. KCC would be able to recommend mitigation packages at the TMF which would be discussed and agreed where appropriate.</p> <p>It should be noted that there are no bus routes on the section of Thong Lane which would be closed, so the bus route that uses the northern</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>In addition, Kent County Council public transport requires a pot of £80k to be secured to cover the temporary works that may impact bus services but which the Transport Assessment cannot determine at this stage.</p> <p>This 'pot' could be held by National Highways and only be drawn down upon in the event that this is required due to the temporary works. It is imperative that temporary works are raised at least 4 weeks in advance of them happening with the KCC Public Transport team and required compensation discussed at the same time based on the of £200 per additional operational hour.</p> <p>Temporary bus priorities should still be considered to counter the impact of delay on buses where possible.</p>	<p>section of Thong Lane will not be affected.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes continued engagement and mitigation proposals from KCC that can be discussed and explored before construction commences and during the construction via the TMF.</p> <p><u>The Applicant therefore considers that the proposed financial contribution is effectively secured and would be applied if evidence and agreement is presented that interventions are needed to resolve issues. By securing it in this way, the amount of funding would not be capped. The approach to TMF / TMP would mean that the funding would be held by the Applicant, and would be applied based on evidence of effects and through consultation with KCC.</u></p>		
Delivery Booking	2.1.165 (DL-6)	Kent County Council notes that the Applicant has identified the use of a delivery booking system as described in DCO document 6.3 Environmental Statement – Appendix 2.2 Code	The Applicant notes that a delivery booking system (as described in paragraph 3.5.11 of ES Appendix 2.2 Annex B: Outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP)) and monitoring data collected by the	<u>Outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP) Document Reference 6.3 ES</u>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan – Annex B – Outline Materials Handling Plan paragraph 3.5.11.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers this does not go far enough and requires more detailed monitoring to mitigate these negative impacts.</p>	<p>Contractors will be used to ensure that Contractor deliveries adhere to the agreed vehicle routes and timing. Monitoring will be provided in addition to the use of the delivery booking system.</p> <p>By analysing the monitoring data, Contractors will be able to assess the compliance of deliveries with the specified routes and identify any deviations or non-compliance. The data will provide insights into various aspects such as actual vs planned deliveries, vehicle arrival and departure times, adherence to agreed vehicle routeing, and non-compliance with Project route bans.</p> <p>By closely monitoring these parameters, the Applicant can evaluate the performance of the Contractors in adhering to the prescribed routes and take appropriate actions to address any issues or non-compliance. This may include providing guidance and feedback to the Contractors, implementing corrective measures, or initiating discussions to resolve problems.</p> <p>The monitoring data will serve as a valuable tool in ensuring that Contractor deliveries are carried out</p>	<p>Appendix 2.2 Annex B (5),</p>	

Deleted: Outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP) [\[REP5-050\]](#)

Deleted: ([APP-338](#)) paragraph 3.5.11.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			in accordance with the agreed vehicle routes, minimising disruptions to the LRN and promoting efficient traffic management throughout the construction phase.		
Access and Egress	2.1.166 (DL-6)	<p>Kent County Council note that Transport Assessment Appendix E [APP-534] paragraph 1.1.9 refers to access and egress for the A226 Gravesend Road compound, indicating HGVs will use the A226 and staff will use Lower Higham Road.</p> <p>Kent County Council is concerned about the negative impact on Lower Higham Road and consider that construction workers should be permitted to use either access to reduce the impact on this access.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the workforce associated with the A226 Gravesend Road compound would be able to access the compound via Lower Higham Road or the A226. The routes shown in Transport Assessment Appendix E: Construction Traffic Assessment Supporting Information provide a scenario modelled, which informs environmental impact assessments and represents a reasonable worst-case scenario.</p> <p>To establish and finalise a specific access route for the workforce to reach the compound, it is crucial to recognise the existence of several unknown factors and considerations at present. These include the specific locations from and to which construction workers would commute daily, as well as details about individual members of the workforce. Consequently, the access routes for the workforce are not finalised yet but will be</p>	<p>Transport Assessment Appendix E: Construction Traffic Assessment Supporting Information [APP-534] FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]</p>	Matter Agreed

Deleted: FCTP [REP5-054]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>developed as part of the SSTOP, allowing for a tailored approach to address potential travel impacts in the most efficient manner.</p> <p>The FCTP sets out that SSTOPs (for each compound or Utility Logistics Hub (ULH) or groups of compounds or ULHs where they are closely located with similar levels of accessibility) will be produced and these would reflect the local environs at the time of production. The FCTP also sets out details of the Travel Plan Liaison Group (TPLG), which KCC would be invited to, and this would offer an opportunity to raise such matters at the time.</p>		
Construction Deliveries	2.1.167 (DL-6)	Kent County Council consider that HGV movements should not be permitted (where reasonably practical) to occur within the local highway network peak hours of 0800-0900 and 1700-1800.	The Applicant acknowledges the importance of minimising its impact on communities and has developed a tailored approach within the oTMPfC. Instead of a blanket approach to enforcing a ban to construction traffic on the use of the local road network during peak hours, specific restrictions have been implemented to address the needs of different stakeholder groups, such as schools, local residents, businesses, and public transport. For example, the Project	oTMPfC Document Reference 7.14 (9)	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>has committed to avoiding school entrances during drop-off and pick-up times. These measures are detailed in Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC highlighting the Project's commitment to mitigating or minimising the impacts of construction traffic and managing traffic-related issues to ensure the safe delivery of the Project.</p> <p>Furthermore, in collaboration with local authorities and stakeholders, the Project has introduced restrictions on Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) associated with the construction activities. Table 4.4 within the Traffic Management Plan outlines the local roads and the proposed restrictions for HGVs during the Project's construction phase, reaffirming the Project's commitment to minimising impacts to the local and wider communities.</p> <p>The majority of deliveries for the Project will be directed to two main compounds within KCC's area. The "A2 Compound" will have access from the A2 eastbound off slip, eliminating the need for construction traffic to utilise the local road network. The southern portal entrance compound will be</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>accessed via the A2 and then the A226. To minimise the impact on the LRN in Gravesend, a commitment has been made to enforce a "no right turn" ban for HGVs when leaving the compound for the duration of the compound operational period, which is set out in Table 2.2 of the oTMPfC. This restriction aims to prevent construction HGVs traveling through local roads and encourages the use of a limited section of the A226 and SRN, namely the A2.</p> <p>The remaining compounds in the KCC area, namely A226 Gravesend Compound and Milton Road Compound, are situated in locations that require the use of the local road network. However, it should be noted that these compounds are smaller and primarily designated for specific element of works. Consequently, the duration of their use and the forecasted volume of construction traffic deliveries are expected to be significantly lower compared to other compounds within the KCC area.</p> <p>Despite their smaller scale, the Project recognises the importance of minimising the impact of</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>construction traffic on the LRN and surrounding areas. Therefore, the specific restrictions outlined in Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC will also apply to these compounds. These restrictions aim to mitigate and minimise the potential impacts of construction traffic and effectively manage any traffic-related issues that may arise. By adhering to these measures, the Project ensures the safe and efficient delivery of the overall construction project within the KCC area.</p> <p>In line with the requirements outlined in Table 2.3, the Project recognises the importance of establishing a framework that promotes the cycle of planning, implementation, and review while allowing for adaptability in response to dynamic scenarios. To achieve this, Section 2 of the oTMPfC incorporates a comprehensive monitoring system as an integral part of the overall Traffic Management Plan (TMP). This system is designed to effectively collect, and report essential data related to various construction activities, allowing for adjustments to monitoring requirements as the</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			construction works progress. Close collaboration and ongoing engagement with relevant highways authorities, including KCC, will be maintained throughout the construction period to oversee the management of the monitoring system and jointly determine suitable monitoring locations.		
Operation and Maintenance					
HGV Parking Rest and Service Area (RSA) Provision	2.1.15 RRE	Kent County Council considers that Kent has a lack of official lorry parking facilities and the loss of the Cobham/Watling Street RSA will increase the deficit of lorry parking spaces within the area, <u>and that the LTC Project should be responsible for replacing the spaces removed by the Project.</u>	The Applicant agrees with KCC that the lack of lorry parking is a pre-existing, regional and national issue and that the loss of Cobham Services petrol station will result in the removal of a small number of lorry parking spaces from the network. <u>However it is not agreed that the Project should replace the spaces that it removes, as the Applicant considers that this is a wider issue that should be considered as part of wider network operations.</u>	N/A	Matter Not Agreed
HGV Parking Enhanced Lorry Park as part of the Project	2.1.16	Kent County Council considers that an enhanced lorry park provided as part of the Project would be a legacy benefit, and that alternative locations for a replacement/ additional provision of spaces should have	The Applicant does not itself deliver roadside facilities, though it is agreed that enhanced lorry parking would provide a benefit and has reviewed the suitability of its own land holdings for lorry parking and carried out an exercise in January	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: .

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>been considered as part of the Project. Further detail is included within Kent County Council's Response to Procedural Decision – PADS Tracker [AS-072]</p>	<p>2022 to explore the appetite in industry to locate a new lorry park at Chigwell. The Applicant is investing £20m in improving HGV facilities at existing roadside facilities on the SRN. Recognising that lorry parking is a multi-agency issue, National Highways' Operational Directorate will be setting out its position across the SRN through its Route Strategies and in considerations for Road Investment Strategies 3 (RIS3) (see Vision for Route Strategies (National Highways, 2021)). This will be informed by a consultation exercise looking into why there has not been more roadside facilities and lorry parks developed in the north-east quadrant of the M25. As such, it is not agreed that additional provision should be considered as part of the Project, but will be considered by National Highways' Operational Directorate across the SRN. The Applicant recently conducted a consultation exercise looking into why there have not been more roadside facilities and lorry parks developed in the north-east</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			quadrant of the M25. The findings were fed into the Route Strategies.		
HGV Parking	2.1.17	<p>Kent County Council is concerned about potential HGV parking on the widened Thong Lane and Henhurst Road areas as well as others in the vicinity, and considers that a clear strategy (legislation, enforcement powers and physical restrictions) for dealing with HGV parking is needed to avoid anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes the lack of service area does not comply with Circular 01/2022 'Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development' with regards to maximum distances between facilities. This may also deter drivers of electric vehicles who may need to use rapid chargers en-route. Further, enhanced lorry parking in an area that suffers with a lack of facilities for hauliers would have been an ideal legacy benefit of the project.</p> <p>Design of the emergency access at the North Portal must not preclude the potential for</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises KCC's concerns about HGV parking on the widened Thong Lane and Henhurst Road and other local roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has included a clearway order on Henhurst Road from the southern roundabout at the Gravesend East junction to the new section of road to be called Darnley Road. In addition, the clearway order will also extend along Darnley Road between Henhurst Road and Halfpence Lane. This is set out within the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that the lack of a service area on Lower Thames Crossing means that it does not comply with Circular 01/22. The Circular notes that '<i>in most cases it is for the private sector to promote roadside facilities</i>'. Furthermore, a roadside facility does not necessarily need to be on Lower Thames Crossing for the Project to operate safely.</p> <p>The Applicant has established a Roadside Facilities Working Group to encourage suitable new developments in areas of the</p>	Draft DCO Document Reference 3.1 (11)	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>the future provision of a junction to provide which would allow motorists the opportunity to turn around and/or a motorway service area with lorry parking facilities.</p> <p>KCC also insists that Government provides National Highways and KCC with the necessary enforcement powers to tackle cases of inappropriate lorry parking that will increase as a result of the new crossing.</p>	<p>network where there is a need, and Working Group strategy would potentially bring forward suitable facilities faster than if included within Lower Thames Crossing.</p> <p>This is a wider issue occurring on roads within and outside of the Project area, and will be considered by National Highways Operational Directorate across the SRN. Through 'Project Rapid', the Applicant is committed to increasing the number of rapid charging points at existing Motorway Service Areas on the SRN. This will not be delivered at a Project level and would be delivered at a strategic regional/national level to ensure the most effective rollout to meet growing demand for EV infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant is improving the power infrastructure to provide rapid charging at roadside facilities in the proximity of Lower Thames Crossing, namely Maidstone and Clacket Lane West and East.</p>		
Safety	2.1.119 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that the Applicant's COBA-LT accident analysis uses default link rates for the local road	The Applicant considers that junctions were taken into account - the appraisal combines links and junctions, which means that although junctions were not	Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>network, but junctions do not appear to be assessed.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that even with this omission, the analysis identifies (in Plate 9.3) increases in traffic volumes and accident costs forecast with the Lower Thames Crossing for the A227, A228 and A229. All these roads have a significant history of severe collisions, as evidenced by the Applicant's historic junction accident analysis in Plate 9.5 (and confirmed by a similar Kent County Council's analysis).</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that if the COBA-LT analysis had been completed for junctions as well as road links, the A227 and A228 in particular, with their many at-grade junctions, would likely incur significantly higher costs/safety impacts.</p> <p>Kent County Council requests that National Highways mitigate these impacts by supporting Kent County Council's Vision Zero initiatives.</p> <p>Kent County Council welcomes further discussions around the</p>	<p>individually assessed, the impact of the Project on them is included in the accident numbers and costs.</p> <p>As a result of the Project the overall accident rate decreases per vehicle kilometre driven as stated in paragraph 9.3.12 of 7.9 Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Local accident rates were calculated using 2015-2019 Department for Transport data on road safety statistics for Great Britain, collected via STATS19, and National Highways Traffic Information System Annual Average Daily Traffic flow (TRIS AADT) data. Plate 9.2 of 7.9 Transport Assessment shows the sections where local accident rates have been applied. Other links in the COBALT appraisal area (Plate 9.1 of 7.9 Transport Assessment) use the default combined link/junction accident rates, not link rates.</p> <p>The default combined link/junction accident rates were applied to the A226, A227, A228 and A229.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently undertaking a Wider Network Impacts (WNI) study with KCC, specific to the corridors mentioned, with safety being a key aspect. The</p>	<p>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p> <p>Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [Document Reference 7.14 (9)],</p>	

Deleted: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [\[REP6-038\]](#)¶
 Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		benefits and rationale of carrying out iRAP assessments, and will be seeking to include these assessments and any subsequent risk mitigation as a Requirement of the DCO.	<p>Applicant would welcome further discussions with regards to the benefits and rationale of carrying out iRAP assessments in addition to the existing study but does not consider that this should be a Requirement of the dDCO.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to the implementation of the CLOCS standard in Environmental Statement Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan (CoCP) and the oTMPfC.</p> <p>The Applicant has not carried out a COBALT assessment for each of the construction phases. The Applicant's position is that following the principles of TAG Guidance, undertaking such detailed analysis is not proportionate at this stage of the Project development. GIS shapefiles showing the change in traffic flows on each link in the network, for each construction phase in each modelled hour, was provided to KCC.</p>		
Road Drainage and the Water Environment					
Assessment methodology	2.1.143 (DL-1)	Whilst consultation has been undertaken on water matters	The LTC drainage team provided a general update on the Project's	N/A	Matter Agreed

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position set out above and further engagement regarding iRAP assessments.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
	RRN	with the Environment Agency with respect to groundwater modelling and Essex County Council with respect to design principles for attenuation and infiltration basins in 2019 and 2020, KCC expects the same level of consideration for water management within Kent's local area and it is disappointing that this still does not appear to be the case (the only direct consultation undertaken with KCC as Lead Local Flood Authority took place in July and September 2017).	drainage design to the south of the River Thames to a representative of KCC LLFA and the Medway IDB in July 2020. Drainage pollution risk assessments were shared in August 2020, and the full FRA and Hydrogeological Risk Assessment were shared in October 2020, when DCO application 1 was withdrawn. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.		
Assessment methodology	2.1.144 (DL-1) RRN	It has not been possible to review the results of hydraulic modelling in order to demonstrate the operational capabilities of the drainage network proposed given the calculated infiltration rate. Without being able to review this information KCC cannot be certain that the surface water drainage network operates within the required operational parameters.	MicroDrainage model outputs can be shared as PDF reports, or alternatively the models themselves could be packaged and shared. The PDF outputs (see example) would provide details of the design criteria applied to each network. The Applicant has committed to share these with KCC following a meeting on 9/5/2023. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May	N/A	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.		
Assessment methodology	2.1.145 (DL-1) RRN	A plan should be provided which overlays the testing locations relative to the individual soakaway feature plans presented in the Flood Risk Assessment ([APP-460] to [APP-477])	An assessment of infiltration rates applicable to the proposed soakaway features in Kent is provided in Environmental Statement Appendix 14.5 Annex M. A plan of the Project ground investigation testing locations relatively to the individual soakaway features will be shared. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.	ES Figure 14.5: Water Framework Directive - Surface Water Bodies, Transitional Waterbodies and Current Status [APP-326]	Matter Agreed
Assessment methodology / Baseline conditions	2.1.146 (DL-1) RRN	Whilst the majority of watercourses affected by the proposals are under the remit of the Environment Agency or Lower Medway Internal Drainage Board, there are some within the vicinity of Shorne and any works to these which could affect the watercourse or ditch's ability to convey water will require KCC's formal flood defence consent (including culvert removal,	The requirement to secure ordinary watercourse consent for works to qualifying watercourses is noted. As detailed in the Project's Consents and Agreements Position Statement, all of the powers required to undertake such works have been included, or addressed, within the DCO, as permitted by various provisions of the Planning Act 2008. This has been subject to the Applicant including the appropriate protective	Consents and Agreements Position Statement [Document Reference 3.3 (8)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Deleted: [[REP6-014](#)]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		access culverts and outfall structures).	provisions in the DCO. The protective provisions in Part 3 of Schedule 14 to the dDCO, agreed by KCC, provide for drainage boards or lead local flood authorities to approve works to ordinary watercourses. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.147 (DL-1) RRR	KCC requests that a plan be provided which clearly shows the soakaway features proposed and which of these are within land currently under the ownership of National Highways.	Soakaway features, including proposed infiltration basins and swales are illustrated, together with the Order Limits, on the 2.16 Drainage Plans (Volume B) (Sheets 1 to 20). The Land Plans show ownership of land including Crown Interest land of which the owner is the Secretary of State for Transport and further details are presented in the Book of Reference. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May	Drainage Plans (Volume B) [Document Reference 2.16 (5)] Land Plans [Document Reference 2.2 (8)] Book of Reference [Document Reference 4.2 (8)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Deleted: Drainage Plans (Volume B) [\[REP6-008\]](#)
Land Plans [\[REP5-004 to REP5-008\]](#)
Book of Reference [\[REP5-030\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.148 (DL-1) RRN	It is noted that Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (APP-140) states "Highway runoff would be collected by means of one of the edge of pavement details specified in the DMRB CD 524 (Highways England, 2021)." Clause LSP.28 of the document 7.5 Design Principles [APP-516] states that "the use of gully pots shall be avoided where a viable alternative is available" as such KCC asks for clarification as to where and what edge of pavement detail will be used throughout catchment (EFR-1) to capture surface water flows	The use of gully pots is sought to be avoided where possible to reduce risks of amphibians and small mammals becoming trapped. Within catchment EFR-1, based on the preliminary drainage design, proposed edge of pavement detail includes a mixture of surface water channels and kerb and gully systems. These details would be confirmed during detailed design. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.	ES Chapter 2 [APP-140] Design Principles Document Reference 7.5 (7)	Matter Agreed
Assessment methodology	2.1.149 (DL-1) RRN	Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140] paragraph 2.4.53 states "Where sediment forebays cannot be accommodated, a vortex grit separator shall be installed upstream of the basin inlet for pollution". In order to confirm the appropriateness of such a device KCC asks that pollution	There is one location in Kent where space constraints preclude a sediment forebay, This is at an existing basin located to the south of the M2/A2/A122 Lower Thames Crossing junction directly east of Cobham petrol filling station, that would be reconfigured as a vegetated drainage system. At this location a pollution control	ES Chapter 2 [APP-140] ES Appendix 14.5: Hydrogeological Risk Assessment [APP-459]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Deleted: Design Principles [REP6-046]

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		mitigation indices be provided for these products in line with British Water's applying the Ciria SuDS Manual Simple Index Approach to proprietary/manufactured stormwater treatment devices document.	alternative, such as vortex grit separator, would be provided in accordance with DMRB standards, with the final solution selected during the detailed design stage. It is noted that all of the proposed infiltration drainage features have been subject to assessment with regard to the potential to cause pollution of underlying groundwater resources. The Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 14.5 Annexes O and M) concludes that, on the basis of a conservative modelling assessment, there would be no exceedances of environmental quality or drinking water standards over the lifetime of the proposed Project. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.150 (DL-1) RRN	Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140] paragraph 2.7.75 states that an external waterproof membrane will be applied to precast box culverts and that this would	Noted. The Applicant is seeking the views of the Environment Agency as to their acceptance of this aspect.	ES Chapter 2 [APP-140]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		typically be a bitumen coating KCC asks for confirmation to be provided from the relevant stakeholder(s) as to their acceptance of the use of bitumen	As noted in paragraph 2.7.73 of ES Chapter 2: Project Description, the final methodology to be followed would depend on the sensitivity of the watercourse and would be subject to consultation and agreement with the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority or the Environment Agency during detailed design.		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.151 (DL-1) RRN	Paragraph 2.7.77 of Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-140] describes the general makeup of headwalls in association with culverts. Whilst not discussed, the County Council advises that the use of concrete bag headwalls is not permitted in KCC managed watercourses.	Noted. This requirement will be shared by the team progressing the detailed design and use of concrete bag headwalls will be avoided on KCC managed watercourses. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.	ES Chapter 2 [APP-140]	Matter Agreed
Project design and mitigation	2.1.152 (DL-1) RRN	Paragraph 14.4.69 of chapter of 14 of the Environmental Statement [APP-152] mentions the requirement for nitrogen deposition compensation site KCC advises that should it be proposed for any water to be discharged other than via infiltration will need to be	No formal drainage is proposed for the nitrogen compensation areas, the rainfall infiltration and runoff regime will remain as existing (albeit with additional tree cover encouraging losses via evapotranspiration and providing attenuation of runoff).	ES Chapter 14 [APP-152]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		considered within and demonstrated as complaint with the Greenfield Run Off Rate.	Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.153 (DL-1) RRN	Paragraph 14.5.10 of chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [APP-152] discusses good practice with regards to the construction phase and that the contractor will be responsible for providing a Flood Risk Assessment and drainage plan. KCC expects for the 1% AEP event to be considered as part of this	The construction phase FRA and drainage plan shall include consideration of 1% AEP design storm events, inclusive of climate change allowances up to 2030. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.	ES Chapter 14 [APP-152]	Matter Agreed
Assessment methodology	2.1.154 (DL-1) RRN	Within paragraph 4.7.2 of document 6.3 Environmental Statement – Appendix 14.6 – Flood Risk Assessment – Part 6 [APP-465] it is stated that “the Environment Agency verbally agreed at meeting held on 4th May 2022 that a 5% departure on peak rainfall intensities was acceptable. With this departure taken into account, the 20% and 40% uplift on peak rainfall	Given the DMRB requirement to ensure no overtopping of attenuation features during all events up to and including the 1% AEP (inclusive of climate change allowance), a departure specific to the 3.3% AEP event was not discussed with the EA. Sensitivity testing has been undertaken to demonstrate that the attenuation features are effective in	ES Appendix 14.6: Flood Risk Assessment – Part 6 [REP1-171]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>intensity are deemed to be accepted for drainage design." Whilst accepting of this principle, KCC asks for clarification as to whether a similar departure has been permitted for 3.3% AEP rainfall event.</p> <p>Given that the requirement is for a 35% uplift to be applied to the 30 year event and that this is above the 5% accepted departure (being that no uplift has been applied to the 30 year event) there is a possible negative impact to Local Area whereby the risk of flooding could be increased due to the recommend climate change uplift factor not being applied to the 1 in 30 year critical rainfall event.</p>	<p>response to consecutive 3.3% and 10% AEP storms.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that sensitivity testing has been undertaken to demonstrate that the attenuation features are effective in response to consecutive [1 in 30 year] 3.3% and [1 in 10 year] 10% AEP storms, in addition to the 1% AEP storm with a 40% uplift for climate change. In all these events there would be no overtopping of attenuation features.</p> <p>The modelling has therefore demonstrated that the drainage attenuation features would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the runoff generated by the 1 in 30 year critical rainfall event inclusive of the climate change uplift factor. There would be no negative impact to the local area due to increased risk of flooding. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by KCC in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023, this matter is agreed.</p>		
Assessment methodology	2.1.155 (DL-1) RRN	Whilst it is appreciated that further information has been provided within the FRA (APP-	ES Appendix 14.5 (Hydrogeological Risk Assessment) Annex M Table 5.1 shows the infiltration rates used	ES Appendix 14.5: Hydrogeological Risk	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant now considers

Deleted: to be

Deleted: Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) the Applicant considers this matter is now Agreed.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		466) with regards to the cascading pond network serving the southern portal, it is not clear as to what the staggered infiltration rates used for the design are to be. As per the concerns above regarding hydraulic analysis, KCC cannot be certain as to its operational effectiveness without these rates and the hydraulic modelling thereof	in the groundwater modelling assessments of the cascading basins. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.	Assessment [APP-459]	
Cumulative effects	2.1.156 (DL-1) RRN	The Thames Estuary Marshes next to/under the road receives its water via surface water/drains rather than ground water. There is a need to ensure that KCC are satisfied that tunnel and road construction do not impact the functionality of the marshes and ensure that they will continue to receive and retain water.	Effects on the water balance of the Thames Estuary Marshes have been subject to detailed assessment, as reported in Chapter 14 of the ES. Measures to ensure no detriment to the quality or quantity of water supporting the Marshes are secured via a suite of commitments within the REAC. Following engagement and subsequent sharing of information on matters raised by Kent County Council in their Relevant Representation undertaken in May 2023 (See Appendix A) this matter is now Agreed.	ES Chapter 14 [APP-152]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Deleted: the Applicant considers

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Traffic and Economics					
Construction traffic impacts Public Transport use During Construction	2.1.18 RRE	<p>Kent County Council considers that the Project's construction would disadvantage the public transport network (mainly services on the A226).</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that all delays to buses should be minimised and avoided where at all possible.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that incentives should therefore be provided to users to increase the attractiveness of public transport for both employees and existing local residents to reduce the overall number of vehicles on the network during construction.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that the information provided by the Applicant does not respond to the issue that bus services, particularly along the A226 will be disadvantaged throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Congestion on the network caused by road works is an opportunity to achieve modal shift away from the private car, a mode which can carry a</p>	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the Project's construction would disadvantage the public transport network or that area-wide incentives to change the travel patterns of the existing local residents is necessary.</p> <p>However, the Project is committed (via the FCTP) to producing SSTPs for construction compounds with measures to reduce the impact of the Project's workforce on the highway network.</p> <p>If the SSTPs do not meet their targets, further measures would be considered and implemented, and this could include measures to incentivise worker behaviour.</p> <p>Further detail related to the Project's position on public transport effects during construction is set out at Matter 2.1.108 (DL-1).</p>	FCTP [Document Reference 7.13 (6)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: FCTP [\[REP5-054\]](#)

Deleted:)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		significantly higher number of people than the private car. Every opportunity should be explored in prioritising public transport during this time through such things as dedicated bus routes on key networks affected by construction, etc.			
Developments and uncertainty log Uncertainty Log	2.1.19	Throughout the process of development of the Traffic Modelling, Kent County Council has reviewed Uncertainty Logs (2018, 2022) and suggested a list of committed and likely developments that should be included in the modelling and base model. Kent County Council notes that most developments have been included, although the Transport Quarter that is currently being built out appears to be missing (GB/20200343). The proposed development at Hoo has also not been included despite funding for significant transport infrastructure being secured. However, it is noted	The Applicant has reviewed the list provided by Kent County Council and can confirm that some of the committed and likely developments are included within the transport model. Others may be included under a different name to that provided by Kent County Council, may be included in future baseline, or not included as they are not of the correct level of certainty or do not meet the minimum size thresholds (as set out in the Transport Forecasting Package, as Appendix C of the Combined Monitoring and Appraisal Report (ComMA) – a copy of which was provided to the authority dated October 2020). As such, given not all developments provided by Kent County Council	Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (ComMA) Appendix C – Transport Forecasting Package [APP-522]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		that this does not have planning permission.	are included, this remains a matter not agreed.		
Local plan growth Local Growth Assumptions	2.1.20	<p>Kent County Council understands that local uncertainty modelling needs to include only those developments that are already under construction; have planning permission; or those for which the development application is within the consent process or planning consent is imminent.</p> <p>However, Kent County Council considers that pressures on local authorities to provide housing have increased – Kent County Council has identified the following growth assumptions that it believes should be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth in Dartford post-2041 • Eastern Quarry in Ebbsfleet Development Corporation area – (2,650 seems like a low figure) • 8,000 additional homes in Gravesham (as per updated local plan) 	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the assumptions provided by Kent County Council should be included.</p> <p>The Project's transport model was built following the principles and processes set out in the Department for Transport's (DfT) Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG), and growth 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 or have planning permission granted.</p> <p>The developments set out by Kent County Council do not meet the guidance for inclusion into the traffic model.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a high-growth scenario has also been reported within the Transport Forecasting Package (Appendix C of the ComMA), a copy of which was provided to Kent County Council in October 2020.</p>	ComMA Appendix C – Transport Forecasting Package [APP-522]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hoo peninsula development (when confirmed) • Higher housing requirements in specific zones • Significant developments like the London Resort 			
Modelling methodology Peak Period Assumptions	2.1.21	<p>Kent County Council considered (at Statutory Consultation in 2018) that peak periods for the A228 and A229 are not the same as peak periods in the Project traffic model and Kent County Council considers that this needs to be corrected.</p> <p>Although this allows the impact on the Dartford Crossing to be reviewed and the SRN within the wider area, Kent County Council considers that it does not correspond with the peak hours on the Local Road Network.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that the current Lower Thames Crossing model and the peak hours assessed, are acceptable. The outputs of the model shows mitigation is required on the local road</p>	<p>It is not agreed that the Project traffic model needs to be corrected.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the hour for each peak period was chosen following analysis of traffic flows on major roads in the Lower Thames area, particularly around the Dartford Crossing.</p> <p>This is set out in more detail in the Transport Model Package (Appendix B of the ComMA), a copy of which was provided to Kent County Council in October 2020.</p>	ComMA Appendix B – Transport Model Package [APP-520]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		network and KCC expect this to be delivered.			
Modelling methodology Baseline Data	2.1.22	Kent County Council notes that 2016 baseline data is used in the Transport Assessment which is now 7 years old and may reduce reliability of the model. Kent County Council notes that the data will be 16 years old in 2032 when National Highways has identified the Lower Thames Crossing is projected to open.	The Applicant does not agree that the age of the baseline data would reduce the reliability 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. Revised model data was issued in 2022 allowing Kent County Council to review. However, the findings are unlikely to change materially the areas of concern.	N/A	Matter Not Agreed
Modelling methodology Modelling – A226	2.1.23	Kent County Council is concerned that Base Year modelled traffic appears low to the east of Gravesend (A226), compared with DfT counts, so the Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM) may not highlight some impacts of the Project in this area in terms of road maintenance and construction traffic.	The Applicant notes that the LTAM is a strategic transport model and covers a vast area; and has been calibrated and validated in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance. As such it is not agreed that the model may not highlight some impacts of the Project in this area in terms of road maintenance and construction traffic.	ComMA Appendix B – Transport Model Package [APP-520]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Details of this are contained within the Transport Model Package (Appendix B of the ComMA).		
Local modelling requests Alternative Scenarios	2.1.24	<p>Kent County Council is concerned that the effects of regular, predictable incidents are not modelled in the Core Scenario, or the associated High/Low Growth forecasts</p> <p>Kent County Council has identified a series of alternative scenarios that it considers should be included within modelling relating to operational traffic sensitivity tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure of the Dartford Crossing or the Lower Thames Crossing. • Incidents related to disruptions of cross channel services. • A viable rail link for freight movements from the Channel Tunnel to the rest of England. • Traffic management during construction. • In order to be able to react to incidents/congestion on the network during both 	<p>It is not agreed that specific sensitivity tests identified by Kent County Council are necessary, though noted that some are included within the model.</p> <p>The Project's traffic modelling forecasts are intended to provide indicative predictions for how the proposed route design would perform under normal circumstances, including at peak and inter-peak hours. Forecasts include predictions for several future years to show how it would perform over time.</p> <p>The impact of incidents or road closures, including both crossings being closed simultaneously, has not been modelled because traffic modelling is not typically effective at predicting the outcomes of scenarios of this type. This is because of the multiple variables that make up any single incident, or set of incidents, that can affect the operation of the road network. Variables include the severity of the incident, its precise location, the length of carriageway and number</p>	ComMA Appendix C – Transport Forecasting Package [APP-522]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		construction and operation of the Lower Thames Crossing, Kent County Council requests real time modelling using the Kent Transport Model (KTM).	of lanes affected, the time of day and the duration of the incident. Scenarios of this type do not lend themselves to being modelled to provide reliable data that can be used to reduce or avoid disruption to the network. It is expected that the number of incidents and collisions at the Dartford Crossing would fall as a result of the reduced traffic flows, which would improve resilience at both crossings. More information is set out in the Transport Forecasting Package, which is Appendix C of the ComMA.		
Mitigation Severance at Valley Drive	2.1.126 (DL-1) RRRN	Kent County Council note that Tables 7.17 and 7.18 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report – Appendix D Economic Appraisal Package: Distributional Impact Appraisal Report show the 'Distributional analysis for links potentially impacted by traffic related severance' Regional and England & Wales respectively. Whilst it is noted that Gravesham and Tonbridge & Malling are predicted to receive some 'slightly beneficial – large beneficial' impacts, Valley	Tables 7.17 and 7.18 of the Distributional Impact Appraisal report show the 'Distributional analysis for links potentially impacted by traffic related severance' Regional and England & Wales respectively. This has informed a more detailed analysis of potential impacts arising from traffic-related severance, which is presented in the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA). Table 7.9 of the HEqIA lists locations where there may be a moderate increase or decrease in traffic-related severance during the	ComMA – Appendix D Economic Appraisal Package: Distributional Impact Appraisal Report [APP-525] Draft Section 106 Agreements - Heads of Terms [REP4-144] HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>Drive, Wrotham Road and Forstal Road are predicted to receive 'slightly adverse – large adverse' impacts, yet no mitigation is proposed in these locations.</p> <p>Kent County Council consider that Valley Drive has residential land uses along its entire length on each side, interspersed with local commercial/retail/community land uses, and as such, increases in severance, assessed as moderate adverse, should be mitigated through the s.106 agreement, through measures including formalised pedestrian crossing points to be determined by Kent County Council.</p>	<p>operational phase of the Project; this is followed by a closer review of these locations in Table 7.10, which takes into account factors such as land-use and local demographics. Paragraph 7.3.31 of the HEqIA notes that 'further actions may be required in certain locations to enhance the road crossing provision for local residents and thereby ensure that effects do not impact on people's ability to cross roads and access community services and infrastructure.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has produced a Unilateral Undertaking which includes funding for feasibility study and works for a new crossing point on Valley Drive.</u></p> <p>The project agrees with the statement by Kent County Council that in light of the nature of the highway and the land use along its length no mitigation would be required along Forstal Road.</p>		
Mitigation <u>Severance at Wrotham Road</u>	<u>2.1.188 (DL-9)</u>	<u>KCC considers that severance effects at Wrotham Road also require mitigation, in-line with the Council's position as set out under Matter 2.1.126.</u>	<u>The Applicant notes that Wrotham Road is included as part of the qualitative assessment presented in Table 7.10 of the HEqIA. Although there are various land-uses along Wrotham Road including residential development, services and facilities,</u>	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Not Agreed

Moved down [2]: Wrotham Road is included as part of the qualitative assessment presented in Table 7.10 of the HEqIA. Although there are various land-uses along Wrotham Road including residential development, services and facilities, there are also a number of pedestrian refuges at a number of locations. As such traffic-related severance at this location was not considered to be significant.

Deleted: A commitment was made as part of the Section 106 Agreements Heads of Terms (7.3) for further investigation at identified locations to discuss the need for, and provision of, pedestrian crossing infrastructure'. This commitment was included within Section 106 Agreements - Heads of Terms. ¶ Paragraph 7.5.3 of Section 106 Agreements – Heads of Terms states that "National Highways will pay a sum to the relevant local highway authorities to implement the identified improvements from the feasibility assessment. Local highway authorities are afforded powers under section 62 the Highways Act 1980 which enables them to undertake agreed improvement works to the local highway. All works can be accommodated within the existing highway extent". Locations specified include Elaine Avenue (Strood), Brennan Drive (Tilbury) and Valley Drive (Gravesham). ¶

Deleted: This also applies to Wrotham Road.

Deleted: ¶ At a meeting on 17 August 2023 the Applicant shared proposals for a crossing at Valley Drive, for which the funding would be secured under a Section 106 Agreement.¶ This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position above and proposed Section 106 Agreement regarding a new crossing at Valley Drive.

Moved (insertion) [2]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<u>there are also a number of pedestrian refuges at a number of locations. As such traffic-related severance at this location was not considered to be significant.</u>		
Wider Network Impacts					
Local WNI concerns Principle of Approach to Significant Effects and Mitigation	2.1.25 RRE	<p>Kent County Council does not agree with National Highways position as set out in the draft Transport Assessment (10.2.8) that:</p> <p><i>'The Project would not be able to resolve all of these wider network impacts within the funding constraints of the Project. Highways England would monitor the impacts of the Project on the network and actively work with the local and highway authorities on any schemes or other measures to address these impacts should they arise'.</i></p> <p>Kent County Council considers that modelling shows that the Project would result in increased congestion on some local junctions and the LRN which are already at or over capacity, and that schemes which result in the local</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that as a result of the Lower Thames Crossing opening, people will choose to make different journeys. In many places on the network, and within Kent, this will lead to beneficial transport impacts on the network, and in some cases will lead to adverse impacts. Overall, the benefits on the road network outweigh the adverse transport impacts, and this is reflected in the positive economic benefit of the Project within Kent.</p> <p>The Applicant has identified the adverse impacts on traffic flows across the local road network, and this assessment is set out in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan (WNIMMP)</p> <p>[Document Reference 7.12 (2)]</p> <p>Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: [APP-545]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>highway network operating above capacity or increase congestion at a junction already operating above capacity are required to implement appropriate mitigation (improved signage, any necessary traffic restrictions, in-vehicle technology, and junction upgrades).</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that these effects must be identified and as much mitigation as possible should be delivered up-front prior to the Project opening, utilising traffic modelling.</p> <p>Kent County Council is concerned that mitigation would not be guaranteed within the DCO and would need to be implemented through a separate consenting route which has less certainty of delivery.</p> <p>Kent County Council requires that the scope of the WNIMMP is expanded to include all areas of concern that Kent County Council has identified, including those identified in Kent County Council's Wider Network</p>	<p>based on this does not agree that the adverse impacts are unacceptable under this policy.</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 (The Applicant Licence from DfT para 5.1.9) and will continue to deliver against this obligation in its collaborative work with local authorities.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan (WNIMMP), which has been updated to take on board comments received to date. If the monitoring outputs from the monitoring plan identify issues/opportunities related to the road network as a result of traffic growth or new third party developments, local authorities will be able to use this as evidence within their intervention case making.</p> <p>The WNIMMP provides clarity on the proposition, including the expectations on funding streams.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		Impacts study that is currently being undertaken in collaboration with the Applicant.	Further information relating to the Applicant consideration of additional monitoring locations in the WNIMMP is set out in Matter 2.1.136 (DL-1).		
Non-Lower-Thames-Crossing highway improvements Specific Links and Junctions	2.1.26 RRE	Kent County Council has identified a list of junctions and routes that it specifically considers would be adversely affected across its LRN as a result of the Lower Thames Crossing, and considers that mitigation via upgrades should be provided for those effects in order to successfully make use of the scheme's benefits should the Project be implemented.	<p>The Applicant agrees that there are some likely increases in traffic across the network, which will in part be caused by the Project, but not wholly, and this is set out within the Transport Assessment and traffic modelling data issued to Kent County Council.</p> <p>While the Applicant does not consider that there any transport impacts requiring mitigation by the Project, nor any subsequent intervention options needed, it notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant is considering the need for enhancements along the A2/M2 corridor which are within the RIS3 pipeline. • The Applicant is continuing to progress the M2 junction 5 project separately to the Lower Thames Crossing. • The Applicant maintains a route strategy for the M25 south of the proposed connection with the Lower Thames Crossing, 	Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>the M20, A2 west of the junction with the Lower Thames Crossing, and to the M2 east of junction 1.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has agreed a scope of work and funded this through a Planning Performance Agreement for Kent County Council to undertake a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) study to identify the impacts of the Project on the Kent road network and to assess the business case of potential interventions to optimise the network.</p> <p>The outputs of this study have allowed Kent County Council to make informed representations during the DCO examination and will enable Kent County Council to develop more advanced business cases over the course of the next 10 years through existing processes.</p> <p>As such, it is not agreed that mitigation via upgrades should be provided within the Project for the identified effects in order to successfully make use of the scheme's benefits should the Project be implemented.</p>		

Deleted: will allow

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
WNI approach Constraint to economic growth	2.1.27	Kent County Council is concerned that traffic resulting from the Project would constrain economic growth in Kent unless wider network improvements are committed.	<p>It is not agreed that traffic resulting from the Project would constrain economic growth in Kent unless wider network improvements are committed through the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that as a result of the Lower Thames Crossing opening, people will choose to make different journeys. In many places on the network, and within Kent, this will lead to beneficial transport impacts on the network, and in some cases will lead to adverse transport impacts. Overall, the benefits on the road network outweigh the adverse impacts, and this is reflected in the positive economic benefit of the Project within Kent.</p> <p>The Applicant has worked with Kent County Council to conduct a series of 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.</p> <p>In line with the WNIMMP, these outputs will be discussed with Kent County Council, and the Applicant will continue to engage in accordance with the licence</p>	<p>WNIMMP [Document Reference 7.12 (2)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: WNIMMP [\[APP-545\]](#)

Deleted: is working

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			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.		
WNI approach Mitigation (Principle): Policy Compliance	2.1.28 RRE	Kent County Council is concerned that policies identified in the Transport Assessment (e.g. Circular 02/13; National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 103 and 108) relating to mitigation being implemented have not been met by National Highways.	It is not agreed that policies referred to by Kent County Council have not been met by the Applicant regarding the Project, and this will be set out within the Transport Assessment. The Applicant notes that paragraph 5 of the NPPF makes clear that the NPPF itself ' <i>does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects</i> '. In accordance with section 104 of the Planning Act 2008, the Secretary of State will be deciding the application in accordance with the relevant national policy statements. Nonetheless, the Applicant is satisfied that it has had due regard to the NPPF in terms of the provision and promotion of active travel and facilitation of public transport, and road safety. With regard to the wider network impacts, the Project is forecast to have substantial overall traffic benefits as set out in the Transport Assessment, ComMA and in traffic	ComMA [APP-518] Transport Assessment [REP4-148] to [REP4-152]	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			modelling data issued by the Applicant to Kent County Council.		
Non-Lower-Thames-Crossing highway improvements Tilbury Link Road / Junction	2.1.29	Kent County Council considers that the Project should include the previously proposed Tilbury junction to deliver local connections and wider economic and regeneration benefits and allow drivers crossing the river by accident the opportunity to turn around. Kent County Council considers that the connection from the south with the A13 eastbound is vital to support flows and divert traffic from the existing Dartford crossing.	The Applicant notes that the Tilbury Link Road has never been part of the Project. The Tilbury Link Road has been identified in the RIS2 as part of the RIS3 pipeline of projects. The Applicant notes that the design at Tilbury Fields provides an operational access which could potentially accommodate further development in the future, and modifications to connectivity in Thurrock presented in the Local Refinement Consultation would improve connections between the Lower Thames Crossing and the Thurrock road network. Clear signage will be in place to indicate to drivers the correct routing. As such, it is not agreed that the Tilbury Link Road should be part of the Project to deliver local connections and wider economic and regeneration benefits or support flows and divert traffic from the existing Dartford crossing, but the Applicant considers that this will be delivered through RIS3.	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Wider Network Improvements Monitoring Locations	2.1.136 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council considers that, regarding the WNIMMP, baseline monitoring should be undertaken ahead of the construction of the scheme to avoid a distorted picture of traffic patterns.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that M25 junction 2 and 1b, and the A206 should be added to the monitoring programme (with local road network junctions to be defined by an ongoing WNI Study currently being funded by National Highways and undertaken by Kent County Council).</p> <p>The A2/LTC junction is included in the WNIMMP and Kent County Council requests that the monitoring programme include an assessment of increased use of unsuitable rural routes as bypasses to avoid the SRN due to congestion in the vicinity of the A2/LTC junction. The WNI study has demonstrated that such "rat running" is forecast to occur, and it is also a key concern of local stakeholders.</p>	<p>The monitoring locations set out in the WNIMMP requires that traffic data collection be undertaken at least one year prior to the opening of the Project (mainline), not prior to construction as proposed by Kent County Council.</p> <p>The monitoring locations set out in the WNIMMP were selected on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (the nearest and 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) Locations requested for monitoring from local highway authorities following a review of the consultation feedback <p>A mechanism allowing for review of the proposed monitoring locations is provided through Requirement 14 in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, which requires the preparation of an operational traffic monitoring plan,</p>	<p>WNIMMP 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>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: WNIMMP [\[APP-545\]](#)
 Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			which must be approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highways authorities. 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.		
Wider Network Improvements Monitoring Frequency	2.1.168 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers that baseline surveys should be undertaken at least one year before commencement of construction and supplemented with additional surveys annually until five years post-opening. This is in line with National Highways' own post-opening project evaluation (POPE) methodology.	The Applicant considers that undertaking monitoring prior to the start of construction under the WNIMMP would not provide a suitable or necessary baseline for the consideration of the wider network impacts. Appropriate monitoring and management of construction related traffic is secured under the terms of the oTMPfC, and Requirement 10 of the draft DCO. The monitoring commitment secured through the WNIMMP ensures data will be collected across the last full year of construction. It is acknowledged that there would be Project related	WNIMMP [Document Reference 7.12 (2)] Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)] oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)] Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position.

Deleted: WNIMMP [\[APP-545\]](#) ¶
Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#) ¶
oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#) ¶

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>construction traffic on the network at this time, and the data collected will be reviewed against other datasets (the Applicant has set out that data will be collected as part of the Traffic Management Plans, and the Site-Specific Travel Plans) so that the traffic impacts from the construction of the Project can be determined. It should be noted that during the last year of construction (included within Phase 11), the impacts forecast on the network as set out in the Transport Assessment would be limited as the majority of physical construction would be complete, and testing and commissioning would be underway.</p> <p>The before and after surveys required by the Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan would also be supplemented by existing data sources (where already available), including Department for Transport (DfT) journey time datasets, National Highways traffic datasets, and any historical traffic datasets from relevant local highway authorities within the local area of influence, subject to agreement with the data owners.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>The methodology for POPE is set out in the POPE Methodology Manual (National Highways, 2022). Section 1.2 of that document details the timeframes for analysis, including a one-year after study and a five-years after study. The methodology also recommends the collection of pre-construction baseline data, but for the reasons set out above and in consideration of the duration of construction of the Lower Thames Crossing, and notably the duration of the testing and commissioning period, pre-operational data is considered more appropriate.</p> <p>The proposed monitoring framework set out in the Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan has been prepared to support the collection of data on the network to see if further investment is needed in improvements. These improvements may be required in part due to changes arising from the opening of the Lower Thames Crossing, but may also be a result of other changes on the network or may be required as a response to other causes of change in traffic</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			flows. Any case for intervention would be contingent on the actual flows at that location, not on whether the changing flows were caused solely, or even in part, by the Lower Thames Crossing. As such, it is not necessary for the system to be developed in a manner which is focussed on trying to isolate the effects of the Lower Thames Crossing.		
WNI Approach	2.1.137 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that LTAM traffic modelling shows an increase of +251 to +500 trips on the A206 in both AM and PM peaks in 2045, as a result of the proposed crossing. Kent County Council considers that the existing Cray Mill Lane bridge reduces capacity creating a bottleneck at the Dartford/Bexley border, and so it is unclear how these additional trips can be accommodated without it resulting in a significant impact. Kent County Council proposes that the A206 and associated junctions are added to the WNIMMP as this route satisfies the criteria for an addition set	The Applicant is obligated under paragraph 5.19 of the Highways England: Licence (Department for Transport, 2015) 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. The Applicant will continue to deliver against this obligation in its collaborative work with local authorities. The Applicant recognises that, as a result of the Lower Thames Crossing opening, people will choose to make different journeys. In many places on the network, and within Kent, this would lead to beneficial impacts on the network, and in some cases lead to adverse	WNIMMP [Document Reference 7.12 (2)] Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152] Transport Assessment - Appendix F - Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Policy Compliance [APP-535] Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)],	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: WNIMMP [APP-545]

Deleted: Draft Development Consent Order [REP6-010]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>out in paragraph 2.3.6 in the WNIMMP.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that this issue is identified in both the London Borough of Bexley and Dartford Borough Council Draft Local Plans (both of which are at Reg 19 examination stage), with the land being safeguarded for widening. The establishment of a joint working group has been agreed by both LA's and KCC to seek developer funds where mitigation is required, and to work together to find a solution. It is requested that National Highways is also a member of this group and assist in seeking future funding once a scheme has been identified.</p>	<p>impacts. Overall, the benefits on the road network would outweigh the adverse impacts, and this is reflected in the positive economic benefit of the Project within Kent. The Applicant has identified the adverse impacts on traffic flows across the local road network, and this assessment is set out in the Transport Assessment. Each of these impacts has been assessed and considered against policy requirements as set out in Transport Assessment - Appendix F - Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Policy Compliance, and adverse impacts requiring intervention have not been identified on the A206.</p> <p>The monitoring locations set out in the Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan were selected on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 (the nearest and second nearest junctions on the SRN and MRN located adjacent 		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>to the junctions with the A122, the A2, the A13 and the M25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locations requested for monitoring from local highway authorities following a review of the consultation feedback <p>A mechanism allowing for review of the proposed monitoring locations is provided through Requirement 14 in Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order, which requires the preparation of an operational traffic monitoring plan, which must be approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highways authorities. The Applicant does not consider it necessary to include additional locations at this time, as the mechanism set out above will allow for the introduction of new locations at a future date, following a consultation with relevant authorities on actual traffic flows closer to the opening year.</p>		
Monitoring	2.1.138 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that WNIMMP Section 5.2 mentions the use of National Highways' WebTRIS database for monitoring traffic data on the	The 7.12 Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan sets out the requirements of the monitoring scheme that must be submitted to the Secretary of State	WNIMMP [Document Reference 7.12 (2)],	Matter Not Agreed,

~~Deleted:~~ The matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position.

~~Deleted:~~ Under Discussion

~~Deleted:~~ WNIMMP [\[APP-545\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>SRN. Previous editions of this document mentioned the DfT Teletrac database for monitoring journey times and speeds, which is understood to have been replaced by INRIX. Clarification and assurance is requested that the methodology for monitoring traffic data on key impacted roads of the LRN will have a comparative degree of confidence as that for the SRN. This is particularly important for monitoring the A227, A228 and A229 link roads between the M2 and M20; as well as the A226, which may carry rat-running traffic avoiding delays on junctions of the A2 caused by the project. Ideally, WebTRIS / INRIX monitoring would be deployed on these roads.</p>	<p>for approval before the tunnel is open to traffic. The monitoring scheme must include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Details of a before-and-after survey to establish the baseline traffic levels and the changes in traffic b. The locations to be monitored c. The methodology to be used to collect the required data d. The periods over which operational traffic is to be monitored e. The method of assessment of traffic data f. Programme for the provision of the collected data to local highway authorities. <p>It would not be appropriate to define the requirements at this time, because new technologies may become available that would better deliver the objectives of the monitoring scheme. Relevant authorities will have the opportunity to advise on their requirements through the consultation necessary as part of process of discharging Requirement 14 of Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Order which secures the monitoring scheme.		
Monitoring approach	2.1.157 (DL-1) RRN	<p>The Applicant's Transport Assessment (TA) indicates from the LTAM model that the new junction of the LTC with the A2 is forecast to operate at up to 76% capacity in the Design Year 2045 AM peak; although a number of highway links exceed 85% in the PM peak.</p> <p>A WNI study (currently being undertaken by Kent County Council funded by National Highways) found similar results for highway links using the KTM model, but the KTM is also able to assess highway "nodes" within the junction, such as merges, diverges and roundabouts.</p> <p>The KTM shows that some nodes on this junction are operating at over 100% capacity in both AM and PM peaks in both Opening Year 2030 and Design Year 2045.</p>	<p>As part of the development of the design of the A122 Lower Thames Crossing, the flow and capacity of individual merges and diverges on the new road and on connections between the existing road network and the new road have been assessed, and are within the appropriate standards.</p> <p>The Applicant has been working with Kent County Council to understand the perceived differences in modelled volume/capacity ratios between the models as referenced by Kent County Council and has provided clarification to this in response to ExA Q4.4.6 which is accepted by Kent County Council.</p>	<p>Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan [Document Reference 7.12 (2)], Transport Assessment [REP4-148 to REP4-152] Draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (11)],</p>	Matter Agreed
A229 Blue Bell Hill	2.1.170 (DL-6)	The Applicant states that <i>"Overall, the benefits on the road network outweigh the adverse transport impacts, and</i>	The economic appraisal for the A122 Lower Thames Crossing is based on forecast traffic flows and journey times from the LTAM	Economic Appraisal Package, Appendix D of the Combined Modelling and	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position.

Deleted: [\[APP-545\]](#)

Deleted: Draft Development Consent Order [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p><i>this is reflected in the positive economic benefit of the Project within Kent.</i></p> <p>Whilst Kent County Council agrees that the LTC will lead to beneficial transport impacts on the network elsewhere, unless improvements are delivered to the A229 in time for opening of the LTC, National Highways' new crossing will not deliver the full economic benefits it sets out to achieve.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that the adverse impacts to the A229 as a result of the LTC must, therefore, be addressed and request for the Applicant to provide the analysis to support the statement that the economic benefits of the LTC outweigh the need to deliver improvements to the A229 Blue Bell Hill.</p>	<p>model. These forecasts are based on the current A229 layout, not any proposed improvements. The economic benefits include Level 1 benefits, such as changes in journey times and vehicle operating costs; and Level 2 benefits, such as reliability and wider economic impacts. The economic appraisal of the Project is based solely on the changes that arise as a result of the Project. As a result the economic benefits as set out in Economic Appraisal Package, Appendix D of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report, do not require any improvements to the A229 to be realised.</p> <p>The transport economic benefits broken down by area are set out in Table A.34 of the Economic Appraisal Package, Appendix D of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report.</p>	<p>Appraisal Report [APP-526]</p>	
Socio-economics					
Community Resource/ Initiatives	2.1.30 RRE	Kent County Council is keen for the Project to use the local	It is agreed that the Project will use the local workforce and chains, with	Skills, Employment and Education	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Local workforce and supply chains – Principle		workforce and supply chains, with apprenticeships and training provided in principle.	<p>apprenticeships and training provided.</p> <p>The Applicant has (in July 2022) shared a Skills, Employment and Education (SEE) Strategy (appended to the Section 106 Heads of Terms) which sets out the Project's ambition to support local labour progression, skills attainment, and pathways to sustainable employment along with measures to support local supply chains become involved in the Project.</p> <p>The SEE Strategy includes a number of obligations on the Project and its contractors to promote apprenticeships, and generally achieve estimates for local recruitment.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has subsequently moved the commitments relating to skills, employment and education to the SAC-R (at Deadline 7) but the content and scope remain.</u></p>	<p>Strategy (appended to the Section 106 Heads of Terms) [REP4-144]</p> <p>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]</p>	
<p>SEE Strategy and Supply Chain</p> <p>Local workforce and supply chains – Detail and further engagement</p>	2.1.31 RRE	Kent County Council considers that bi-lateral engagement is now required to scope the approach to employment, skills, training and supply chain activities and interventions,	The Applicant acknowledges Kent County Council's proposed approach to bi-lateral engagement and will continue to work with Kent County Council to develop and agree detailed measures for	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant considers that this is a matter agreed but notes that further agreements may be subject to details on monitoring, governance and review of obligations to be secured by the S106 Agreement, and upon Kent County Council's review of the SEE Strategy.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>which may include a construction skills hub, subject to further development of detail. Kent County Council has specifically requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Requirement that any training offered should directly link to available jobs and in respect of those jobs and associated apprenticeships, there should also be a clear progression route for new apprentices and existing staff to progress and further their careers within the scheme; • A Requirement to support a centralised apprenticeship scheme, such as a flexi-jobs apprenticeship scheme or the lead contractor employing all apprentices, to ensure that the volume of apprenticeships required can be offered; and • A Requirement to provide staff to act as tutors in shortage areas or provide funding to enable the education providers to offer 	<p>employment, skills, training and supply chain. <u>The Applicant has provided for KCC officers to attend construction phase SEE meetings via an officer contribution set out within a Unilateral Undertaking.</u></p> <p>The Applicant intend to appoint a Delivery Partner for the Roads South contract in the coming months and this will enable discussions around detail of implementation to accelerate.</p> <p>The Applicant <u>seeks to inspire the next generation and attract a more diverse workforce, through effective engagement with local schools and educators.</u></p> <p><u>By providing more than 7,000 hours of engagement, individuals working on the LTC will help students with their learning and transition into work, while supporting educators (teachers, professors, tutors).</u></p> <p><u>Working closely with Regional Partners (such as SELEP and CITB), Education Providers and Local Authorities, LTC will define a strategy to contribute to addressing the tutor shortage in the most strategic way.</u></p>		

Deleted: through discussions around the subsequent Section 106 Agreement

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		financial incentives to support recruitment; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A training target of 500 spaces (rather than 350 proposed); • Apprentices to comprise 2.3% of the workforce as an example of best practice, or aim for funding of at least one apprentice per £1m of spend on labour on the scheme. 	<p><u>The Applicant's Skills, Education & Employment Strategy outlines a minimum target for the number of apprenticeships across the Programme. These apprenticeship opportunities will extend throughout the Delivery Partners' supply chains.</u></p> <p><u>Contractors will be required to develop an Early Career Talent Strategy that will detail how they will:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>promote access to opportunities and resources within our local communities</u> o <u>develop support programmes and forums to support new entries into and on the project</u> o <u>develop standards and courses to address the skills gap</u> o <u>develop effective succession planning to make sure early career talent have the right skills and attributes to succeed in their training programme</u> o <u>develop training programmes for staff managing early career talent to provide the right support and guidance</u> <p><u>The Applicant will provide local people with the tools to access</u></p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><u>higher skilled jobs, minimise the skills gap and maximise opportunities to gain more meaningful employment. Our Delivery Partners will be required to engage with local job brokerage services and education providers to advertise jobs on the Programme. Contractors will be required to proactively offer industry related training to local communities and develop an Early Career Talent Strategy (above bullets provide further detail).</u></p> <p><u>The targets outlined in the Skills, Education & Employment Strategy are minimum Programme-wide targets. These targets were based on estimated contract values and lessons learnt from other large infrastructure projects</u></p>		
Traffic Effects on Business / Local Economy SWCP Access	2.1.32 RRE	<p>Kent County Council is concerned that closure of Brewers Road Bridge for 19 months would reduce access to Shorne Woods Country Park (SWCP) and therefore impact on its visitor numbers and income.</p> <p><u>KCC notes (at Deadline 9) that:</u></p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that Brewers Road will be closed for a period of likely between 16–19 months (based on a reasonable 'worst case', and this is necessary in order to demolish the existing structure and construct the new green bridge which is considered a positive measure.</p>	<u>oTMPfC [Document Reference 7.14 (9)]</u>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Kent County Council continue

Deleted: on this matter to be reflected in a Draft Section 106 Agreement.

Deleted: oTMPfC [\[REP6-048\]](#)

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p><i><u>KCC has reviewed the draft Side Agreement and is continuing to negotiate with the Applicant on a number of concerns regarding the proposed content. It is hoped these concerns can be easily resolved and the agreement will be signed and sealed by both parties shortly after the Examination, if not before.</u></i></p>	<p>More information is provided in the oTMPfC on the justification for this closure.</p> <p>The oTMPfC sets out that there would be an increase in journey times (around 6 mins) due to the closure and diversion (via Three Crutches roundabout), but that access would be maintained through illustrative diversion routes, which are subject to refinement on engagement with relevant authorities (as other factors may need to be taken into account, such as other works in the nearby area at the time of closure).</p> <p>The main access to the Country Park would not be impacted, and direct access to the site from the central car park within the Country Park would be retained. It is considered that the proposals for replacement open space and additional links between isolated parcels of woodland would add benefits to the wider community and Shorne Woods Country Park users, with re-provided land being more accessible by PRoW.</p> <p>The REAC in ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP outlines the construction noise and dust mitigation measures</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>that will be implemented by the Contractor to ensure that the impacts of construction activities are not significant.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that landowner losses as a result of the Project's temporary occupation will be payable in line with the Compensation Code.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has engaged with KCC regarding a Side Agreement proposing a mechanism to deal with the payment of compensation related to land within SWCP required by the Project. While at the time of writing this is not signed, the Applicant and KCC are confident that it will be resolved shortly after the end of the examination.</u></p>		
<p>Community Facilities Southern Valley Golf Course</p>	2.1.33	<p>Kent County Council recognises that the loss of Southern Valley Golf club is unavoidable for the route and environmental mitigation around the new road, but should be compensated with new facilities provided nearby.</p>	<p>It is agreed that recreational facilities should be provided as mitigation for the loss of open space, and the Applicant proposes to replace the area with equivalent scale of space in the form of public open space (Chalk Park which will be accessible and improve connectivity across the area and provide a recreational asset that is currently deficient in the area).</p>	<p>Planning Statement (Appendix G – Private Recreational Facilities) [APP-502]</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Deleted: The Applicant and Kent County Council continue to engage on this matter.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>The Applicant notes that Southern Valley Golf Course ceased operations in August 2022 and the Applicant acquired the site in March 2023.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further information as part of the Planning Statement (Appendix G – Private Recreational Facilities) on this Matter.</p>		
<p>Community Facilities Effects on other community assets/facilities</p>	2.1.34 RRE	<p>Kent County Council considers that where community assets/facilities are affected then suitable compensation should be arranged to offset the impact.</p>	<p>It is agreed that where community assets/facilities are affected then suitable compensation should be arranged to offset the impact, and the Applicant notes that the draft DCO obliges the Applicant to comply with the Compensation Code <u>in this regard</u>.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements for affected landowners and businesses including community facilities are noted in ES Chapter 13: Population and Human Health.</p> <p>The ES also considers – in-line with methodology for assessing cumulative effects – any likely significant effects on community facilities and the measures to be secured to avoid or reduce them.</p> <p>▼ The Applicant has engaged with Kent County Council to alleviate the</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Population and Human Health [APP-151] <u>Draft DCO Document Reference 3.1 (11)</u>,</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Draft DCO [REP6-010]

Deleted: For public assets, the Applicant anticipates that this will remain a matter under discussion prior to Kent County Council's review of the ES.¶

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			concerns about future compensation, including outlining the basis on which disturbance costs would be assessed.		
Air Quality					
Monitoring Methodology: Air Quality Monitoring	2.1.35	Kent County Council considers that National Highways should carry out air quality monitoring before and after the delivery of the Project, to establish background/current concentration and for the assessment of actual air quality impacts arising, to allow for validation of the modelling methodology.	The Applicant will carry out Post Opening Project Evaluation (POPE) to evaluate how assessments have determined the actual Project impacts. It is not agreed that monitoring is an appropriate approach to validate air quality modelling set out in ES Chapter 5, due to the significant variability. As directed by DMRB LA 105, the Applicant would only propose to undertake operational monitoring if the ES Chapter 5 assessment predicted significant air quality effects which triggered the requirement for mitigation. The purpose of the monitoring would be used to determine when and if the mitigation (for example speed restrictions) can be removed. Air quality monitoring would be undertaken throughout the construction period as secured in the REAC.	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143] REAC within the Code of Construction Practice [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: REAC within the Code of Construction Practice [REP6-038]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
<p>Assessment of likely significant effects Impacts: Air Quality at SWCP</p>	2.1.36	<p>Kent County Council considers that an increase in emissions in areas of Shorne Woods Country Park (SWCP) previously buffered from the road could have an impact on vulnerable species of fungi, lichens and bryophytes.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that detailed surveys on these – and invertebrates associated with the veteran trees – should be carried out.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that the species surveys have not covered all habitats or species to fully assess the impact of the proposed development (for example moth surveys have not been conducted, all required bat emergence surveys not completed, bat activity surveys did not follow best practice guidelines and reptiles surveys do not appear to have been carried in all suitable habitat).</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that the increase in emissions will potentially have an impact</p>	<p>The Project's air quality assessment (Chapter 5 in the ES) includes consideration of air quality effects on designated sites and habitats, including veteran trees in line with the Applicant's assessment standards, and guidance from Natural England.</p> <p>The Applicant's assessment also includes the potential effect of the Project on lichens and invertebrates, both aquatic and terrestrial based on survey information.</p> <p>Further engagement has been undertaken with Kent County Council and SWCP officers, including a workshop on 21 February 2023.</p> <p><u>Following this additional ecological surveys were agreed and funded by the Applicant during the examination.</u></p>	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: The Applicant and Kent County Council continue to engage on this matter.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>on vulnerable species of fungi, lichens and bryophytes as areas of the park that were buffered from the road will now potentially be exposed to higher levels of air pollution, and suggest that more detailed surveys on lichens and bryophytes and invertebrates associated with the veteran trees should be carried out to better understand what the impact of the new development will be.</p> <p>Where it is agreed by KCC that specific surveys are not required to be undertaken during the examination then the DCO should include a Requirement for the Applicant to undertake these surveys prior to start of construction. Kent County Council considers that mitigation strategies must be continuously updated following new survey results. In addition, a long-term monitoring programme is needed to understand the impact of increased emissions on Shorne Woods Country Park and vulnerable species, and that</p>			

Deleted: KCC are currently in discussions with the Applicant regarding the undertaking of additional surveys. This request has been noted by the Applicant and the County Council is currently awaiting confirmation of when these surveys will be undertaken. ...

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		this is to be secured through a Requirement of the DCO or the S106 Agreement.			
Assessment of likely significant effects Impacts: Air Quality and 'Net Zero'	2.1.37	Kent County Council considers that the Project should not disbenefit the efforts of local authorities and central government to improve air quality and achieve net-zero carbon.	The Applicant agrees that the Project should not disbenefit the efforts of local authorities and central government to improve air quality and achieve net-zero carbon. The Applicant considers that the Project is being designed and procured in such a way to limit construction emissions as far as practicably possible and with the intention of being aligned with the Applicant's Net Zero Highways: 2030 / 2040 / 2050 Plan (The Applicant, 2021). The Applicant considers that the Government's long-term commitments to reduce traffic emissions and improve air quality, by phasing out petrol and diesel vehicles, will not be impacted significantly by the building of the Project.	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143] ES Chapter 15: Climate [APP-153]	Matter Not Agreed
Project design and mitigation Mitigation: Air Quality Mitigation during	2.1.38	Kent County Council considers that the impact of construction-related air pollution on schools and other sensitive locations and vulnerable people should	The Applicant agrees with Kent County Council's position and considers that the air quality assessment for the Project (Chapter 5 in the ES) includes	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143] ES Chapter 13: Population and	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ¶
This remains a matter under discussion pending Kent County Council's review of the DCO s including ES Chapter 5 and ES Chapter 15.¶
Further engagement has been undertaken with Kent County Council, including a workshop on 15 February 2023.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Construction (Vulnerable People)		<p>be investigated in detail and appropriate mitigation should be implemented.</p> <p><u>KCC notes that the HEqIA assessed the health impact of changes on air quality due to the project on EU and UK limits, but KCC deemed this to be an inappropriate standard to assess health impacts when negative health impacts have been found well below those limits.</u></p> <p><u>KCC welcomes the further submission of the AQQHIA which indicates that impacts from the project as a whole are neither measurable nor material in the context of public health.</u></p> <p><u>However KCC notes that the assessment is based on the population as a whole and it is therefore a challenge to understand whether there could be impact to health where there are changes to air quality in specific geographic areas. KCC considers that the AQQHIA does not attempt to assesses the impact of changes in air quality to health on the basis that any improvement or</u></p>	<p>'worst-case' receptor locations where total pollutant concentrations are expected to be greatest (typically closest receptors to roads and junctions) and where the largest change in air quality is anticipated based on the Project traffic impacts.</p> <p>The receptors considered include residential uses, educational facilities, hospitals, care homes and hotels.</p> <p>Related health impacts are covered in ES Chapter 13: Population and Human Health and within the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA) where there may be differential or disproportionate effects as a result of Protected Characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>Whilst sufficient to determine compliance with NN NPS (2014), residual concerns were noted through wider engagement, and additional clarity was deemed of value to set potential risk of changes in pollutants into context. This was deemed useful to respond to concerns from stakeholders in relation to non-threshold pollutants, and the perceived potential health</p>	<p>Human Health [APP-151]</p> <p>Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA) [REP3-118]</p> <p>AQQHIA [REP3-141]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p><u>deterioration in air quality will have an impact on human health at individual receptors as the HEqIA did, but on the basis that impact on health was associated with EU and UK limits.</u></p> <p><u>KCC notes that this makes it a challenge to understand how LTC might impact on health inequalities in Kent due to changes in air quality.</u></p>	<p>risk from any changes in air quality as a result of the Project, regardless of meeting the legal air quality thresholds for protective of health.</p> <p>The voluntary Air Quality Quantitative Health Impact Assessment (AQQHIA) was therefore carried out, applying the approach and supporting evidence base collated by the Department of Health's Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and the Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme. The methodology includes the use of robust concentration response functions recommended for quantification by COMEAP, and applies a consistently precautionary approach, for example overly pessimistic PM2.5 concentrations using modelled road PM10 component added to PM2.5 backgrounds. The AQQHIA has no lower threshold to the assessment, so changes of all magnitudes (no matter how small) both above and below the threshold objectives have been considered.</p> <p>The quantitative exposure response assessment as part of the AQQHIA demonstrates that the impact of</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>changes in air pollution as a result of the operation of the Project is not significant, with no measurable change in public health. This conclusion further reinforces the findings of the submitted air quality assessment, that the impacts on Human Health receptors are not significant.</p> <p>On the above basis, the Applicant maintains we have followed the most appropriate guidance to determine whether the Project complies with the NN NPS (2014). Engagement with stakeholders identified residual health concerns. The voluntary AQQHIA was commissioned to respond to such concerns, it concludes that the relative change in air quality within the area studied is neither at a concentration or exposure sufficient to quantify any measurable change in public health. A technical note providing the detail underpinning this conclusion has been submitted to the examination.</p> <p><u>As set out in the executive summary and Section 2.2 Outline Methodology of the 9.67 AQQHIA, the quantification methodology is well-established, following</u></p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><u>approaches published by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and the World Health Organization (WHO) Health risks of air pollution in Europe (HRAPIE) project.</u></p> <p><u>These organisations have reviewed the extensive international epidemiological literature on the subject to develop the methods for the quantification of health effects from air pollution.</u></p> <p><u>The methodology utilised to quantify health effects across a population due to a change in air pollutant concentrations produces outcomes across the exposed population and not the effect on any individual living within that population. This is because the methodology is appropriate for the consideration of effects at the population level and impacts cannot be accurately ascribed to individuals given the variations of innate sensitivity, real-world exposure level, lifestyle etc.</u></p> <p><u>The baseline health statistics used to feed into the assessment is also collected over a geographical population area including hospital admissions, mortality rates etc. and would therefore not be appropriate</u></p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<u>to assess at an individual receptor level. The effect on mortality within the AQQHIA study area by local authority is detailed in Annex A.</u>		
Project design and mitigation Mitigation: Air Quality Mitigation during Construction (Other)	2.1.39	Kent County Council considers that displacement of traffic should be carefully managed and mitigated, particularly related to a deterioration in air quality along the M20 during years 2026 and 2027 of the construction period.	It is agreed that air quality effects related to traffic should be carefully assessed, managed and mitigated. The Applicant's air quality assessment for the Project (Chapter 5 in the ES) determines (in accordance with the standard LA 105) whether the Project would have a significant air quality effect during construction and operation. The assessment concludes that the Project does not lead to a significant air quality effect when considering human health and compliance risk, but does lead to a significant air quality effect on designated habitats, and as such an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) has been appended to the ES chapter which sets out measures to identify and assess the feasibility of air quality mitigation measures and quantify the change in pollutant concentrations associated with the measures. <u>It is noted that the Applicant's approach to managing and</u>	ES Appendix 5.6: Project Air Quality Action Plan <u>[Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 5.6 (2)],</u>	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>

Deleted: This remains a matter under discussion, subject to Kent County Council's review of information it considers is required to resolve the matter.¶ Further engagement has been undertaken with Kent County Council, including a workshop on 15 February 2023.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: [APP-350]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			mitigating effects of displaced traffic on the wider network is not agreed with KCC.		
Cultural Heritage					
Heritage Assets: Impacts Methodology: Assessment of undesignated assets	2.1.40 RRE	<p>Kent County Council has been concerned that the assessment of undesignated heritage assets (particularly those with archaeological interest which require evaluation before a consideration of significance and impacts can be made) lacks detail.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that the DCO documentation also recognises that the wider construction and mitigation works for the road project would result in a negative impact on a large number of important non-designated heritage assets with archaeological interest. If the project is to proceed, a well-defined and very detailed approach to further investigation and mitigation is required. The applicant recognises this and sets out the overall approach in the dAMS-OWSI [APP-367]. In addition the Applicant's archaeologists</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Across the Project, 4,086 archaeological trial trenches were excavated between November 2019 and November 2021.</p> <p>Those within Kent were monitored by Kent County Council and the reports on the fieldwork have been submitted to Kent County Council for comment.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (AMS-OWSI) will be updated based on the detailed ongoing discussions with Kent</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]</p> <p>dAMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)].</p>	Matter Agreed

Deleted: This remains a matter under discussion, subject to Kent County Council's review of information it considers is required to resolve the matter.¶
 Further engagement has been undertaken with Kent County Council, including a workshop on 15 February 2023.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: dAMS-OWSI [REP6-044]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		are engaged in ongoing discussions with Kent County Council Heritage Conservation about the detailed scope of further investigations, mitigation excavation and recording, and in the accompanying Written Representation KCC asks that these details are included in an updated dAMS-OWSI (and relevant supporting documents) during the DCO Examination process.	County Council. It should be noted that the footprint of development in the wetland areas of the Project in Kent is limited. The ground protection tunnel at the Milton compound comprises a vertical shaft which would limit the impact to wetland areas. The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at <u>Deadline 9</u> .		
Removal / recording of heritage assets	2.1.171 (DL-6)	Two built heritage assets are identified which would have to be physically removed to make way for construction. These are Asset 1562 and Asset 1875. The DCO documentation states that these structures would be subject to historic building recording (Historic England Level 3) before their loss (AS052) and in the dAMS-OWSI. Kent County Council consider that it would be preferable if these heritage assets could be recorded and conserved.	The exact location of the caves (Asset 1562) is uncertain, and their removal is assessed as a worst-case scenario – it is possible that they may not be affected by the Project. The removal of Asset 1875 (an air raid shelter within the remains of a WWII accommodation camp, Asset 1331) is unavoidable due to key utility diversions along the A2 corridor. The Applicant acknowledges and agrees that Level 3 recording of Asset 1562 and Asset 1875 would be carried out, if required.	dAMS-OWSI [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: will

Deleted: dAMS-OWSI [REP6-044]

Deleted: [APP-367].

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Plot size of non-designated assets	2.1.172 (DL-6)	<p>Kent County Council welcome the fact that mitigation through design changes has saved the non-designated early 20th century Homes for Heroes, at the northern end of Thong village (Asset 1561) from being demolished.</p> <p>However, it is noted that part of the original plot would be reduced in size because of the realignment of Thong Lane.</p> <p>Kent County Council consider that it would be preferable if the original plot size, which forms the setting of the buildings, could be maintained.</p>	<p>The diversion of utilities, including below-ground gas mains, has meant that it has not been possible to rule out a slight temporary encroachment into the rear garden plot associated with the Homes for Heroes (Asset 1561) in Thong.</p> <p>However, while utility Work No. G3 has a provision that means part of the rear garden plot could be utilised for the pipeline diversion, the garden would be considered as part of the detailed design and avoided unless absolutely necessary to facilitate the diversion.</p> <p>Once the diversions have been completed, the land would be returned to the landowner and the original rear garden plot would be reinstated. Regarding the front garden plot of Asset 1561: the impact of utility Work No. MU18 on the front garden depends wholly on the alignment of Thong Lane Bridge (Work No. 3B), but impacts would be considered and reasonably reduced at the detailed design stage. In summary, the assessment of both of these impacts on Asset 1561, which are provided in the ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage, are based upon worst-case scenarios</p>	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			which the Applicant will aim to avoid or reduce if possible at the detailed design stage.		
Heritage Assets: Impacts Mitigation: Impacts on Cultural Heritage inc. Below-ground	2.1.41	Kent County Council supports the work done to date to seek to identify heritage assets and set out alternatives for further evaluation and mitigation of impacts. However, Kent County Council is concerned about whether there will be sufficient flexibility in the process of design and build, and resources, to provide for meaningful preservation <i>in situ</i> .	The Applicant welcomes Kent County Council's support for work undertaken to-date and notes that a programme of archaeological trial trenching has been completed and the reports shared with Kent County Council. The Applicant notes that in some areas a phased approach to mitigation will be required which is being developed with Kent County Council's archaeological advisors and the full details will be set out in the Draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation. The vast majority of buried archaeological remains will be accessible at some stage during construction and a programme of archaeological mitigation will ensure a proper record is made in line with policy and best practice. There are ongoing discussions to discuss what further initiatives can be developed around archive storage and accessibility to the	ES Appendix 6.9: Draft Archaeological Mitigation and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ES Appendix 6.9: Draft Archaeological Mitigation and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [\[REP6-044\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			results of the programme of archaeological mitigation. The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at <u>Deadline 9</u> .		
Heritage Assets: Impacts Impact on Heritage Assets	2.1.42 RRE	Kent County Council is concerned about the lack of detailed recognition and explanation of the impact of the Project on the historic landscape and the wider setting of heritage assets such as Cobham Hall and Thong village Conservation Area.	The Applicant has not identified any direct impacts on historic buildings identified within Kent and any impact on setting during construction and operation will be mitigated by appropriate fencing or through the landscape design, taking into account historic landscapes. Following technical engagement on this Matter between Kent County Council and the Applicant, this matter has been resolved.	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Agreed
Mitigation & Compensation Archaeological Impacts of Proposed Mitigation	2.1.43 RRE	Kent County Council is concerned about consideration of proposed mitigation, such as landscaping, creation of ponds and woodlands which will have its own archaeological impacts. KCC note that there is further investigative work to carry out and this work, and mitigation field work, will reveal presently unknown heritage assets with	It is agreed that proposed mitigation, such as landscaping, creation of ponds and woodlands which have their own potential archaeological impacts, should consider those impacts and mitigate them. The Applicant notes that the design of proposed environmental mitigation has had regard to the historic character of the landscape	Design Principles Document Reference 7.5 (7)	Matter Agreed

Deleted: will

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		archaeological interest and flexibility may be required in the final design and location of landscape features such as ponds, planting etc. to allow for the preservation in situ of significant and sensitive heritage assets.	and that this is ensured by the Design Principles (e.g. Design Principle LSP.07). The Applicant has assessed the full impact of the Project including that caused by other potential mitigation, and within Kent this has led to two design changes where an area of planting and a set of infiltration basins have been moved to avoid damage to below ground archaeological remains. The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at <u>Deadline 9</u> .		
Mitigation & Compensation Offsite mitigation	2.1.44	Kent County Council is concerned about consideration of compensation offsite for impacts to the historic environment where mitigation is not possible or sufficient within the Order Limits.	It is agreed that compensation offsite for impacts to the historic environment where mitigation is not possible or sufficient within the Order Limits should be considered. However, the Applicant considers that mitigation within the Order Limits is possible and sufficient. Further engagement with Kent County Council has been undertaken to discuss this matter. The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: will

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: will

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			dAMS-OWSI <u>to be submitted at Deadline 9.</u> <u>At the point of submission of this Statement of Common Ground this has not been confirmed due to limited time for review, so this has been considered a mater not agreed within the examination period, albeit not reflecting fundamental disagreement between the parties.</u>		
Project Design and Mitigation	2.1.109 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that clarification is required on the proposals for landscape and planting mitigation areas, including Chalk Park, and the impact of these on the historic landscape of the area and the setting of, and ability to appreciate relevant heritage.	The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter <u>is anticipated to be resolved through clarification provided by a revised dAMS-OWSI at Deadline 9.</u> <u>At the point of submission of this Statement of Common Ground this has not been confirmed due to limited time for review, so this has been considered a mater not agreed within the examination period, albeit not reflecting fundamental disagreement between the parties.</u>	N/A	Matter Not Agreed
Assessment of likely significant effects	2.1.110 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that it is unclear how the has concluded vibration impacts during construction will have no significant impact on built heritage. Furthermore,	The Applicant and KCC have discussed these matters and both are content that the appropriate assessment has been undertaken. The Applicant acknowledges that KCC has requested a record of	Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116] Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [APP-150]	Matter Agreed

- Deleted:** will
- Deleted:** Under Discussion
- Deleted:** on agreement of

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		clarification is also needed on whether a realistic approach was taken to assessing the impact on designated and non-designated built heritage assets and historic landscapes (e.g. the Darnley Estate), before it is possible to determine if the proposed mitigation is appropriate and sufficient.	where impacts have been set out within the application documents – the Applicant confirms this has been considered within Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (see paragraphs 6.6.10-12), supported by technical information in Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration and Appendix 12.9: Effects of Vibration from Road Traffic.	Appendix 12.9: Effects of Vibration from Road Traffic [APP-449]	
Project Design and Mitigation	2.1.111 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement – Cultural Heritage [APP-144] fails to clearly identify how values have been calculated for certain individual heritage assets and, whilst the proposed mitigation may be appropriate, Kent County Council would like clarification on this and to discuss this further with the Applicant to understand the proposals and ensure the best possible outcomes. These will need to be secured through the DCO.	The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter <u>is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at Deadline 9.</u> <u>At the point of submission of this Statement of Common Ground this has not been confirmed due to limited time for review, so this has been considered a matter not agreed within the examination period, albeit not reflecting fundamental disagreement between the parties.</u>	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Not Agreed
Assessment methodology	2.1.112 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that there is a lack of consistency within the DCO documentation. For example, the defined 'project areas' and	The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter <u>is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at Deadline 9.</u>	ES Appendix 6.9: Draft Archaeological Mitigation and Outline Written Scheme of	Matter Agreed

~~Deleted:~~ will

~~Deleted:~~ Under Discussion

~~Deleted:~~ Under Discussion

~~Deleted:~~ will

~~Deleted:~~ -

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		archaeological mitigation works (field evaluation, archaeological excavation etc) outlined in Chapter 2 (Project Description) of the Environmental Statement [APP-140] does not appear, for example, to be consistent with the areas defined in the draft AMS-OWSI. In addition, there are other areas of the documentation which also require clarity and additional content.	<u>At the point of submission of this Statement of Common Ground this has not been confirmed due to limited time for review, so this has been considered a matter not agreed within the examination period, albeit not reflecting fundamental disagreement between the parties.</u>	<u>Investigation Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)</u> ES Chapter 2: Project Description [APP-140]	
Assessment methodology	2.1.113 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that certain areas of the scheme have not been subject to archaeological field evaluation [APP-194] and there is a risk of unexpected archaeological discoveries, which may be of national importance. This is a particular concern in respect of the tunnel boring and development in the wetland areas of the scheme. Clarification is needed on how this issue is to be satisfactorily addressed.	<u>The Applicant and KCC are in agreement on this matter, subject to the following caveat – this is about areas not yet subject to field evaluation, including wetland areas, which are now covered by the main text of the AMS-oWSI. It is understood that Plate D.48 (included in AMS-oWSI) and associated text for mitigation polygon K96 relates to the potential for near surface archaeology and that if the twin tunnels and any related below-ground works do not remain in chalk but were to impact on later Pleistocene and early Holocene deposits above chalk, then appropriate investigation and</u>	ES Figure 6.7: Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Carried Out by LTC [APP-194]	Matter <u>Agreed</u> .

Deleted: ES Appendix 6.9: Draft Archaeological Mitigation and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [REP6-044]

Deleted: [APP-367].

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			mitigation of these wetland areas will have to be undertaken.		
Monitoring	2.1.139 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Non-designated organic deposits and remains of possible national importance that owe their significance to waterlogging are not adequately considered in the Environmental Statement nor in the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (AMS-OWSI) [APP-367]. Baseline monitoring for the hydrological environment of areas of impact is required to allow a model to be developed which can then be considered in relation to development proposals and so that appropriate mitigation by design and/or remedial works can be agreed upon.</p> <p>KCC consider that the revised AMS-OWSI must record where waterlogged deposits are likely to be encountered, what methods of investigation and mitigation will be employed, how hydrology will be monitored and the process for halting</p>	<p>The archaeological trial trenching did not reveal areas of extensive waterlogging. A summary of the results of the archaeological trial trenching across Kent is provided in Section 4 of Appendix 6.9 - Draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation paras 4.2.1 and 4.2.57, and in full in Appendix 6.8 - Trial Trenching Reports - Volume D (4 of 5) and Appendix 6.8 - Trial Trenching Reports - Volume E (5 of 5).</p> <p>Appendix 14.5 - Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (Part 1 of 2) sets out the baseline hydrogeological conceptual model (CSM) for the whole project. Section 5.2 covers 'South of the Thames' and a summary is presented in Table 5.1. A summary of the Project impacts on groundwater levels and flows is presented in Table 6.6 which reports that there will be no change or a negligible change. Therefore, the Project concluded there would be no impact on non-designated organic deposits or remains of</p>	<p>ES Appendix 6.9 - Draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports - Volume D (4 of 5) [APP-365]</p> <p>ES Appendix 6.8: Trial Trenching Reports - Volume E (5 of 5) [APP-366]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.5: Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (Part 1 of 2) [APP-458]</p>	Matter Agreed

~~Deleted:~~ The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter will be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI.

~~Deleted:~~ Under Discussion

~~Deleted:~~ ES Appendix 6.9 - Draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [REP-044]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		nearby works to agree stand-off distances.	possible national importance through changes in groundwater. <u>As above, the Applicant and KCC are in agreement on this matter, subject to the following caveat – this is about areas not yet subject to field evaluation, including wetland areas, which are now covered by the main text of the AMS-oWSI. It is understood that Plate D.48 (included in AMS-oWSI) and associated text for mitigation polygon K96 relates to the potential for near surface archaeology and that if the twin tunnels and any related below-ground works do not remain in chalk but were to impact on later Pleistocene and early Holocene deposits above chalk, then appropriate investigation and mitigation of these wetland areas will have to be undertaken.</u>		
Sensitivity Rating	2.1.173 (DL-6)	Kent County Council does not agree with the sensitivity rating in the assessment of historic landscapes. Reclaimed land, woodland, parkland and settlement are assessed as of being of Medium value. Farmland, industry/infrastructure and military/defence, are assessed	The Applicant does not accept this argument that the presence of archaeological remains should increase the value of the farmland, industry/infrastructure and military/defence landscapes. Historic England guidance sets out a number of principles for Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC), one of which is that HLC should	N/A	Matter Agreed ,

Deleted: The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter will be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		as being of Low value. However, Kent County Council would recommend that when archaeological evidence is considered, these three categories should also be assessed as being of Medium rather than Low value.	'Define historic character first and foremost in the present-day landscape' (English Heritage (now Historic England) and Somerset County Council, 2003 Historic Landscape Characterisation, Taking Stock of The Method, The National HLC Method Review, 2002). These areas are valued as "low" due to their relative lack of surviving above-ground historic elements in the present-day landscape which is acknowledged by KCC in their comments above as 'much changed over time and fragmented'. <u>The Applicant understands that KCC maintains that the agricultural, industrial and military historic landscape components could be considered to be of medium sensitivity rather than low, because of their archaeological interest. However, it is agreed that the AMS-oWSI recognises the importance of all aspects of the historic landscape and its archaeological interest and provides for appropriate levels of investigation and mitigation.</u>		
Shorne Woods Country Park Historic Landscape	2.1.174 (DL-6)	The historic landscape of Shorne Woods Country Park will be impacted by utilities	The Applicant will discuss appropriate mitigation measures for the affected areas in Shorne Woods	<u>Draft AMS-OWSI Document</u>	Matter <u>Agreed</u>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		works along the southern border. At present the Assessment Table (AS-052) (Asset 1311) Table 1.13 Non-designated built heritage assessment table: South of the River Thames, notes that Construction Mitigation will be 'best practice'. More detail on the exact approach to mitigation is required in the dAMS-OWSI. Likewise, in the north of the project area more detail is required on the impact and mitigation that will be required for the Thames and Medway Canal (AS052) (Asset 1449) which it is proposed would have a ground protection shaft tunnel excavated in its base. At present it is stated in the ES (AS-044) that mitigation of negative impacts will include restoration of the canal and an archaeological watching brief because of the nature of the alluvial deposits in this area. KCC recommends the need for field evaluation in such cases to understand the impacts and to	with KCC, for inclusion within the draft AMS-OWSI. For the Thames and Medway Canal (Asset 1449), an appropriate evaluation and mitigation strategy will be developed with KCC and reported in the draft AMS-OWSI. The Applicant and KCC recognise that this matter <u>is anticipated to be resolved on agreement of a revised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at Deadline 9.</u>	<u>Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 6.9 (6)</u>	

Deleted: Draft AMS-OWSI [\[REP6-044\]](#)

Deleted: will

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		agree the appropriate mitigation.			
Terrestrial Biodiversity					
Impacts Loss of Ancient Woodland and Demand for Natural Gas	2.1.45	Kent County Council is concerned that before the Project is open the importance of gas will have already started to diminish, and yet the loss of ancient woodland to maintain this supply of fuel of diminishing importance, would have already happened.	The Applicant does not agree that before the Project is open the importance of gas will have already started to diminish. Even though natural gas is being phased out of new build homes, the gas main along the A2 is a strategic main into south-east London, feeds upwards of 250k domestic properties, and is not anticipated to reduce in demand in the next 10 years. The Applicant notes that Southern Gas Networks (SGN) are trialling Hydrogen as a potential replacement, but one that would still require existing infrastructure to transport it across the network.	N/A	Matter Not Agreed
Impacts Impacts: A2 Widening and Impacts on woodland, habitats and resources	2.1.46	Kent County Council considers that widening of the A2 (or construction activity related to it) in any form (e.g. for diversion of utilities) should not impact on Shorne Woods Country Park, Brewers Wood (which includes tree species of international importance), Ashenbank Wood and other	The Applicant has altered the design to minimise the footprint of the road itself through the AONB. The lanes of the A2 previously shown as widening the corridor would now be within the existing highway boundary and would not impact Shorne Woods Country Park, and revisions to the requirements of construction and	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>areas of ancient woodland adjacent to the A2.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that this should not result in the loss of woodland in the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB), or result in significant impacts on habitats or biodiversity.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that as the proposal will result in a direct loss of SSSI, Kent County Council would expect that the effect on the SSSI will be greater than first anticipated within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) (National Highways, 2018).</p>	<p>utility diversions have further reduced the requirements for loss of ancient woodland.</p> <p>In terms of land-take for utilities, the diversion design has been developed and the easement width – previously estimated at 60m – has been reduced to around 15m (subject to discussions with utility companies). The route would be largely aligned with an existing access track, in order to limit the impact on the woods. Impacts remain between the Inn on the Lake and the Brewers Road overbridge.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response to these concerns which sets out the evolution of the proposals in an effort to mitigate likely adverse effects on SSSIs as far as possible, reducing the overall area of land-take and developing sensitive mitigation and compensation measures.</p>		
Impacts Impacts: Effects on Darnley Trail (SWCP)	2.1.47	<p>Kent County Council is concerned that movement of the road alignment north towards the existing development line boundary and Shorne Woods Country Park should be avoided if possible, as this risks severing the 10km</p>	<p>It is agreed that effects on the Darnley Trail should be avoided where possible, and mitigated where not.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the Darnley Trail is not severed as a result of the Project. There may be</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The matter remains under discussion pending Kent County Council's review of various application documents, which set out the detail of the iterative project design summarised here.¶ Further engagement has been undertaken with Kent County Council, including a workshop on 21 February 2023 and follow up meetings to clarify technical queries.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		Darnley Trail, the blue multiuser route within the park.	temporary impacts for users of the Darnley Trail as a result of construction works and activities. Sections of the Luddesdown Trek, which follows a similar route through SWCP to the Darnley Trail would be upgraded as part of the proposals.		
Impacts Impacts: Effects on Hornbeam Maidens (SWCP)	2.1.48	Kent County Council considers that movement of the road alignment north towards the existing development line boundary and Shorne Woods Country Park should be avoided if possible, considering that construction on this land has the potential to impact on dormouse which are immediately adjacent to the existing A2 and an area of Hornbeam Maidens which are veteran trees and rare for the area.	<p>The Applicant can confirm that due to the refinement of the utilities working areas there are no predicted impacts on the Hornbeam Maidens, which are within an area of SWCP included within the Project's Order Limits only to provide mitigation for effects on dormice, together with enhancements for dormouse in the wider country park through agreement with Natural England and SWCP.</p> <p><u>Notwithstanding this, as the Project will move the road closer to SWCP, this matter is technically not agreed.</u></p>	N/A	Matter Not <u>Agreed</u>
Impacts Impacts: Effects on WW2 Bunkers (Dormice and Bats)	2.1.49	Kent County Council considers that the Project should avoid potential effects on an old WW2 camp/bunker identified at SWCP, where the shelters are bat roosts and are known to	<p>It is agreed that the Project should avoid potential effects on this sensitive receptor and provide mitigation where effects are unavoidable.</p> <p>One of the bunkers identified by Kent County Council is within the</p>	N/A	Matter Agreed

Deleted: It is agreed that movement of the road alignment north towards the existing development line boundary and Shorne Woods Country Park should be avoided if possible.¶

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of relevant documents within the planning application.¶
Following engagement, this matter remains under discussion subject to the Applicant providing further responses to clarifications requested by Kent County Council.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		have brown long eared bats roosting in them every year.	Project's Order Limits, and here the Applicant is seeking to avoid impacts through micro-siting of the utilities diversion. A replacement bunker is included in the mitigation strategy, to address possible disturbance impacts to bats.		
Impacts Impacts: Effects on Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees	2.1.50	Kent County Council considers that movement of the road alignment north towards the existing development line boundary and Shorne Woods Country Park should be avoided if possible, with impacts on ancient woodland and veteran trees avoided.	It is agreed that where possible, the loss of veteran trees and ancient woodland should be avoided. The Applicant has worked to avoid impacts, but where they are unavoidable, has sought to design a compensatory package of planting and other measures, in discussion with the Kent Downs AONB unit, Kent County Council, the Forestry Commission and Natural England. Where the loss of veteran trees is unavoidable, the hulks of those trees would be translocated. Other trees will be 'veteranised' as further compensation. <u>Notwithstanding this, as the Project will move the road closer to SWCP, this matter is technically not agreed.</u>	<u>ES Figure 2.4: Environmental 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)].</u>	Matter Not Agreed
Assessment	2.1.51	Kent County Council considers that effects on archaeology have not been considered in several areas, despite	The Applicant notes that effects on archaeology of all areas of woodland planting have been considered within Chapter 6:	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: ¶
This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of relevant documents within the planning application.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan [\[REP4-124, REP3-098, REP2-018, APP-162, REP4-127, REP4-129, REP2-024 to REP2-031\]](#)

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to detailed development of plans for compensatory planting and other measures via the Environmental Masterplan.¶
Following engagement, this matter remains under discussion subject to the Applicant providing further responses to clarifications requested by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Impacts: Effects on Ancient Woodland Archaeology		<p>archaeological field evaluation demonstrating that there are below-ground archaeological remains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient woodland compensation between Claylane Wood and Shorne Wood • Ancient woodland planting near the edge of Gravesend • Ancient woodland compensation between Brewers Wood and Great Crabbles Wood, and south of HS1 	<p>Cultural Heritage within the ES. Effects on ecology and woodlands themselves are considered in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity. Where appropriate, planting proposals have been reduced/adapted to accommodate undisturbed archaeological remains.</p> <p><u>KCC and the Applicant have engaged on this matter and anticipate that an agreement will be reached on resolution of a finalised dAMS-OWSI to be submitted at Deadline 9.</u></p>	<p>ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity <u>[Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)]</u></p>	
Mitigation Mitigation: Management of Effects/Ecology Working Group	2.1.52 RRE	<p>Kent County Council considers that an Ecology Working Group should be established, to keep relevant/key consultees abreast of developments as survey data are collated, provide local knowledge where appropriate, and have early sight of developing mitigation and compensation strategies.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that this group would be concerned with effects of the Project on vegetation clearance, landscape</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees with Kent County Council's position and although an Ecology Working Group has not yet been established, there has been ongoing consultation and engagement with all relevant statutory environmental bodies and non-statutory environmental bodies throughout the pre-application phase.</p> <p>Kent County Council was provided with a Terms of Reference for the proposed <u>oLEMP Advisory</u> group (April 2022) and this has now been incorporated into the oLEMP.</p>	<p>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan – Appendix 1 – LEMP Terms of Reference <u>[Document Reference 6.7 Appendix 1 (3)]</u></p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Deleted: [APP-146]

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the approach to assessment and mitigation as set out in the ES.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: [APP-491]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		severance and loss of ancient woodland and Kent County Council suggests that the proposed Group meets every six months to consider potential effects on the AONB and protected landscapes, helps to inform the scheme design with the intention to ensure that issues are considered at the earliest opportunity	The Applicant has been consulting with the Kent Downs AONB Unit throughout the pre-application phase and has negotiated measures of compensation for the works proposed that directly and indirectly affect the Kent Downs AONB. <u>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant notes that KCC has been unable to agree to the detailed approach of the proposed Advisory Group and this matter is therefore not agreed.</u>		
Mitigation Mitigation: Ancient Woodland Compensation	2.1.53	Kent County Council notes National Highways' proposals for temporary use and permanent acquisition of rights over land for the diversion of utilities impacts on ancient woodland within Claylane Wood. Kent County Council considers that this cannot be mitigated, and so must be minimised and habitat compensation must be provided. Kent County Council <u>did</u> not consider that information provided by National Highways <u>during consultation allowed</u> stakeholders to fully assess and	The Applicant agrees that loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated, and acknowledges the impact on irreplaceable habitats, and is proposing compensatory habitat. Ancient woodland soils will be salvaged where possible for use in new areas of compensatory planting. In terms of adequacy of information provided, the Applicant considers that – in light of materials presented at Community Impact Consultation and through subsequent engagement <u>and within the DCO application</u> – information provided now <u>meets EIA standards and</u>	<u>ES Figure 2.4: Environmental 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)</u>	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u> ,

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to the development of funding for officer resourcing to be agreed via a Section 106 Agreement.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: does

Deleted: allows

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		comment on the proposed impacts and mitigation measures.	allows stakeholders to fully assess and comment on the proposed impacts and mitigation measures. <u>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant notes, that KCC has not been able to confirm a position on this matter during the examination.</u>	<u>Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)]</u> <u>REAC, appended to ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</u>	
Mitigation Mitigation: Replacement Open Space at SWCP	2.1.54	Kent County Council, as owner and operator of SWCP, agrees that the replacement land as included in the DCO application is no less advantageous and no less in area, in accordance with s.131 & s.132 of the Planning Act 2008. Kent County Council requests that the replacement land is directly vested in them (and National Highways agrees to do so should the relevant compulsory acquisition powers be granted).	The Applicant welcomes this agreement and it is agreed that the replacement land would be directly vested in Kent County Council should the relevant compulsory acquisition powers be granted.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Mitigation Mitigation: Chalk Park/ Environmental Mitigation	2.1.55	Kent County Council notes that provision of environmental mitigation land around Thong, and also the Riverview Park area of Gravesend, is welcomed provided that it is	The Applicant notes that the Design Principles Sections 4.2 and 4.3 contain area specific design principles of relevance to land around Thong and the eastern edge of Gravesend.	<u>ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 7 (2)]</u>	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>

Deleted: (subject to detail)

Deleted: cannot be shared until DCO submission).

Deleted: ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan [[REP4-124](#), [REP3-098](#), [REP2-018](#), [APP-162](#), [REP4-127](#), [REP4-129](#), [REP2-024](#) to [REP2-031](#)]
Design Principles [[REP6-046](#)]
REAC, appended to ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [[REP6-038](#)]

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		appropriate to the character of the landscape.	<p>The open rural setting of the village of Thong will be maintained, using species-rich grassland and wildflower meadow planting, and open views across the landscape north of Thong Lane shall also be maintained as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>the Applicant considers that the above (supported by ES Chapter 7 and Design Principles) provides comfort that the environmental mitigation land will be appropriate to the character of the landscape. <u>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant recognises that KCC has not confirmed a view on the proposed Design Principles and therefore this matter is not resolved.</u></p>	Design Principles Document Reference 7.5 (7)	
Assessment methodology	2.1.127 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council is concerned that the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculations for the Project is anticipated to be lower than 3% for Kent. Trading rules have not been satisfied and thus the positive net gain scores south of the Thames will be invalid.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are concerns that condition assessment information may be</p>	<p>Para. 5.3.22 of Environmental Statement Appendices - Appendix 8.21 - Biodiversity Metric Calculations states the following: "The assessment of the Project does however include biodiversity units generated by essential ecological mitigation areas included within the Order Limits to mitigate and compensate for effects on protected species.</p>	ES Appendix 8.21: Biodiversity Metric Calculations [APP-417]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [\[APP-145\]](#) ¶
Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#)¶

Deleted: Although a matter under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the assessment (within ES Chapter 7 and Design Principles),

Deleted: and as such considers this likely to be a matter agreed subject to Kent County Council confirmation on review of application materials.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>inaccurate – a limitation the ecologists acknowledge. BNG has been discussed since the original DCO submission in 2020 so the Applicant has had sufficient time to collect this information to support the BNG assessment.</p> <p>There is also no mention in ES Appendix 8.21 – Biodiversity Metric Calculations [APP-417] about how additionality has been dealt with, with regards to protected species. For example, receptor sites for Great Crested Newts/reptiles should only be allowed within the calculations up to no net loss and it is not clear within the submission if this point has been addressed.</p>	<p>For these areas, the direct impacts they are addressing fall within the Order Limits and do not relate to irreplaceable habitats. Including these areas gives a full assessment of the biodiversity units generated by the current landscape design within the Environmental Masterplan (6.2)". The assessment does therefore include assessment of units generated in protected species mitigation/compensation areas.</p> <p>However, at the time of writing the Appendix it was not clear what the Government's position was in terms of including protected species mitigation and additionality i.e. what contribution was/was not appropriate. Therefore, the specific contribution these areas make to the BNG assessment was not specified.</p> <p>However, the February 2023 consultation response on the BNG regulations and implementation subsequently clarified this. As per the 2023 Defra consultation response, "mitigation and compensation for protected species and protected sites can be counted within a development's BNG</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>calculation”, and it is clarified that this can be up to the point of no net loss in biodiversity. For Kent, the contribution of protected species mitigation and compensation sites comprises only 5% of the post-intervention units generated i.e. of the total reported in 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices - Appendix 8.21 - Biodiversity Metric Calculations.</p> <p>As only 5% of all the post-intervention units in Kent are generated through these essential mitigation areas, it is considered that the Project aligns with the current approach for protected species mitigation/compensation additionality.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a detailed response to Kent County Council relating to Biodiversity Net Gain and trading.</p>		
Project Design and Mitigation	2.1.128 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that the Project includes proposals for three green bridges, however currently these offer poor connectivity to other suitable habitats and the inclusion of roads on the	<p>The design of all green bridges proposed as part of the Project is reported in 7.4 Project Design Report – Part D – General Design South of the River.</p> <p>All three green bridges within Kent are maintaining road connections</p>	Project Design Report – Part D – General Design South of the River [APP-509] ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: This remains a Matter Under Discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position set out here and provided directly to Kent County Council through engagement.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		structures provides additional hazards to animals trying to use the bridges to access other areas of suitable habitat.	<p>that already exist in those locations to avoid severance impacts as a result of the Project.</p> <p>In respect of the green bridges at Brewers Road and Thong Lane South, these are providing new habitat connections where they are currently absent due to the existing transport corridors of the A2 and HS1. The provision of green bridges in these locations is, therefore, a benefit as a result of the project, and is reported in Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity, paragraph 8.5.8, and 6.7 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, paragraph 5.6.6.</p> <p>In respect of Thong Lane North green bridge, this is the widest green bridge proposed by the Project and will connect into the wider habitat connections being provided as a result of the landscape planting and habitat enhancements proposed as part of the Project. Thong Lane North green bridge planting zones shall be maximised. Their width shall vary across the length of the bridge but shall have a 7m minimum width at pinch points to provide habitat connection across the bridge and</p>	<p>Biodiversity [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)], Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [Document Reference 6.7 (7)], Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)]</p>	

Deleted: [\[APP-146\]](#)

Deleted: [\[REP4-140\]](#)

Deleted: Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>will also provide new WCH connections to Shorne Woods Country Park where WCH access is currently limited from the west.</p> <p>The specific design principles for green bridges are reported in the Design Principles; notably:</p> <p>Clause STR.08 states that planting would tie in with the broader landscape to ensure connectivity.</p> <p>Clause S1.04 states that detailed design would provide connectivity of habitats for a range of protected species between Shorne Woods and Ashenbank Woods, Jeskyns and Cobham Park. This connectivity is currently absent given the habitat severance caused by the existing A2 and the HS1 railway line, so the provision of new green bridges at Thong Lane South and Brewers Road would help address this existing impact.</p> <p>Clause S2.04 states that Thong Lane North green bridge would be designed to extend the character of the well-vegetated Thong Lane and to connect woodland to the east and west to provide a habitat corridor for mammals. This connectivity between habitats adjacent to and within the green bridges would</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>facilitate movement of a range of species across them.</p> <p>Clause S3.18 states that the following minimum widths shall apply in accordance with design principles STR.08 and STR.16: • The planting green zones shall be maximised. Their width shall vary across the length of the bridge but shall have a 7m minimum width at pinch points. The WCH routes may be located within the planting zones. • WCH provision on the west side within the planting zone, comprising a 3m shared pedestrian/cycle route and a 3.5m horse riding route. • WCH provision on the east side within the planting zone, comprising a 3m shared pedestrian/cycle route and a 3.5m horse riding route. A WCH crossing shall be provided on the bridge between the east and west WCH routes.</p> <p>The Applicant will ensure the replanting of vegetation where possible to either side of the A2. There is no space for a planted central reserve – it was considered preferable to limit widening and associated impacts on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>and country parks. The green bridges would provide better flight lines for species to cross the A2, and would strengthen links between either side.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered and incorporated elements suggested by KCC where practicable, alongside advice from the Kent Downs AONB Unit, KCC, Gravesham Borough Council and Natural England. The Applicant continues to engage with all parties to seek a balanced approach through detailed design. The Applicant notes that local authorities would need to be consulted on any modifications to the Project within the parameters of the Environmental Masterplan and oLEMP, and therefore this provides the appropriate balance of certainty and flexibility.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to design the operation phase lighting as part of the Project design and mitigation measures to preserve nocturnal character and habitats, and maintain dark corridors for wildlife (Design Principles Clause no. LST.02; LST.03).</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Assessment of likely significant effects	2.1.129 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council notes that very minimal information has been provided for the anticipated light spill [APP-199] from the operational phase of the Project, with only a small section highlighting the expected light spill upon key receptors. Without this information the County Council is unable to determine the full extent of the impacts.</p> <p><u>Due to the location adjacent to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ancient Woodland (AW) and within 100m of the Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar/SSSI, KCC would expect the lighting design to go above and beyond standard use for highways. KCC considers that with a road scheme of this size the lighting requirements are likely to be quite significant and the Design Principles lack commitment.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the location of operational lighting is shown on the General Arrangement Plans (Volume B) and (Volume C). As described in ES Chapter 2: Project Description, proposed lighting has been designed with consideration of associated environmental impacts including the use of luminaires that emit no light above the horizontal to reduce skyglow, directing lighting to reduce light spill, and the use of warm white LEDs to reduce the impact of light spill. ES Appendix 8.15: Construction and Operational Light Spill Calculations provides details on changes in light levels during the operational phase. These calculations have been used in the assessment of the effect of light spill on European sites in paragraphs 6.2.107 to 6.2.115 in the Habitats Regulations Assessment - Screening Report and Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment. The effect of light spill on ecological receptors including bats, invertebrates, badgers and dormice is reported in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity, paragraphs</p>	<p>General Arrangement Plans (Volume B) [Document Reference 2.5 Volume A (5), Volume B (5)], ES Chapter 2: Project Description [APP-140] Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)] ES Appendix 8.15: Construction and Operational Light Spill Calculations [APP-407] ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)], Habitats Regulations Assessment - Screening Report and Statement to Inform an Appropriate</p>	<p>Matter <u>Not Agreed</u></p>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: [REP4-031] ¶
General Arrangement Plans (

Deleted: C) [REPS-016]

Deleted: Design Principles [REP6-046] ¶

Deleted: [APP-146]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>8.6.451 to 8.6.482, and concludes permanent impacts on some receptors which would not adversely affect the integrity or key characteristics of those receptors and would therefore not be significant effects.</p> <p>In ES Appendix 8.15: Construction and Operational Light Spill Calculations, paragraph 3.5.2 states that lighting technologies and standards are reviewed and updated regularly and would be assessed as part of detailed design to minimise light spill into adjacent habitats as far as practicable. Commitment TB024 in ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP commits to complying with industry best practice around lighting and light spill, and to consulting with an Ecological Clerk of Works on lighting around any sensitive ecological features such as retained badger setts.</p> <p>These measures are reinforced in principle LST.02 and principle LST.03 of the Design Principles to preserve the nocturnal character of the landscape.</p>	<p>Assessment [APP-487]</p> <p>ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	
Project Design and Mitigation	2.1.130 (DL-1)	Kent County Council considers that there is a need to ensure that proposed mitigation areas	The short and long-term management of mitigation measures is secured within the	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice [[REP6-038](#)]

Deleted: ¶
This Matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of these application materials.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
	RRN	<p>and habitat creation works will be managed in the short and long-term. There is also a need to highlight that the habitats have to be retained long term and not lost as part of future developments (e.g. habitat creation as part of the mitigation for the High Speed 1 rail line is being lost as a result of this scheme).</p> <p>No information has been provided on who will be responsible for implementing the management (short or long-term) or how associated funding will be secured. The open habitats, such as the meadows and chalk grassland will require minimal but very specific management on an annual basis.</p>	<p>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP). The Contractors will be responsible for the establishment of mitigation measures and management for up to five years during the maintenance period.</p> <p>The Applicant will be responsible for the long-term management. Identification of funding mechanisms and procurement of suitably qualified management partners, to act on National Highway's behalf, is ongoing to facilitate the management where the measures lay outside the maintainable highway boundary. The Applicant's operational teams will manage mitigation measures within the maintainable highway boundary.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that this Matter is covered under the following Matters elsewhere in this Statement of Common Ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.52 – Mitigation: Management of Effects/Ecology Working Group • 2.1.95 – Compensatory Land Arrangement - Principle 	(oLEMP) [Document Reference 6.7 (7)]	

Deleted: [\[REP4-140\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Project Design and Mitigation	2.1.131 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that as woodlands are proposed to be created to mitigate the impacts of nitrogen deposition, there is a need to ensure they can be established, retained and managed in the long term. A number of the woodlands surveyed as part of this works were flagged up as not having any management and therefore as part of this process there is a need to question if further mitigation can be carried out through enabling management of some/all of those woodlands.	The establishment, retention and long-term management of woodlands that are to be created to compensate for the potential impacts of nitrogen deposition is described in the oLEMP. The oLEMP sets out proposals for appropriate long-term adaptive management, which will be informed by long-term monitoring. The assessment of impacts of nitrogen deposition (ES Appendix 8.14: Designated Sites Air Quality Assessment) identified a lack of management in a number of the woodland sites that were surveyed. Management intervention would contribute to improving the condition of such habitats. However, Table 6.1 of ES Appendix 5.6: Project Air Quality Action Plan (PAQAP) explains that site management measures would not avoid or reduce the nitrogen deposited from the Project itself and are therefore not mitigation but compensation measures. In the detailed consideration of potential compensation measures (Section 7.3 of the PAQAP), three options were assessed against a number of criteria:	<p>oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)]</p> <p>ES Appendix 8.14: Designated Sites Air Quality Assessment [APP-403, APP-404, APP-405 and APP-406]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.6: Project Air Quality Action Plan (PAQAP) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 5.6 (2)],</p>	Matter Not Agreed

~~Deleted: Under Discussion~~

~~Deleted: oLEMP [REP4-140]†~~

~~Deleted: [APP-350]~~

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat management measures within affected sites Habitat creation or enhancement measures adjacent or near the affected sites Habitat creation measures at an ecological network scale <p>The assessment concluded that habitat creation measures at an ecological network scale, with a small number of larger compensation measures in carefully selected locations associated with identifiable habitat networks would provide the most suitable and certain option for compensation. This would provide permanent, meaningful, landscape-scale habitat creation areas that would be a long-term habitat resource of a comparable area to that affected by degradation in the affected sites.</p>		
Assessment Methodology	2.1.132 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers the species surveys have not covered all habitats or species to fully assess the impact of the proposed development (for example moth surveys have not been conducted, all required bat emergence surveys not completed, bat activity surveys	For all surveys undertaken to develop an ecological baseline against which the assessment of likely significant effects has been made, any limitations around extent of surveys and divergence from best practice have been detailed within the relevant technical appendices supporting the	ES Appendix 8.3: Terrestrial Invertebrates [APP-392] ES Appendix 8.8: Bats [APP-397] ES Appendix 8.6: Reptiles [APP-395]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		did not follow best practice guidelines and reptiles surveys do not appear to have been carried in all suitable habitat), but does consider that survey data was sufficient.	<p>application. Any assumptions made in relation to such limitations are also reported, and support a precautionary approach that provided a robust assessment of likely significant effects and an appropriate and proportionate mitigation/compensation strategy.</p> <p>With respect to terrestrial invertebrates, notably moths, baseline survey data is reported in ES Appendix 8.3: Terrestrial Invertebrates, Section 6: Assumptions and limitations being the relevant section and paragraph 6.1.2 specifically relating to moths.</p> <p>With respect to bats, baseline survey data is reported in ES Appendix 8.8: Bats, Section 5 Assumptions and limitations being the relevant section, and with respect to reptiles, baseline survey data is reported in ES Appendix 8.6: Reptiles, Section 6: Limitations and assumptions being the relevant section.</p> <p>Regarding the overall assessment of likely significant effects, these are reported in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity, Section 8.6 Assessment of likely significant effects, notably paragraphs 8.6.69–</p>	<p>ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)], Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)],</p>	

Deleted: [\[APP-146\]](#)

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			79 (terrestrial invertebrates); paragraphs 8.6.101–113 (reptiles); and paragraphs 8.6.130–153 (bats). Further pre-construction survey work is secured within the draft DCO, specifically Schedule 2 Requirement 7 – Protected Species.		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.133 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council is concerned that only one receptor site has been clearly mentioned in the oLEMP (APP-490) for reptiles. It is noted that this site will require habitat manipulation and then habitat creation to make it suitable, taking an estimated 10 years before the habitat is of the required condition. Mitigation areas need to be in a condition to support the species when required during the construction timetable.	Thong Open Mosaic Habitat has been identified as a receptor site for reptiles in the oLEMP, Section 5.9. The relevant habitat typologies for this management area are reported in Sections 8.22 (LE8.1: Open mosaic habitat) and 8.26 (LE8.5: Ecological ponds). For all habitat typologies within the oLEMP, their time to target condition has been aligned to that set out within Natural England's biodiversity metric calculator (v3.1). This considers the habitat type and the proposed target condition and provides an establishment period to meet the criteria set out for that habitat within the metric. In the case of open mosaic habitat, this establishment period to meet the metric criteria is 10 years. For the site to offer valuable reptile habitat it needs to provide the following (Edgar <i>et al.</i> , 2010):	oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)] ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A, 2, 3, 4 and 9 [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)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: oLEMP [REP4-140]¶
ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A, 2, 3, 4 and 9 [REP4-124, REP3-098, REP2-018, APP-162, APP-163]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warmth (to facilitate temperature regulation) • Structural complexity (to offer shelter, foraging, hibernation opportunities) • Habitat connectivity (to provide links into the wider landscape and facilitate genetic interchange and offer resilience to challenges such as climate change) <p>The Thong Open Mosaic Habitat management area is positioned immediately adjacent to Shorne Woods Country Park on its northern, eastern and southern sides. These links would be maintained throughout Project construction. The Project landscape design in Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A, 2, 3, 4 and 9 details how this area would then connect into Thong Lane green bridge north, linking this site with habitats west of the Project such as Open space north of Claylane Wood, and Chalk Park and environs as detailed in Sections 5.7 and 5.12 of the oLEMP; both management areas would provide high quality reptile habitat.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>The Thong Open Mosaic Habitat management area is currently horse-grazed pasture which would develop structural diversity within 12–18 months of removing this grazing pressure. Its structure would be further enhanced by the creation of areas of sparsely-vegetated nutrient-poor substrate, refuge habitats and hibernacula which would offer opportunity for thermoregulation, shelter and hibernation. Ecological ponds would provide additional habitat structural diversity.</p> <p>The Thong Open Mosaic Habitat management area is therefore considered an appropriate site for reptile translocation within 12–18 months of habitat creation, but that, to align with the biodiversity metric criteria for open mosaic habitat, the metric calculator presents a 10-year establishment period.</p> <p>Recent discussions between Kent County Council and the Applicant have covered the additional provision of potential reptile translocation sites. Two offsite receptor areas are proposed for reptiles, both situated north of the River Thames in Essex. In Kent,</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>habitat creation within areas identified for nitrogen deposition compensation would provide additional suitable habitat for reptile translocation. The woodland and grassland habitat proposals for these areas would offer suitable reptile habitat in the grassland and woodland edge areas. With habitat creation being split on a roughly 70% woodland and 30% grassland basis, there would be approximately 13ha of suitable receptor area for reptiles. These areas would be used to release reptiles in preference over the offsite receptors north of the River Thames, which would only be used as a last resort.</p> <p>The long-term management of Thong Open Mosaic Habitat, the nitrogen deposition compensation sites and Chalk Park as habitats which would support reptiles is reported in the oLEMP, in Sections 5.5, 5.9, 5.12, 5.14 and 5.15.</p> <p>The reptile surveys were targeted to be carried out in the most suitable habitat to establish the precautionary reptile population baseline. As reptiles were found across the Project, they have precautionarily been assumed to be</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			present in all suitable habitats found within the Order Limits. The majority of the reptile habitat south of the River Thames is of low quality (as evidenced by the low to good population of common reptile species). As such the mitigation habitat is deemed sufficient as this will be of significantly higher quality than the habitat to be lost. In addition to the designated reptile receptor at Land East of Thong, a number of other sites have the potential for use as reptile receptors including the Nitrogen Deposition compensation sites. ▾		
Project design and mitigation	2.1.134 (DL-1) RRN	In regards to mitigation for the loss of veteran trees, Kent County Council is concerned that the proposals state that 'a <i>minimum of 30 individual specimen trees would be planted as replacement for lost veteran trees</i> '. The County Council also has concerns that 30 trees is not sufficient for the loss of veteran trees and there must be a responsibility to retain standing deadwood. For example, all dead wood must not be left in log piles and should instead be strapped to	The removal of trees to facilitate construction of the Project is discussed in ES Appendix 7.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The worst-case assumption on the likely loss of trees in paragraph 5.2.11 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment is that six potential veteran trees (trees identified during Project surveys as displaying the features of a veteran tree but not recorded on the Ancient Tree Inventory) would be removed to facilitate the Project. Three of these six potential veteran trees would be lost south of the River Thames.	ES Appendix 7.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-387] REAC within ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9) ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A, 2, 3 and 4 Document Reference 6.2 ES Figure 2.4 Sections	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
This matter remains under discussion pending KCC's review of the position set out by the Applicant.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		felled mature trees to support invertebrate diversity.	<p>However, commitment LV001 of the REAC mandates an aim for the detailed design for the Project, including diverted utilities, to reduce the removal of trees and vegetation as far as reasonably practicable. This includes potential veteran trees.</p> <p>In accordance with commitment LV032 set out in the REAC, a minimum of 30 specimen trees would be replanted as replacement for lost veteran trees, 15 of which would be planted to the south of the River Thames in Kent. This specimen tree planting would be in addition to the extensive native woodland planting also proposed south of the River Thames, as shown on the Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A, 2, 3 and 4.</p> <p>Where felling of veteran trees cannot be avoided, the intact hulk would be retained and relocated in close proximity to a nearby veteran tree or within a parkland to allow fungi and invertebrates to relocate and promote habitat creation (in the form of standing dead wood). This measure is secured via the REAC commitment LV031.</p>	<p>1 and 1a (4), Section 2 (5), Section 3 (4), Section 4 (2)</p>	

Deleted: REAC within ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [REP6-038]¶
ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A, 2, 3 and 4 [REP4-124, REP3-098, REP2-018, APP-162]¶

Deleted: ¶
This matter remains under discussion pending KCC's review of the position set out by the Applicant.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Assessment methodology	2.1.135 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council is concerned that the conclusions of 'no adverse impact' are based on the implementation of best practice guidelines for avoiding impacts from surface water, dust, noise, air quality, vibration and lighting during construction and operational phase. However, the Examining Authority must be satisfied that the proposed approaches are appropriate.</p> <p>The Thames Estuary Marshes next to/under the road receives its water via surface water/drains rather than ground water. There is a need to ensure that KCC are satisfied that tunnel and road construction do not impact the functionality of the marshes and ensure that they will continue to receive and retain water.</p>	<p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment – Screening Report and Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment sets out the project design and environmental measures in Section 3.3 and mitigation measures in Section 7.1. The measures that are established good practice methods are highlighted and their effectiveness at avoiding or reducing impacts has been reported within the assessment of likely significant effects (Section 6.2) under the heading 'Efficacy of committed measures' and within Section 7.1 under the heading 'Confidence of success'.</p> <p>With regard to the concerns regarding groundwater, a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been carried out to identify any likely significant effects of the Project on European designated sites, including the Thames Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area and Ramsar site. The HRA contains proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential adverse effects. The HRA concludes that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of</p>	Habitats Regulations Assessment – Screening Report and Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment [APP-487]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			the Thames Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area and Ramsar site or any other European designated site.		
Impacts on bats	2.1.183 (DL-6)	<p>Kent County Council consider that the impacts on foraging/commuting bats could have been under-estimated due to habitats overall being assessed as moderate, while some habitats (such as Ancient Woodland) provide high suitability for foraging/commuting habitat. The Applicant's surveys have not fully assessed the significance of how bats commute across the A2/HS1 line.</p> <p>The impact of a loss of habitat resulting in a decline in suitable foraging/commuting habitat is negative but has the potential to be neutral in the long term if the key habitats being lost (hedgerows and woodland) are successfully established/managed/monitored in the long term.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that data gathered through field survey and analysis of biological records indicates predominantly common species of bats are active in this area (over 90% activity recorded was from the pipistrelle species group), with the highest levels of activity occurring south of the A2 and HS1 railway where the Project is having minimal impact. The overall valuation of the bat assemblage south of the River Thames is assessed as being of County level importance (i.e. the geographic scale at which the loss of the bat assemblage would be felt would be at county level). It is considered that this baseline dataset is robust and allows the characterisation of potential impacts to be determined and the likely effect of those impacts to be assessed, as reported in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity, paragraphs 8.6.130 to 8.6.153. Surveys of bats commuting across the A2/HS1 line were undertaken</p>	<p>ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)], ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A and 2 [Document Reference 6.2 ES Figure 2.4 Sections 1 and 1a (4), Section 2 (5)], Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)], Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [Document Reference 6.7 (7)], ES Appendix 8.16: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Bats [Document</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position set out above.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: [\[APP-146\]](#)

Deleted: ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A and 2 [\[REP4-124 and REP3-098\]](#) ¶
Design Principles [\[APP-516\]](#) ¶

Deleted: [\[REP4-140\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>and recorded bats crossing this infrastructure but a relatively low levels of activity, and not representative of the activity levels recorded in adjacent woodlands (e.g. Ashenbank Wood). It is therefore considered that there is not a clear and regularly used flightpath for bats crossing the A2/HS1 line. The existing vegetated central reserve may be beneficial to bats looking to cross this infrastructure as it could function as a hopover for bats, although it is certainly not designed as such. although the central reserve would be lost as a result of the Project, the two bridges at Thong Lane South and Brewers Road would be converted to green bridges with vegetation planting tying into the adjacent habitats. These would provide strong commuting opportunities in this area which do not currently exist and therefore would be beneficial for bats. The green bridges are shown in ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Sections 1 & 1A and 2, with the associated design principles secured in the Design</p>	<p>Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.16 (2)</p>	

Deleted: [APP-408](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>Principles, clauses STR.08, S1.04, S1.17, S2.12.</p> <p>The general loss of woodland habitats used for foraging and roosting, and hedgerows used for commuting and foraging would be offset through the landscape design for the Project which would result in a significant increase in high quality woodland, scrub, and semi-natural species-rich grassland than is currently present. These newly created habitats are also designed to link into existing semi-natural habitats across the wider landscape, helping establish coherent ecological networks and facilitating movements of species throughout these networks. It is acknowledged that these habitats would take time to establish so would be a resource available to bats in the long-term, but there is significant available resource within the wider landscape to support the extant bat assemblage. The long-term management proposals for newly created habitats are reported in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan which include objectives to maximise value for species such as bats. The</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			commitment to monitoring habitats and structures for bats over a 10-year period is reported in ES Appendix 8.16: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Bats.		
Impact on Roosting Bats	2.1.175 (DL-6)	Kent County Council note that the impact of the Project on Roosting Bats has the potential to be neutral but the replacement roosts need to be located in an area where connectivity and foraging will be retained/maintained. Individual species needs (e.g. light adverse species) to be taken in to account.	The Applicant's position is that of the known bat roosts being impacted, all but one are considered to be day roosts, the one exception being a hibernation roost used by brown long-eared (Plecotus auritus), Natterer's (Myotis nattereri), and Daubenton's bats (M. daubentonii), within an air raid shelter in Shorne Woods. The baseline for bats south of the River Thames is reported in ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity, paragraphs 8.4.52 to 8.4.60. Bat boxes would be used to compensate for the loss of tree roosts and, where appropriate, roosts in other structures. The type of bat box used would be based on its similarity in size and function to the roost being lost. In addition to compensation for the loss of roosts, bat boxes would also be provided to compensate for the loss of trees with suitable roosting features as these contribute to the roosting resource within the area. Bat boxes	ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)] , ES Appendix 8.16: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Bats [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.16 (2)] ,	Matter Not Agreed ,

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: [APP-146]

Deleted: [APP-408]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>would be installed within areas of retained woodland either within the Project Order Limits, such as areas within Ashenbank Wood, or within woodland under agreement with the landowner such as Shorne Woods. The amount of woodland that will be lost south of the River Thames is 47.9ha (including 34.8ha of plantation woodland). The area of woodland in which bat boxes will be installed is 148.6ha including 97ha of woodland within Shorne Woods Country Park. These woodland blocks are shown on ES Appendix 8.16: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Bats, Figure E3, pg. 136. For the potential loss of structures supporting roosts which cannot be adequately mitigated through the provision of bat boxes (e.g. maternity or hibernation roosts of certain species), the Project includes the provision for the construction of four bespoke bat structures south of the River Thames. These structures are located adjacent to retained foraging and commuting habitats, in areas proposed for semi-natural habitat creation as part of the Project design.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Effects on Badgers	2.1.176 (DL-6)	<p>Kent County Council consider that limited information has been provided by the Applicant on how badgers commute/forage through the site. This restricts understanding of the impact the proposal will have on commuting/foraging badgers and how it will impact badgers in any setts which are being retained outside/edge of the Order Limits. The Project will result in a negative impact on badgers as there will be a short to medium term loss of habitat, resulting in a decline in suitable foraging/commuting habitat.</p> <p>The loss of habitat also increases the risk of badgers going on the roads (both existing and proposed) which could cause an increased risk of Road Traffic Accidents.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that the impact has the potential to be neutral if in the long term the key habitats being lost (chalk grassland, hedgerows and woodland) are successfully established/managed/monitored in the long term.</p>	<p>At the request of KCC and subject to a Non-Disclosure Agreement, the Applicant shared the following confidential documents with KCC on 12 January 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES Figure 8.29: Badger Survey Results ES Appendix 8.12: Badger ES Appendix 8.19: Draft Badger Development Licence Application <p>In relation to long-term management, there are a number of securing mechanisms in place including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan Specific REAC commitments (e.g. for badgers TB008) within ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice oLEMP draft DCO (Schedule 2 Requirement 7) <p>These will all compel the Contractor and the Applicant to implement the necessary mitigation measures and to ensure these are adequately monitored and maintained.</p>	<p>ES Figure 8.29: Badger Survey Results [APP-290]</p> <p>ES Appendix 8.12: Badger [APP-401]</p> <p>ES Appendix 8.19: Draft Badger Development Licence Application [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.19 (2)]</p> <p>ES Figure 2.4: Environmental 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>ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice [Document</p>	<p>Matter Not Agreed</p>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: [\[APP-415\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>The approach to badger mitigation has been agreed with Natural England and the Applicant has received a Letter of No Impediment with respect to badgers.</p> <p>A wide range of semi-natural habitats which would provide good quality foraging and shelter for badgers is proposed, including grassland, open mosaic habitat, scrub and woodland.</p> <p>The long-term management of these habitats is reported in the oLEMP.</p>	<p>Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9) oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)] Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p>	
Effects on Water Voles	2.1.177 (DL-6)	<p>Kent County Council consider that it will be imperative that the works to displace water vole are not carried out outside the recommended period (15th Feb – 31st March in SE England, Water Vole Cons Handbook Dean 2016, Appendix 1 Displacement Protocol).</p> <p>Furthermore, mitigation should follow best practice to avoid impacts on young born during that calendar year.</p> <p>Displacing the water voles may not be sufficient and a translocation must be required. Habitats must be established</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises and will comply with Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), relating to requirements for the translocation of species in the Order Limits prior to the commencement of construction.</p> <p>Detailed information on the mitigation strategy for water vole is provided in ES Appendix 8.20: Draft Water Vole Conservation Licence Application.</p> <p>Pre-construction surveys will be carried out prior to the submission of a formal Natural England water vole mitigation licence. These surveys will include all areas where</p>	<p>ES Appendix 8.20: Draft Water Vole Conservation Licence Application [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.20 (2)], Code of Construction Practice [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)],</p>	Matter Agreed

Deleted: ES Figure 2.4: Environmental Masterplan [\[REP4-124, REP3-098, REP2-018, APP-162, REP4-127, REP4-129, REP2-024 to REP2-031\]](#)
 ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice [\[REP6-038\]](#)
 oLEMP [\[REP4-140\]](#)
 Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Deleted: [\[APP-416\]](#)

Deleted: Code of Construction Practice [\[REP6-038\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>sufficiently prior to works commencing.</p> <p>This impact has been identified as being neutral pending protection of retained water course/habitat during construction of the LTC.</p>	<p>water vole will be impacted and will be carried out as close to construction activities starting, as reasonably practicable. The mitigation proposals have been discussed with Natural England and can be found in ES Appendix 8.20: Draft Water Vole Conservation Licence Application. It is noted that displacement is not advised after 31 March in the south-east, in the Water Vole Conservation Handbook (Dean, 2016). Preferentially animals will be displaced up until 31 March, however 15 April end date has been included within the mitigation proposals as a precaution against bad weather or other factors that might impede the displacement process.</p> <p>The addition of a new watercourse to the north of the Thames and Medway Canal is not predicted to impact the existing water levels within the current ditch network. Water vole displacement mitigation will be suitable to allow the habitat creation work to take place. This area is covered in a specific REAC commitment (within the Code of Construction Practice) – <i>'The land would be reinstated to create</i></p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><i>additional slow-flowing ditch, pond and grassland with scrub habitats for use by species such as water vole and GCN, as well as to provide suitable bird foraging and nesting habitat. These habitat enhancements have been agreed in principle with the RSPB, who are the landowners for this area</i> (REAC Ref. TB022). This methodology has been discussed with NE and has been included in the NE water vole licence.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that managing low suitability watercourses in this area would enhance the habitat for water voles, however these low suitability watercourses are outside of the Order Limits and therefore the Applicant will not be able to manage these watercourses for the enhancement for water voles.</p> <p>The mitigation licence application timetable is detailed in Section 7 of ES Appendix 8.20: Draft Water Vole Conservation Licence Application.</p>		
Pre-construction surveys	2.1.178 (DL-6)	Kent County Council notes that for all protected species, updated pre-construction surveys will be required.	The Applicant agrees - Requirement 7 of the draft DCO secures the need for pre-construction surveys, including the following commitment:	<u>Draft DCO Document Reference 3.1 (11)</u> ,	Matter <u>Agreed</u> ,

~~Deleted:~~ Under Discussion

~~Deleted:~~ Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>'7.-(1) No part of the authorised development is to begin until for that part final pre-construction survey work has been carried out to establish whether European or nationally protected species are present on any of the land affected or likely to be affected by that part of the authorised development, or in any of the trees and shrubs to be lopped or felled as part of the relevant works'.</p> <p>The timing of these pre-construction surveys will be informed by the proposed start dates for impactful work to ensure that the data gathered is as up-to-date as possible to inform relevant mitigation strategies, and if required, protected species mitigation licences.</p>		
Wintering Birds	2.1.179 (DL-6)	Kent County Council considers that the impact on wintering birds would be neutral if the Applicant includes proposals to manage land to support wintering birds associated with the SPA during the construction period.	The Applicant considers that paragraph 4.6.2 of ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP and REAC commitments HR001, HR003 and HR012 provide appropriate security to manage land to support wintering birds associated with the SPA during the construction period.	ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]	Matter Agreed
Reptile Management	2.1.180 (DL-6)	Kent County Council consider that the Applicant should be	The Applicant notes that the long-term management of Thong Open	oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP [[REP6-038](#)]

Deleted: oLEMP [[REP4-140](#)]

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		required to produce a clear Reptile Mitigation Strategy Plan, showing distribution of different species of reptiles, proposed displacement areas, proposed translocation and receptor areas for each species.	Mosaic Habitat, the nitrogen deposition compensation sites, and Chalk Park as habitats which would support reptiles, is reported in the oLEMP in Sections 5.5, 5.9, 5.12, 5.14 and 5.15. As these details already appear in the oLEMP, the Applicant does not agree that a Reptile Mitigation Strategy Plan is also required.		
Tree Removal and Re-planting at SWCP	2.1.181 (DL-6)	Kent County Council request a Requirement on the Applicant to provide mitigation planting and maintenance of the new woodland that needs to be led by members of the Council's Country Parks team, as experts in their field. Kent County Council estimates that two members of staff will need to be dedicated full time to deliver this mitigation and seeks a commitment that associated costs would be covered by the Applicant.	The Applicant agrees that members of the Shorne Woods Country Park team, as experts in their field, would be well-placed to lead on the planting and maintenance of the new woodland mitigation in SWCP. As part of KCC, the Applicant would be expect these persons/roles to be closely involved with detailed design and interaction with contractors through the oLEMP Advisory Group. It is noted that to-date, the Applicant and KCC/SWCP have had a collaborative approach to undertaking works including ecological surveys within the area and it is anticipated that this relationship continues. The oLEMP at Section 4 (specifically paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.1.6) sets out the proposed roles and responsibilities for the	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

~~Deleted:~~ ¶
However

~~Deleted:~~ will consider KCC's suggestion for

~~Deleted:~~ which, if taken forward, would need to occur post pre-construction surveys as part of detailed design

~~Deleted:~~ Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>implementation of the Plan. This notes that <i>Contractors will appoint an appropriately experienced and qualified landscaping contractor. The contractor is to be competent at identifying plant species, including those proposed as part of seeded and planted mixes, as well as any undesirable species, and experienced in the various habitat creation and enhancement works required on this Project. Specialist work (such as pond creation, fenland restoration and ancient woodland compensation) may be carried out by specialist sub-contractors appointed by the Contractor where particular specific skills, equipment and/or experience are required.</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers that this does not exclude SWCP staff from being appointed to undertake works and secures that they will at the least be consulted on the approach.</p> <p><u>However, as the Applicant is not willing to commit to a Requirement as suggested by KCC, this matter is not agreed.</u></p>		
Environmental Community	2.1.182 (DL-6)	Kent County Council request commitment from the Applicant to fund a community	The Applicant <u>has engaged with KCC to agree an approach to community engagement measures</u>	N/A	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Engagement Programme at SWCP		<p>engagement programme and to collaborate with KCC to produce a campaign to help highlight what Shorne Woods Country Park (SWCP) has to offer. The aim of this will be to inform and promote the SWCP from an educational and environmental standpoint. We consider this will go some of the way to help mitigate some of the negative impacts that will be caused by the LTC.</p> <p><u>KCC notes (at Deadline 9) that: KCC has reviewed the draft Side Agreement and is continuing to negotiate with the Applicant on a number of concerns regarding the proposed content. It is hoped these concerns can be easily resolved and the agreement will be signed and sealed by both parties shortly after the Examination, if not before.</u></p>	<p><u>that has been shared through a Side Agreement.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant has engaged with KCC regarding a Side Agreement proposing a mechanism to deal with the payment of compensation related to land within SWCP required by the Project. While at the time of writing this is not signed, the Applicant and KCC are confident that it will be resolved shortly after the end of the examination.</u></p>		
Material Assets and Waste					
Legislative and policy framework	2.1.118 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council notes that National Highways is proposing the creation of Chalk Park as mitigation for the loss of open space as a result of the Project	The Applicant notes that Chalk Park provides essential mitigation to mitigate the impact of the Project as well as integrate the portal and	Project Design Report – Part D – General Design South of the River [APP-509]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: is considering

Deleted: proposal from KCC.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>(APP-126 item 2.1.33). but that it is not clear, whether Chalk Park is in fact required in order to effectively dispose or reuse of otherwise waste materials. Kent County Council considers that it is not clear whether this is a disposal led activity at the bottom of the defined waste hierarchy, and as the least sustainable waste management outcome, this would not be in accordance with the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 (early Partial Review 2020).</p>	<p>route alignment into the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The key drivers for the inclusion of Chalk Park within the Project proposals and its design rationale are set out in the Project Design Report – Part D – General Design South of the River and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) family objectives call for woodland creation, habitat buffering and creation of multifunctional accessible spaces to the east of Gravesend. • A review of local policy and the existing context has identified a catchment gap for the open space typologies for parks and gardens, and natural and semi-natural green space for the Gravesham urban area. This is identified in the Gravesham Borough Council Open Space Assessment, April 2016. • The design of Chalk Park addresses the local landscape character. Within the surrounding context of chalk sloping farmland to the east of 	<p>Need for the Project [APP-494] REAC within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)]</p>	

Deleted: REAC within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [\[REP6-038\]](#)†

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>Gravesend, development/settlements have generally been located adjacent to wooded hill tops, such as the residential properties in the village of Shorne. The hill proposal references the distinct local characteristic of settlements located on the slopes below a wooded hill (Need for the Project).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the reuse of excavated material for the creation of Chalk Park hilltop landform is not a disposal-led activity. In line with Project commitment MW007 excavated material (and all wastes) would be managed in line with the waste hierarchy. Preference would be given to appropriate reuse, recycling and/or recovery before disposal where feasible and permitted by the design. Where excavated materials and soils are to be reused, recycled and/or recovered within the Order Limits this would be subject to the relevant regulatory controls. For example: Directive 2008/98/EC on Waste (Waste Framework Directive), Article 2, environmental permit (as</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			per the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (2016)), exemption and/or a Materials Management Plan (as per the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (CL:AIRE, 2011). This commitment is secured through its inclusion in the REAC.		
Noise and Vibration					
Project design and mitigation Mitigation: Noise mitigation (SWCP)	2.1.56	Kent County Council considers that noise reducing fencing and appropriate landscaping should be put in place to mitigate significant impacts on Shorne Woods Country Park, developed and implemented with Kent County Council and other organisations.	Following environmental workshops held with relevant stakeholders in April and June 2020, acoustic barriers have been incorporated into the design of the Project where the Applicant considers appropriate, utilising LA 111 of the DMRB. However, it is not agreed that this type of mitigation is required to mitigate significant impacts on Shorne Woods Country Park. Justification for the approach to impact assessment and mitigation is set out within the ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration. Following further engagement including a workshop on 15 February 2023, it has been confirmed that by introducing a higher standard of low noise road	ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [APP-150]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: This Matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the referenced application materials.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			surfacing the previously proposed acoustic barriers were removed in this location, which also led to a reduction in the visual impact of the barriers. This change responds to visual concerns raised by Kent Downs AONB Unit. The Project design has sought to incorporate noise mitigation by means of earthwork features where practicable, these are described in Table 12.28 of ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration.		
Population and Human Health					
Cross-river WCH and Sustainable Travel Cross-river provision for walking and cycling	2.1.57 RRE	Kent County Council considers that cross-river cycling and walking provision should be appropriately considered and included in the Project where supported by policy and effective in reducing congestion and emissions and promoting health and active travel. Kent County Council consider that clarity should be provided by the Applicant as to why technical feasibility has not been undertaken on the options Kent County Council considers that National Highways should:	The Applicant has considered various options during the development of the Project to provide improved river crossings for walkers and cyclists. The options investigated included using the tunnel, upgrading the existing ferry, relocating the ferry, building a separate bridge or cable car, and providing a shuttle service through the tunnel. All of these options have been rejected for reasons including lack of technical feasibility, operational issues, lack of commercial viability, cost and poor safety.	Project Design Report – Part E – Design for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders [APP-512] Rights of Way and Access Plans Document Reference 2.7 Volume A (5), Volume B (5), Volume C (7)] Draft DCO Document Reference 3.1 (11)] Project Design Report, Part G:	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Rights of Way and Access Plans [[REP4-046](#) to [REP4-050](#)]
Draft DCO [[REP6-010](#)]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement public transport priority as a 'Requirement', upon opening of the scheme • Consider alternative priority accesses across the Thames for public transport as part of developing a future ready new highway infrastructure • Invite Kent County Council's Public Transport Department to the Sustainable Transport Working Group • Commit to reviewing options for priority public transport and cycling measures at the Dartford Crossing • Provide Kent County Council with a financial contribution to provide additional buses during construction, to counter the delays that are predicted to occur. This will help to reduce delays and retain passengers during this time • Provide cycle counters, and a cycle route in Gravesend. 	<p>The statement, "lack of technical feasibility" means that an option was assessed at the optioneering stage against a set of criteria and considered not feasible from a technical (engineering) and/or constraints (environmental and other) point of view, rather than meaning that the feasibility of an option was not assessed. The Project Design Report, Part G: Design Evolution, sets out design evolution of the Project and the options under consideration at various stages of the Project's development. The specific reasons why a pedestrian and cycle crossing underneath the River Thames alongside the vehicle tunnel and a cycle shuttle service were not taken forward are set out at page 48 of Part G of the Project Design Report. Latent demand for walking and cycling across the River Thames at the Project crossing point is low and therefore unlikely to unlock enough trips to make the required infrastructure for a shuttle service economically viable. In addition, journey times and distances for a shuttle would be excessive because the most suitable collection and</p>	<p>Design Evolution [APP-514]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>drop-off points would be at the proposed M2/A2 junction and as far north as the proposed A13/A1089 junction. For more information about the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding routes, see the Project Design Report.</p> <p>The WCH provision in the Project is set out in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and Schedule 5 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Further information on the provision is set out in the Project Design Report.</p> <p>The Applicant's position relating to public transport provision within the Project is set out within Matter 2.1.58.</p> <p>Kent County Council is already a member of the Sustainable Transport Working Group and can facilitate attendance from its Public Transport Department.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on Public Transport effects during construction is set out in Matter 2.1.108 (DL-1).</p>		

Deleted: The Applicant is working with Kent County Council to understand the Council's request for active travel counters.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Cross-river WCH and Sustainable Travel Cross-river provision for public transport	2.1.58 RRE	<p>Kent County Council considers that cross-river public transport services should be appropriately considered and included in the scheme where supported by policy and effective in reducing congestion and emissions and promoting health and active travel.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that public transport solutions – such as public transport segregated junctions or alteration of emergency accesses to allow public transport vehicles – would help to reduce congestion and air quality effects, and unlock economic growth.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered the approach to public transport within the Project.</p> <p>A number of constraints prevent segregated public transport access to the crossing, notably using the emergency accesses. The emergency access roads/merges/diverges have been specifically designed to optimise emergency service accessibility and response times. However, the emergency access roads and Lower Thames Crossing merges/diverges have not been designed to a DMRB standard for public use. The operation of the emergency access (as designed) is to be supported by the Applicant Regional Operations Centre and appropriate interventions. This introduces incompatibility between emergency service operation and bus operations. The principles apply to the access points at the North and South Portals.</p> <p>As such, while it is agreed that public transport use can help to reduce congestion and air quality effects, and unlock economic growth, the Applicant considers that it has assessed options for inclusion</p>	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			within the Project appropriately and concluded that this will not be possible, and has provided alternative means that facilitate and support public transport schemes outside of the DCO application (via the Sustainable Transport Working Group).		
WCH/Active Travel – Design WCH Re-designation of NG8	2.1.59	Notwithstanding other Matters relating to WCH, Kent County Council supports the proposed re-designation of footpath NG8 set out in the Local Refinement Consultation, however it considers that this should include improvements to the crossing point (of the A226) as currently this part of the route is unsuitable for horse riders, and an extension of improvement works slightly south to the bus stop to improve this part for pedestrians.	The Applicant confirms that Footpath NG8 is to be upgraded and redesignated as a bridleway, and where the new bridleway will connect to the A226, a new Pegasus crossing will be provided. In addition, a new bridleway has been proposed to the east, connecting Footpath NG9, which will be resurfaced and redesignated as bridleway, to the A226 (See draft DCO – Schedule 5, part 6). A footway is already provided on the northern side of the A226 which can be accessed by using the crossing facilities. Further engagement has been undertaken with Kent County Council, including a workshop on 08 March 2023, and this and the above information lead the Applicant to consider this a Matter Agreed.	Rights of Way and Access Plans [Document Reference 2.7 Volume A (5), Volume B (5), Volume C (7)] Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: Rights of Way and Access Plans [\[REP4-046 to REP4-050\]](#)
Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
WCH/Active Travel – Design	2.1.121 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council considers that provision is required to ensure that there is adequate consultation with, and input from, Kent County Council concerning detailed design of PRoW.</p> <p>Kent County Council considers that its Public Rights of Way and Access Service should be fully consulted as Delivery Partners produce detailed Traffic Management Plans related to PRoW before commencing works.</p> <p>Kent County Council is particularly concerned about the specification of the widths and finished surfaces for proposed routes, which will differ dependant on their proposed use and overall context.</p>	<p>It is agreed that Kent County Council as the Local Highway Authority should be consulted on the detailed design of Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>The draft DCO secures that (Part 3, Schedule 15 (1)(f)) <i>'From the date on which the roads and public rights of way described in Part 1 to 6 (inclusive) of Schedule 5 (classification of roads, etc.) are completed and open for traffic the public rights of way and permissive paths described in Part 6 (other public rights of way and permissive paths) of Schedule 5 will be of the type described in column (1) to the extent described in column unless otherwise agreed with the relevant planning authority'</i>.</p> <p>In addition, Part E of the Project Design Report sets out the preliminary design for PRoW and permissive paths including diversions, resurfacing/upgrades, crossings, designations; and the Design Principles sets out how the Applicant and Delivery Partner must consider and accord with design guidance/standards as set out in PEO.01 to PEO.13.</p>	<p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>Project Design Report – Part E – Design for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders [APP-512]</p> <p>Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)]</p>	Matter Not Agreed ,

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Deleted: Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>The Applicant <u>has included Protective Provisions within the draft DCO which</u>, set out how assets would be transferred to the Local Highway Authority, <u>and has developed officer contributions (to be secured via a Unilateral Undertaking) covering</u>, resourcing for appropriate design input and sign-off on completion (for clarity, this refers to resourcing for the Council's representations for the design stage, and then 'sign-off' via a final certificate to confirm transfer of the asset once works are complete).</p> <p><u>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant recognises that KCC has not at this stage been able to confirm that the above approach is acceptable and KCC's request for commuted sums is not agreed.</u></p>		
Monitoring	2.1.125 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that National Highways should fund installation of active travel counters 12 months before the construction phase starts; with the counters to be maintained for a period of three years post completion.	<p><u>The Applicant has agreed to provide monitoring equipment at three locations as requested by KCC, and to provide funding for route promotion and engagement activities via a commitment (SACR-023) added to the SAC-R at Deadline 8,</u></p>	<p><u>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)],</u></p>	Matter <u>Agreed,</u>

Deleted: and Kent County Council are working on Side Agreements which would

Deleted: including

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: N/A

Deleted: The Applicant is considering this request from Kent County Council subject to further discussions on the purpose of the proposed counters, their location and management, installation and data sharing arrangements.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Maintenance	2.1.122 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that National Highways should provide an adequate commuted sum or ongoing maintenance arrangements for the upkeep of new routes.	The maintenance of both local highways and the SRN is funded by the Department for Transport. Local highway funding is mainly based on a formula linked to the total mileage of A roads, B and C roads, and unclassified roads in each area, together with the numbers of bridges, lighting columns, cycleways and footways. This funding is refreshed every few years to take account of changes in road length and number of highway structures. Accordingly, as local highway works are carried out under the DCO, the amount of funding that each local highway authority receives will be amended to recognise these additional responsibilities. Given that this process already exists, it is not appropriate to require the Applicant to provide funding for the maintenance of parts of the local network out of the money given to it to maintain the SRN. Article 10(1) of the draft DCO provides that where a new local highway is constructed, it must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority, who becomes responsible	Draft DCO Document Reference 3.1 (11)	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>for its maintenance from completion. Article 10(2) makes similar provision for alterations or diversions of existing local roads. Both provisions enable the Applicant and the local highway authority concerned to reach different arrangements for specific maintenance responsibilities, but otherwise the default position is that once the local highway authority is satisfied that the highway has been properly completed, it becomes responsible for the maintenance of these highways just as it is for other public highways in its area.</p> <p>This arrangement is well-precedented for local highway works carried out by the Applicant in connection with NSIP schemes. It strikes an appropriate balance between the Applicant's ability to carry out its works, and local highway authorities' duties to maintain public highways in their areas.</p>		
WCH/Active Travel – Design	2.1.120 (DL-1) RRN	Kent County Council considers that National Highways should produce a clear plan indicating the PRoW network to be created, the legal status of the routes to be provided, and the	WCH routes within Kent are shown on the General Arrangement drawings found within the General Arrangement Plans (Volume B). The proposed WCH routes are also shown within the Rights of Way and	General Arrangement Plans (Volume B) [Document Reference 2.5 Volume B (5)]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant and Kent County Council are working on a Side Agreement would provide appropriate provisions in respect of the maintenance period by the Applicant.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>context of the wider PRow network.</p> <p>In addition, Kent County Council considers that National Highways should produce a General Arrangement Plan showing the WCH widths achievable to ensure these adhere to relevant standards.</p>	<p>Access Plans (Volume B). These drawings should be read in conjunction with the draft DCO, with reference to Schedule 4 – Permanent Stopping Up of Streets and Private Means of Access.</p> <p>Details on all WCH routes can be found within the Project Design Report – Part E – Design for Walkers Cyclists and Horse riders. The design specifications for these WCH routes will be dependent upon the environment within which they are located and their intended users.</p> <p>Defining the widths/surfacing will be undertaken at the detailed design stage. Specific WCH design principles can be found within Table 4.1 Project-wide design principles: Connecting people within the Design Principles. All WCH routes will be designed to the latest design standards and guidance listed under Clause No. PEO.04.</p> <p>The Applicant consider that the information requested by Kent County Council has been provided and therefore this is matter is agreed.</p>	<p>Rights of Way and Access Plans (Volume B) [Document Reference 2.7 Volume B (5)]</p> <p>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</p> <p>Design Principles [Document Reference 7.5 (7)]</p> <p>Project Design Report – Part E – Design for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders [APP-512]</p>	

Deleted: General Arrangement Plans (Volume B) [\[REP4-031\]](#) ¶
Rights of Way and Access Plans (Volume B) [\[REP4-048\]](#) ¶
Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#) ¶
Design Principles [\[REP6-046\]](#) ¶

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
WCH/Active Travel – Construction Effects	2.1.123 (DL-1) RRN	<p>Kent County Council considers that permissive access, particularly for equestrian and cycle use, is not to be viewed as a suitable alternative/compensatory provision for Non-Motorised Users (NMUs); and that PRow routes need to have Highways status.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes this in the context of National Highways' proposed provision south of the M2 corridor through Jeskyns Community Woodland, which in that context cannot be considered adequate.</p> <p>Kent County Council is concerned that the route (to accommodate NCN177 during construction) lacks clarification as to the nature of the permissive agreement, the terms of the agreement or the parties to the agreement and therefore there is no certainty that permission would not be rescinded -removing the link for NMUs and specifically equestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Kent County Council notes that should the permission be revoked at some future point</p>	<p>A WCH strategy has been developed that includes new or improved pathways and bridges, which are designed to encourage active travel and promote health and wellbeing across the region. These WCH routes will provide access between parks, woodlands, heritage sites and employment centres in Kent, Thurrock, Brentwood and Havering. Both formal PRow and permissive routes have been informed by the surrounding environment and through discussions with landowners. Please refer to the Project Design Report: Part E Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders and Chapter 5 of the Planning Statement which provides our WCH strategy.</p> <p>At the Design Refinement Consultation, a permanent alternative route to NCR177 for WCH was proposed through Jeskyns Community Woodland and Ashenbank Woods where a formal PRow Bridleway would be provided. In the case of Jeskyns Community Woodland this route was partially along an existing equestrian route and partially along</p>	<p>Project Design Report – Part E – Design for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders [APP-512]</p> <p>Planning Statement [APP-495]</p> <p>Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for OFH2 [REP1-185]</p>	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>the only viable alternative for recreational users would be the replacement NCN177 route; this route is conceived as meeting the needs of commuting cyclists.</p>	<p>existing pedestrian-cycle tracks through the site. This route is to be used as part of the temporary NCR177 cycle route while the main highway works were being undertaken.</p> <p>Further engagement with Forestry England and Woodland Trust was undertaken following the Local Refinement Consultation. A detailed discussion on the type of routes (bridleways) and their intended users (walkers, cyclists and horse riders) located through their woodland was held. Formal PRowS with permanent bridleways were deemed unacceptable for fear of increased footfall in sensitive areas and the management of their routes. Concerns on the interaction and potential conflict between cyclists and horse riders particularly through Jeskyns Community Woodland were raised. As horse riders are already provided with a dedicated horse trail through Jeskyns Community Woodland, Forestry England did not see the need for a formal bridleway. Our enhanced WCH network will connect Jeskyns Community Woodland's existing permissive</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>horse-trail to further green spaces via our proposed green bridges across the A2.</p> <p>Forestry England want to retain the flexibility to manage their land as appropriate and have made the decision to reject the proposed bridleway. As Jeskyns Community Woodland is on Crown Land, the Project cannot impose a bridleway on them. However, they will continue to provide permissive access through their woodland via their existing dedicated horse trail. To our knowledge, this will remain free and open to horse riders. However, it is our understanding that there may be scope to explore some form of licensed permissive path should this be acceptable with Forestry England, offering some level of future security for access rights.</p> <p>Forestry England agreed for a new temporary pedestrian/cyclist route to be located through the eastern part of the Jeskyns Community Woodland site while the NCR177 highway works are being constructed, and to maintain the existing permissive equestrian trail, being separate from the new</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>pedestrian-cycle route. To the west of the site part of an existing pedestrian/cycle track, as well as a new link to Henhurst Road would be made permissive bridleway to create a new link for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to Henhurst Road and the new bridleway parallel to Church Road. Once the permanent route for NCR177 is operational, the temporary pedestrian and cycle routes through the woodlands would be removed if requested by Forestry England.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that, regarding the position above, the scope to explore some form of licensed permissive path (should this be acceptable to Forestry England) offering some level of future security for access rights, may only apply to the section of the route through Ashenbank Wood.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a response related to this matter in its Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for OFH2 from paragraph 3.1.1).</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
HEqIA – Assessment	2.1.60 RRE	<p>Kent County Council is concerned that the Project could increase health inequalities particularly around physical activity, access to open space and air quality, for example in Riverside ward which is identified as having high sensitivity due to pre-existing deprivation and lack of access to private transport.</p> <p>Kent County Council consider that interventions (secured either through a Requirement of the draft DCO or the S106 Agreement) are required to mitigate loss of PRoWs and access to open space during in particular the construction phase for residents of Westcourt and Riverside wards; and as a minimum to provide monitoring equipment for areas in which air pollution is due to increase due to impact of the Lower Thames Crossing.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises the concerns raised by Kent County Council and has considered factors relating to health inequality within the HEqIA, following a briefing to local authorities (via the Community Impacts and Public Health Advisory Group (CIPHAG)) on the Project's approach to considering baseline, effects and mitigation related to health inequalities in May 2022.</p> <p>A full assessment has been presented within the HEqIA considering all sensitive receptors and communities, their pre-existing health inequalities and their indicators, and any likely significant differential or disproportionate effects.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has agreed to provide monitoring equipment at three locations as requested by KCC, and to provide funding for route promotion and engagement activities via a commitment (SACR-023) added to the SAC-R at Deadline 8.</u></p> <p><u>It is noted that KCC has also requested funding for improvements to other WCH routes (NG3 and NS317) which it considers would require re-surfacing and other</u></p>	<p>HEqIA [REP3-118] Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]</p>	<p>Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>,</p>

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<u>improvements to account for and attract additional usage as a result of temporary changes to WCH routes during construction. The Applicant has considered these requests but does not consider that they meet the tests of relatedness or proportionality for development consent obligations and therefore has opted not to include them within the Project or provide for them via a planning agreement.</u>		
HEqIA Assessment HEqIA – Air Quality and Health Inequalities	2.1.61 RRE	Kent County Council understands that overall, the Project will lead to improvements in air quality. However, Kent County Council is concerned that at the local level, there may be areas where air quality is likely to reduce, and these may include residents with greater vulnerability to health problems caused by NO2 concentrations.	It is agreed that overall, the Project will lead to improvements in air quality, but that at the local level, there may be areas where air quality is likely to reduce and these may include residents with greater vulnerability to health problems caused by NO2 concentrations, as set out within the HEqIA with a comprehensive baseline which clearly identifies vulnerable populations across the study area. However, effects are not anticipated to be significant or in most cases even perceptible in relation to effects on human health.	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Not Agreed
Positive and neutral effects on wards in operational phase	2.1.169 (DL-6)	Kent County Council notes that the HEqIA [APP-539] Table 1.4, indicates positive operational	The Applicant welcomes this agreement.	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant is considering requests for monitoring and mitigation relating to environmental effects.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>phase impacts on active travel in all but four wards in Gravesham outlined as wards directly or indirectly affected by the project, these are Riverside, Northfleet South, Central and Coldharbour where the impacts are indicated as neutral.</p> <p>Overall Kent County Council supports the evidence base outlined by the Applicant and recognises the impacts during operation on active travel of the wards outlined in Table 1.4 as positive and neutral.</p>			
<p>HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations Health Impact Assessment (HIA) recommendation from independent review – Health Priorities</p>	2.1.62	<p>Links between local health priorities and the assessment should be made clear. Where the local priorities identify topics or sensitive groups, these should be considered in the assessment (including in consideration of enhancement measures).</p>	<p>Local health and equalities priorities have been set out within Appendix A of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA). Appendix A was updated between the 2020 and 2022 versions of the HEqIA in line with updated priority and strategy documents produced by individual local authorities.</p> <p>A new section has been included within each of the assessment topics of the HEqIA itself, setting out which of the local health and equalities priorities are relevant for that topic, together with findings</p>	<p>HEqIA [REP3-118] HEqIA – Appendix A – Policy and Strategy Context [APP-540]</p>	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>from consultation and from baseline data.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.13 of the HEqIA sets out the factors which have been taken into account when assessing population health effects that may arise as a result of the Project, including the relationship with the health policy context and/or local health priorities. The assessment tables for each topic in Section 7 of the HEqIA include reference to the relevance / importance of local health and equalities priorities for each assessment topic.</p> <p>The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.</p>		
<p>HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations</p> <p>HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Construction Phasing</p>	2.1.63	<p>Further information should be provided on construction phasing as part of HEqIA (when available) and indication of how this may influence assessment and an explanation of how HEqIA has been planned and timed to inform decision making.</p>	<p>Further detail relating to construction phasing was presented and discussed at a CIPHAG meeting in June 2021.</p> <p>The Health and Equalities Impact Assessment includes a new section on Project construction phases and timelines (Section 4.3), providing further detail on construction activities across the four construction sections, information relating to individual construction</p>	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed .

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>compounds, and estimated timelines for construction in each section.</p> <p>Information relating to construction activities which may potentially impact individual assessment topics is included within the assessment sections as relevant. This includes information relating to the length of time construction activities are anticipated to last as well as to construction phasing.</p>		
<p>HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Scope</p>	2.1.64	<p>Further commentary and evidence should be provided to understand how the scope of the HIA was identified and agreed. This could include provision of further information on the outcomes of discussions on scoping that were undertaken with the CIPHAG.</p>	<p>Further commentary and evidence around outcomes of discussions with CIPHAG concerning the scope of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA) has been included within it.</p> <p>Section 3.4 of the HEqIA covers screening and scoping. Table 3.1 summarises scoping discussions held as part of CIPHAG meetings between 2018 and 2021. The findings from the Independent Review and subsequent discussions with CIPHAG stakeholders included further information relating to the scoping and assessment of individual topics within the HEqIA. Paragraph 3.4.5</p>	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>of the HEqIA includes a summary of the changes made to the original scope of the HEqIA as a result of subsequent discussions with stakeholders.</p> <p>Table 5.2 of the HEqIA details the CIPHAG meetings which have taken place between 2018 and 2022 (of which there were more than 20) and summarises the matters discussed at each meeting and outcomes of those discussions where relevant.</p>		
<p>HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Stakeholder Engagement</p>	2.1.65	<p>Further information should be provided on the outcomes of stakeholder engagement exercises and how this has meaningfully informed the HEqIA and the Project.</p> <p>1. This includes providing further details of what was agreed at the CIPHAG and methods of engagement and issues raised at the focus groups and how these comments were addressed.</p> <p>2. Information should also be included on measures used to reach hard-to-reach groups.</p> <p>Wider concerns have also been</p>	<p>Section 5 of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment (HEqIA) sets out the approach taken to consultation and engagement for the Project and how this has fed into / informed the HEqIA assessment. The section summarises activities and headline information from both non-statutory and statutory consultation, including the supplementary consultation, design refinement consultation, community impacts consultation and local refinement public consultation events.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders including that received</p>	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>raised regarding the consultation activities which should be addressed as part of the wider consultation strategy.</p>	<p>as part of the Independent Review, the Community Impacts Consultation included a comprehensive 'You Said, We Did' document, setting out how the Applicant has addressed issues and suggestions received at each of the previous consultations.</p> <p>Section 5.4 of the HEqIA sets out the Applicant's approach to consultation and engagement with hard-to-reach groups (more favourably referred to as under-represented groups). At a CIPHAG meeting held in June 2021 the Applicant's approach to engagement with under-represented groups was discussed with stakeholders; this included research undertaken by the Applicant into the presence of hard to reach communities along the route of the Project, which typically include older people, those with disabilities, those who may not be able to read, and those for whom English is not their first language. The findings from this meeting helped to inform the approach to engagement during the Community Impacts Consultation.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>In relation to the focus groups held during 2019, the Applicant reiterates the view that these formed just one part of engagement with vulnerable groups and that wider conclusions were not drawn from this sample. This is explicitly stated in paragraph 5.4.6 of the HEqIA.</p> <p>The individual topic assessments contained in Section 7 of the HEqIA include a section summarising relevant findings to have arisen from consultation and engagement. The assessment methodology described in paragraph 3.6.13 of the HEqIA sets out the various factors which have informed the individual assessments; these include the extent to which stakeholders are concerned about particular determinants of health or health outcomes.</p>		
<p>HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Ward sensitivity</p>	2.1.66	National Highways should clarify how ward sensitivity has been determined through clear links to the baseline.	The approach to defining ward sensitivity was discussed and agreed with stakeholders at the CIPHAG meeting held in September 2021. The methodology for determining ward sensitivity is subsequently described in Section 3.6 of the HEqIA. The sensitivity of individual wards has been identified	HEqIA [REP3-118] ES Appendix 13.2: Ward Sensitivities [APP-452]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			as high, medium or low based on the range of indicators identified. Draft ward sensitivity data and information was distributed to CIPHAG attendees; this information was subsequently included in the DCO submission in 2022. The assessment of sensitivity by ward is summarised in Table 3.3 of the HEqIA; data informing this assessment is set out in ES Appendix 13.2: Ward Sensitivities. ▼		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Methodology for aggregating impacts	2.1.67	Justification/methodology for aggregating impacts at general population/ward level should be provided. Use of GIS mapping for baseline and assessment information would enable a clearer understanding of specific impacts including effects on health inequalities.	The Assumptions and limitations section of the HEqIA set out in paragraph 3.6.18 states that <i>'For all topics, the assessment has been aggregated to ward level unless otherwise specified.'</i> ▼	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Duration of effects	2.1.68	Further information should be included about the duration of effects anticipated beyond if they are temporary or permanent. This is particularly relevant to the health outcomes identified during the construction phase as this phase is anticipated to last six years. Further information	Paragraph 3.6.9 of the HEqIA sets out the temporal scope for the assessment. This describes the duration of potential effects as being short, medium or long-term (with durations as appropriate) or permanent. This enables a more granular assessment to that provided at DCO 1.0, where effects were simply described as temporary	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: ¶
 The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.
Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ¶
 The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		should be included on if effects are considered to be short-term, medium-term or long-term and a definition provided which outlines what each of these terms mean (e.g. short term = 1–2 years).	or permanent; this is as a direct result of discussions with stakeholders as part of CIPHAG meetings (as described in paragraph 3.6.11 of the HEqIA). The assessment methodology described in paragraph 3.6.13 of the HEqIA sets out the various factors which have informed the individual assessments; these include the duration of effect as described above.		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Severity and Likelihood of health outcomes	2.1.69	The assessment should provide information on the severity and likelihood of the health outcomes. At present it is just stated whether a health outcome is considered to be positive, negative or neutral, however the assessment would benefit from further information being provided on the severity of the effect (e.g. minor, moderate or major positive/negative) to help provide a more balanced assessment and increase understand of the level of health outcomes anticipated.	The methodology for assigning impacts on health outcomes is set out in DMRB LA 112, which states that health outcomes should be described as positive, negative, neutral or uncertain. Whilst LA 112 states that ' <i>it is not possible to quantify the severity or extent of the effects which give rise to these outcomes</i> ', the guidance also states that information should be presented relating to changes to health determinants as a result of a scheme or project, together with evidence provided to support conclusions. The HEqIA provides information around the plausibility of health outcomes as part of the review of evidence for each assessment	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>topic. Further evidence has been presented in relation to the individual assessments to help increase understanding of the level of health outcomes anticipated. The assessment methodology described in paragraph 3.6.13 of the HEqIA sets out the various factors which have informed the individual assessments; these include an assessment of the severity of health outcome, for example whether this relates to changes in mortality/morbidity or whether the change may be more related to wellbeing or quality of life.</p> <p>The HEqIA submitted as part of DCO 2.0 in 2022 also identifies where health effects are likely to be significant; the guidance document 'Human health: ensuring a high level of protection. A reference paper on addressing human health in Environmental Impact Assessment' (International Association of Impact Assessment and European Public Health Association, 2020) has been used to inform an approach to identifying significance, taking into account multiple criteria, including severity of health outcome as described above.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			This has enabled the identification of significant effects within Section 7 of the HEqIA.		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Data Sources	2.1.70	There are some concerns identified with the technical data sources used to inform the HEqIA (e.g. transport, air quality and noise assessments). Technical concerns should be addressed and updated accordingly in the HEqIA as these may have implications for the health outcomes identified. Clarification should also be provided on how the level of effect identified in the source assessment has been translated into the effect identified in the HEqIA (including how this has been aggregated to general population/ward level).	A number of technical concerns were raised in Appendix A of the Independent Review relating to a variety of other documents and assessments produced as part of the submission at DCO 1.0. These primarily related to the transport, air quality and noise methodologies and assessments. Technical assessments across the ES (such as noise and air quality) were updated for inclusion in the DCO submission in 2022 to address concerns raised by the Independent Review. Where appropriate, assessments were updated and amended accordingly, however there will be specific to each ES topic area where agreement has not yet been reached where these relate to those topic areas, they are covered in the relevant sections of this SoCG.	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Not Agreed
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent	2.1.71	The HEqIA should provide further information regarding effectiveness of mitigation/enhancement measures. This could include	Section 4.4 of the HEqIA presents the approach taken to the provision of mitigation and enhancement measures, including the categories within which mitigation falls and the	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
review – Effectiveness of mitigation		providing a conclusion on the residual health outcome anticipated after mitigation measures is implemented.	locations where mitigation measures are secured within the DCO. For each assessment topic in Section 7 of the HEqIA, mitigation measures are described within relevant sections relating to construction and operation. The assessment conclusions relate to residual health outcomes after mitigation measures have been implemented. <u>While the Applicant is content that this recommendation has been incorporated, it is noted that KCC has not been able to confirm agreement on the matter during the post-submission and examination period.</u>		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Monitoring	2.1.72	Further information to be included on monitoring (impacts, mitigation, and enhancement – to be clearly specified), how this will be secured and anticipated timelines.	Monitoring has been an area of specific interest to stakeholders and discussed at a number of CIPHAG meetings over the course of Project development (for example an exceedance framework and various potential approaches to health monitoring were discussed at the CIPHAG meeting in May 2021, as referenced within the HEqIA). Further, more detailed information on monitoring has been included where relevant in the HEqIA, including in relation to both	HEqIA [REP3-118] WNIMMP Document Reference 7.12 (2) ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP and REAC Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9) ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [APP-150]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: WNIMMP [[APP-545](#)]
ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP and REAC [[REP6-038](#)]

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>construction and operational phases of the Project. For construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality and baseline dust monitoring during construction – contractors shall determine the level of any dust and particulate monitoring carried out on Project construction sites by means of a risk based approach. If required, further commitments are included in the REAC in relation to actions that would be taken in cases of air quality monitoring exceedances. • Noise monitoring at agreed sensitive receptors (to be defined through development of the CoCP and Noise and Vibration Management Plan) to ensure that the mitigation measures suggested are working effectively. Monitoring would be undertaken at locations identified in consultation with the relevant Environmental Health Officers before works start. The REAC includes measures relating to noise and vibration monitoring during the construction phase (REAC Ref. NV009), including the identification of a framework 		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>should noise exceedances occur (REAC Ref. NV015).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to workforce accommodation, a monitoring framework is proposed to be established (and is secured by the Framework Construction Travel Plan) to ensure that the proposed accommodation helpdesk is effective. <p>During operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic impact monitoring during the operational phase of the Project would identify changes in performance on the surrounding road network. Information setting out how such a scheme would be implemented is contained in the WNIMMP. The findings of ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration concluded that there would be some significant effects as a result of the Project. Post-construction monitoring and evaluation would therefore be undertaken for the Project as set out in DMRB LA 111 (Highways England, 2020c). 		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations	2.1.73	An assessment of cumulative effects (in relation to inter-project effects) should be	Section 7.17 of the HEqIA contains an assessment of cumulative effects. The section covers both	HEqIA [REP3-118] ES Appendix 16.2: Short-list of	Matter Agreed

Deleted: S106 agreement within the draft DCO

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Cumulative Effects		included in the HEqIA instead of cross referencing the ES to see that cumulative effects on vulnerable groups are appropriately considered.	intra-project effects (impacts that can occur as a result of interrelationships between different assessment topics) and inter-project effects (due to the Project in combination with other existing and/or approved developments). The assessment of cumulative effects undertaken within the HEqIA is consistent with that included within the ES, for example using the same short-list of projects identified for inclusion in the assessment of inter-project effects (as set out in ES Appendix 16.2: Short-list of Developments).	Developments [APP-484]	
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations HIA Recommendations from Independent review – Limitations	2.1.74	The HEqIA should include a limitations section to clearly outline any limitation or constraints of the assessment.	A series of assumptions and limitations are included at paragraph 3.6.18 of the HEqIA, clearly outlining limitations or constraints of the assessment.	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations EqIA Recommendations from Independent Review – Lack of Specificity	2.1.75	The overall document lacks specificity, with individual incidences being highlighted in the tabulated analysis of the EqIA. It is important to be specific about the rationale behind decisions when evidencing that they meet the requirements of the Equality Act	Appendix B of the HEqIA has been expanded to respond to the concerns raised and to be specific about the rationale behind decisions when evidencing that they meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty.	HEqIA – Appendix B – National Highways EqIA Screening Template [APP-541]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty. Lack of specificity in the EqIA leads to an assumption that some things have been missed, when it is possible this work has been done.	The EqIA has been prepared in line with the Applicant's approach and utilising the standard reporting template used by the Applicant for this purpose. A thorough review of the document was undertaken between DCO 1.0 and the submission in 2022. Further detail was incorporated into the EqIA to ensure that in the Applicant's view, the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty were met. <u>While the Applicant is content that this recommendation has been incorporated, it is noted that KCC has not been able to confirm agreement on the matter during the post-submission and examination period.</u>		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations EqIA Recommendations from Independent Review – Context	2.1.76	The document lacks important context, such as study area demographic breakdowns. Providing this would give a clearer picture as to whether resources/consultation efforts have been correctly apportioned. Where shortfalls are identified, analysis of possible reasons for this and reasonable mitigations should be included.	The EqIA is informed by the comprehensive baseline set out in Appendix C of the HEqIA, which includes information relating to all protected characteristics within the study area for the HEqIA. This information has not been replicated in the EqIA itself. The EqIA identifies for each protected characteristic whether people may have different levels of access, and whether there are	HEqIA [REP3-118] HEqIA – Appendix B – National Highways EqIA Screening Template [APP-541] HEqIA – Appendix C – Baseline [APP-542] Consultation Report [APP-064 to APP-069]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>social or physical barriers to participation, such as language, format or physical access. When preparing for non-statutory consultation, the Applicant developed a strategy for engaging effectively with the stakeholders and communities it had identified as its target audience. In developing this strategy, the Applicant researched and considered the presence of hard-to-reach communities, which typically include older people, those with disabilities, those who may not be able to read, and those for whom English is not their first language.</p> <p>The Consultation Report provides a full description of the consultation activities undertaken, including the Project response to the feedback received. The Statement of Engagement describes the extensive engagement with stakeholders throughout the pre-application stage of the Project. Ongoing engagement has helped stakeholders shape the Project and has facilitated continuous improvement to its design, providing a deeper understanding of local issues and enabling information to</p>	<p>Statement of Engagement [APP-091]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			be gathered to support decision making.		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations EqIA Recommendations from Independent Review – Disparity in genders	2.1.77	There is a large disparity between numbers of male and female consultees. This is of particular concern as gender plays an important role in travel patterns, and women may have less time to take part in consultation activities than men.	Consultation response forms from each of the consultation events allowed people to record gender identity as part of their response. Although there may have been a recorded disparity between male and female consultees at a number of events, this is not considered to impact the robustness of the assessment itself. The EqIA includes evidence from literature reviews in relation to various of the assessment topics covered in the document; this includes the role that gender plays in travel patterns (for example public transport may be more commonly used by women).	HEqIA [REP3-118] HEqIA – Appendix B – National Highways EqIA Screening Template [APP-541]	Matter Not Agreed
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations EqIA Recommendations from Independent Review – Specific Characteristic Groups	2.1.78	Additionally, the scheme has been recorded as having a 'neutral' impact on Sex and Religion or Belief characteristic groups. It is recommended this is reviewed and consultation with representatives of these groups evidenced and reconsidered.	The EqIA was reviewed between DCO 1.0 and the final submission in 2022. The submitted EqIA records a neutral impact on both Sex and Religion or Belief characteristic groups. Supporting text in relation to the Sex characteristic group references the fact that ' <i>women are more likely to be users of public transport than men and may be affected by temporary changes in bus travel during the construction</i>	HEqIA [REP3-118] HEqIA – Appendix B – National Highways EqIA Screening Template [APP-541]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<i>period, although it is noted that changes in journey times are small. Full analysis and assessment of the changes in journey time for each construction phase are provided in the HEqIA.</i>		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations EqIA Recommendations from Independent Review – Consideration of Covid 19	2.1.79	COVID-19 should be considered more comprehensively in the EqIA as it affects groups differently and is impacting upon and shaping travel habits and consultation efforts.	The submitted HEqIA includes baseline data in relation to deaths involving COVID-19 by local authority area (Office for Health Improvement and Disparities) in addition to available information relating to populations considered to be clinically extremely vulnerable and therefore advised to shield during the pandemic. The HEqIA describes the measures taken to overcome restrictions to consultation that were in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the measures which were put in place during times when these restrictions had eased but people did not feel able to join in traditional face-to-face engagement. These measures are described in Section 5.3 of the HEqIA. Impacts of the pandemic on travel and behavioural patterns have been incorporated into the assessment where relevant – for example in relation to the impacts of COVID-19	HEqIA [REP3-118]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			on levels of exercise, usage of green space and the link between nature and wellbeing (described in Section 7.4 of the HEqIA) and in relation to work and training (described in Section 7.10 of the HEqIA). ▾		
HEqIA CIPHAG Independent Recommendations EqIA Recommendations from Independent Review – Intersectional Characteristics	2.1.80	Intersectional characteristics (i.e., Religion and Gender, Age and Disability) appear not to have been considered. This can be of specific use in identifying hard-to-reach groups who may have more complex considerations, and in providing important context.	The submitted EqIA includes a section on intersectional effects, highlighting that multiple social identities can mean that individuals experience overlapping systems of potential discrimination or disadvantage. The assessment identifies two groups considered to have more complex considerations particularly, notably older women, and older people with disabilities. The assessment notes that no additional mitigation or intervention is considered necessary in relation to intersectional effects than that already proposed and that ongoing stakeholder engagement will continue to inform detailed Project design. ▾	HEqIA – Appendix B – National Highways EqIA Screening Template [APP-541]	Matter Agreed .
HEqIA Assessment	2.1.140 (DL-1) RRN	Negative health impacts have been found well below current EU & UK limits of which LTC references as the standard by which the significance of air	The air quality assessment presented in Environmental Statement Chapter: 5 Air Quality has been carried out in accordance with DMRB LA 105 (Highways	ES Chapter 5 : Air Quality [APP-143]	Matter Not Agreed .

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers this to be a Matter Agreed subject to confirmation by Kent County Council.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>quality has on human health. It should therefore be recognised that any improvement or deterioration in air quality will have an impact on human health both positive and negative.</p> <p><u>KCC notes that the HEqIA assessed the health impact of changes on air quality due to the project on EU and UK limits, but KCC deem this to be an inappropriate standard to assess health impacts when negative health impacts have been found well below those limits.</u></p> <p><u>KCC welcomes the further submission of the AQQHIA which indicates that impacts from the project as a whole are neither measurable nor material in the context of public health.</u></p> <p><u>However KCC notes that the assessment is based on the population as a whole and it is therefore a challenge to understand whether there could be impact to health where there are changes to air quality in specific geographic areas. KCC considers that the AQQHIA</u></p>	<p>England, 2019). The predicted pollutant concentrations at receptors are compared to the appropriate legal thresholds including Limit Values and Air Quality Strategy Objectives. This is to ensure compliance with the National Networks National Policy Statement (NN NPS), particularly when determining whether the scheme has a significant impact on air quality. The change in pollutant concentration is described in the assessment both positive and negative in Chapter 5: Air Quality between paragraphs 5.6.30 and 5.6.112.</p> <p>Section 7.8 of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment relates to air quality. The assessment draws from the findings of the air quality assessment presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality. The assessment of health outcomes relating to changes in air quality during the operational phase is set out in Table 7.28. The assessment refers to the fact that, across the study area for air quality, there are locations predicted to experience both improvements and</p>	<p>Health and Equalities Impact Assessment [REP3-118]</p> <p>AQQHIA [REP3-141]</p>	

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p><u>does not attempt to assesses the impact of changes in air quality to health on the basis that any improvement or deterioration in air quality will have an impact on human health at individual receptors as the HEqIA did, but on the basis that impact on health was associated with EU and UK limits.</u></p> <p><u>KCC notes that this makes it a challenge to understand how LTC might impact on health inequalities in Kent due to changes in air quality.</u></p>	<p>deteriorations in air quality and that the majority of changes in air quality are forecast to be imperceptible or small at human receptors. The table also notes that groups particularly sensitive to deteriorations or improvements in air quality and who may be more likely to experience changes to health outcomes as a result of air quality changes include children, older people and people with existing respiratory conditions.</p> <p>Whilst sufficient to determine compliance with NN NPS (2014), residual concerns were noted through wider engagement, and additional clarity was deemed of value to set potential risk of changes in pollutants into context. This was deemed useful to respond to concerns from stakeholders in relation to non-threshold pollutants, and the perceived potential health risk from any changes in air quality as a result of the Project, regardless of meeting the legal air quality thresholds for protective of health.</p> <p>The voluntary Air Quality Quantitative Health Impact Assessment (AQQHIA) was therefore carried out, applying the approach and supporting evidence</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>base collated by the Department of Health's Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and the Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme. The methodology includes the use of robust concentration response functions recommended for quantification by COMEAP, and applies a consistently precautionary approach, for example overly pessimistic PM2.5 concentrations using modelled road PM10 component added to PM2.5 backgrounds. The AQQHIA has no lower threshold to the assessment, so changes of all magnitudes (no matter how small) both above and below the threshold objectives have been considered.</p> <p>The quantitative exposure response assessment as part of the AQQHIA demonstrates that the impact of changes in air pollution as a result of the operation of the Project is not significant, with no measurable change in public health. This conclusion further reinforces the findings of the submitted air quality assessment, that the impacts on Human Health receptors are not significant.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><u>The voluntary AQQHIA was commissioned to respond to such concerns, it concludes that the relative change in air quality within the area studied is neither at a concentration or exposure sufficient to quantify any measurable change in public health. A technical note providing the detail underpinning this conclusion has been submitted to the examination.</u></p> <p><u>As set out in the executive summary and Section 2.2 Outline Methodology of the 9.67 AQQHIA, the quantification methodology is well-established, following approaches published by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and the World Health Organization (WHO) Health risks of air pollution in Europe (HRAPIE) project.</u></p> <p><u>These organisations have reviewed the extensive international epidemiological literature on the subject to develop the methods for the quantification of health effects from air pollution.</u></p> <p><u>The methodology utilised to quantify health effects across a population due to a change in air pollutant concentrations produces outcomes</u></p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<u>across the exposed population and not the effect on any individual living within that population. This is because the methodology is appropriate for the consideration of effects at the population level and impacts cannot be accurately ascribed to individuals given the variations of innate sensitivity, real-world exposure level, lifestyle etc. The baseline health statistics used to feed into the assessment is also collected over a geographical population area including hospital admissions, mortality rates etc. and would therefore not be appropriate to assess at an individual receptor level. The effect on mortality within the AQQHIA study area by local authority is detailed in Annex A.</u>		
HEqIA Assessment	2.1.141 (DL-1) RRN	It is not clear why the impact on air quality of the LTC (APP-143) has been concluded as neutral when other health determinants have been more nuanced and explicit when there have been both positive and negative benefits. <u>KCC notes that the HEqIA assessed the health impact of changes on air quality due to the project on EU and UK limits.</u>	Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality concluded that the Project is not expected to lead to a significant air quality effect on human health. The air quality assessment has been undertaken in line with DMRB LA 105 (Highways England, 2019). The LA 105 Standard requires us to assess whether the impacts of the scheme are significant or not significant on human health based on the	ES Chapter 5 [APP-143] Health and Equalities Impact Assessment [REP3-118] AQQHIA [REP3-141]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position set out here.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p><u>but KCC deem this to be an inappropriate standard to assess health impacts when negative health impacts have been found well below those limits.</u></p> <p><u>KCC welcomes the further submission of the AQQHIA which indicates that impacts from the project as a whole are neither measurable nor material in the context of public health.</u></p> <p><u>However KCC notes that the assessment is based on the population as a whole and it is therefore a challenge to understand whether there could be impact to health where there are changes to air quality in specific geographic areas. KCC considers that the AQQHIA does not attempt to assesses the impact of changes in air quality to health on the basis that any improvement or deterioration in air quality will have an impact on human health at individual receptors as the HEqIA did, but on the basis that impact on health was associated with EU and UK limits.</u></p>	<p>approach described in paragraphs 2.89 to 2.96 of the standard. This is required to determine compliance with Paragraph 5.12 of the National Networks National Policy Statement.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.6.132 and 5.6.133 of Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement: Air Quality, state: 'There are a total of nine receptors which experience a worsening in NO2 concentrations, and 16 receptors which experience an improvement in NO2 concentrations where the annual mean NO2 AQS objective is exceeded. When judging whether the Project leads to a significant effect, the change in concentration and the total number of receptors are considered against the guideline bands in DMRB LA 105 (Highways England, 2019) as described in paragraphs 5.3.132 to 5.3.137'.</p> <p>Further, there are no exceedances of AQS objectives predicted for PM2.5 or PM10 with or without the Project.</p> <p>The health assessment in relation to air quality is presented within Section 7.8 of the Health and Equalities Impact Assessment. This describes the positive and negative</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p><u>KCC notes that this makes it a challenge to understand how LTC might impact on health inequalities in Kent due to changes in air quality.</u></p>	<p>impacts reported in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality and concludes a neutral health outcome in relation to construction and operation phases. The sensitivity of particular populations to deteriorations or improvements in air quality (for example children, older people and people with existing respiratory conditions) has been taken into account in the assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.18 of the HEqIA describes the limitations and assumptions for the assessment, stating that for all topics, the assessment has been aggregated to ward level unless otherwise specified. Health effects are therefore considered at a population, rather than an individual level. A neutral assessment has been recorded for air quality on the basis that no significant impacts are reported in Environmental Statement Chapter 5 – Air Quality and that both positive and negative changes in air quality are reported along the route.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement was appropriately scoped with all regulatory authorities and statutory consultees, and included an</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>appropriate air quality assessment (ES Chapter 5: Air Quality). This considered sensitive receptors, existing air quality and was assessed to the relevant air quality thresholds in the assessment years (Air Quality Objectives and Limit Values, which are inherently protective of the environment and health).</p> <p>The methodology applied follows the National Highways DMRB LA 105, to ensure the applicant can test the Project's impacts against the requirements in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) (DfT, 2014). This assessment was completed, submitted and concluded that the operational phase does not result in a significant effect on human health receptors.</p> <p>While sufficient to determine compliance with NPSNN, residual concerns were noted through wider engagement, and additional clarity was deemed of value to set potential risk of changes in pollutants into context. This was deemed useful to respond to concerns from stakeholders in relation to non-threshold pollutants,</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>and the perceived potential health risk from any changes in air quality as a result of the Project, regardless of meeting the legal air quality thresholds for protective of health.</p> <p>The voluntary Air Quality Quantitative Health Impact Assessment (AQQHIA) was therefore carried out, applying the approach and supporting evidence base collated by the Department of Health's Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and the Clean Air for Europe (CAFE) programme. The methodology includes the use of robust concentration response functions recommended for quantification by COMEAP, and applies a consistently precautionary approach, for example overly pessimistic PM_{2.5} concentrations using modelled road PM₁₀ component added to PM_{2.5} backgrounds. The AQQHIA has no lower threshold to the assessment, so changes of all magnitudes (no matter how small) both above and below the threshold objectives have been considered.</p> <p>The quantitative exposure response assessment as part of the AQQHIA</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>demonstrates that the impact of changes in air pollution as a result of the operation of the Project is not significant, with no measurable change in public health. This conclusion further reinforces the findings of the submitted air quality assessment, that the impacts on human health receptors are not significant.</p> <p>On the above basis, the Applicant maintains it has followed the most appropriate guidance to determine whether the Project complies with the NPSNN (DfT, 2014). Engagement with stakeholders identified residual health concerns. The voluntary AQQHIA was commissioned to respond to such concerns. It concludes that the relative change in air quality within the area studied is neither at a concentration or exposure sufficient to quantify any measurable change in public health. A technical note providing the detail underpinning this conclusion has been submitted to the examination.</p> <p>As set out in the executive summary and Section 2.2 Outline Methodology of the 9.67 AQQHIA, the quantification methodology is</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p><u>well-established, following approaches published by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and the World Health Organization (WHO) Health risks of air pollution in Europe (HRAPIE) project.</u></p> <p><u>These organisations have reviewed the extensive international epidemiological literature on the subject to develop the methods for the quantification of health effects from air pollution.</u></p> <p><u>The methodology utilised to quantify health effects across a population due to a change in air pollutant concentrations produces outcomes across the exposed population and not the effect on any individual living within that population. This is because the methodology is appropriate for the consideration of effects at the population level and impacts cannot be accurately ascribed to individuals given the variations of innate sensitivity, real-world exposure level, lifestyle etc.</u></p> <p><u>The baseline health statistics used to feed into the assessment is also collected over a geographical population area including hospital admissions, mortality rates etc. and</u></p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<u>would therefore not be appropriate to assess at an individual receptor level. The effect on mortality within the AQHIA study area by local authority is detailed in Annex A.</u>		
HEqIA Assessment	2.1.142 (DL-1) RRN	Within the HEqIA [APP-539] it is noted that the consultation highlighted concerns about the absence of a hard shoulder along the proposed road links within the Project with reference to potential safety. Kent has above average levels of killed and seriously injured casualties on the roads, and the absence of a hard shoulder has not been addressed with any evidence to justify the decision.	The Lower Thames Crossing is being designed to be an All Purpose Trunk Road similar to the many miles of A-roads used by millions of motorists every year across the UK, not a motorway. It will feature Emergency Areas (on the link roads) and technology such as stopped vehicle detection, CCTV and electronic signing and signalling. Should a vehicle need to stop before it reaches an emergency area, technology used along the route will be designed to detect the stopped vehicle, alert and operator and the over-lane signals will be changed to indicate that the affected lane is closed to traffic. Safety is a key priority for the Applicant. The new tunnel and roads will be designed and built to the highest safety standards recommended today, and the Applicant continues to adapt its design to incorporate advances in	Health and Equalities Impact Assessment [REP3-118] Project Design Report Part C: Design Rationale [APP-508] Project Design Report Part G: Design Evolution [APP-514] Project Design Report Part D: General Design South of the River [APP-509] ES Chapter 2: Project Description [APP-140] Consultation Report [APP-064 to APP-069]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position set out here.

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>design and technology that emerge in the years ahead.</p> <p>In the past, the Lower Thames Crossing has been referred to as an A-road using Smart Motorway technology. This is because there are common standards for certain design such as traffic and stopped vehicle detection systems, electronic signing and signalling, and Emergency Areas. The Applicant has included these in the design of the Lower Thames Crossing as they support the project's safety objectives and make the road safer.</p> <p>The Project Design Report Part C: Design Rationale describes how the Project responds to the ten principles of good design. Paragraph 4.1.2 states that 'safety is fundamental to the design of the Project route and the road alignment, signage, barriers, structures and other highways elements have been designed to ensure the safety of users. The issue of safety becomes the overriding concern with design issues'.</p> <p>The Project Design Report Part G: Design Evolution outlines key</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>design changes as a result of consultation feedback and/or National Highways Design Review Panel (NHDRP) over the course of Project development. Changes made at Supplementary Consultation in 2020 included the removal of the hard shoulder from the eastbound connector road along the A2. To mitigate this, it was replaced with a hard strip and if an incident occurs, it is proposed to control the traffic to prevent the connector road backing up into the tunnel.</p> <p>A hard shoulder was retained on the Brewers Road eastbound slip to accommodate broken-down vehicles at this junction.</p> <p>The Project Design Report Part D: General Design South of the River describes the approach to Project design in this location. Paragraphs 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 note that the Project has been designed to commence at the existing A2 and includes the widening of the A2 between the junction with Henhurst Road and Valley Drive through to junction 1 of the M2 to generally provide four lanes each way with hard shoulders. To achieve the proposed</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>widening of the A2, the alignment has been altered to the west of the M2 junction 1. Through the M2 junction 1 the design includes the widening of the A2 from three lanes to four, with intermittent hard shoulders along this length.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.3.4 notes that the Preliminary Design includes the provision of two new two-lane link roads, north and south of the A2, connecting to the existing A289 and the A2 at the eastern end. These link roads have been designed to re-provide the two connections removed from the existing arrangement. Both the eastbound and westbound connecting roads have hard strips. Environmental Statement Chapter 2: Project Description defines these further as being 1m-wide hard strips on the edge of the carriageways.</p> <p>Elsewhere within the Project alignment (to the north of the River Thames), Environmental Statement Chapter 2: Project Description states that in Section 7 of the Project (A13/A1089/A122 Lower Thames Crossing junction), paragraph 2.3.134 states that the Project road would be two lanes in</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>both directions through the new junction, along which hard shoulders would be provided.</p> <p>Additionally, within Section 9 of the Project (A122 Lower Thames Crossing/M25 junction), paragraphs 2.3.187 and 2.3.188 reference the approach to widening of the M25 in this location: in the southbound direction, the M25 would be widened from four lanes with a hard shoulder to five lanes with a hard shoulder between the M25 junction 29 southbound on-slip and A122 southbound off-slip; through M25 junction 29, the existing M25 would be widened from three lanes each way with hard shoulder to four lanes each way with hard shoulder in both directions.</p> <p>The Consultation Report states, in response to stakeholder feedback, that the Project proposals submitted for the application for development consent have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (The Applicant, 2019) standards published in July 2019, with the designs being reviewed against all standards published since that date, up to March 2022. The detailed</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>design for the Project would be carried out by the appointed Contractors in accordance with the DMRB standards published at the time of detailed design.</p> <p>The DMRB specification used for the design of the Project does not require a hard shoulder because it features advanced safety systems, including variable mandatory speed limits, red-X lane signalling to support incident management, stopped vehicle detection systems, CCTV, and emergency areas for road users to access in an emergency. Incident management plans and protocols would play a key part in minimising the impact of incidents. These systems are included in the Project's design to support its safety objectives and make the road safer for all road users. The Applicant would use the most current stopped vehicle detection systems available at the time of opening, minimising both the risk of collisions and any reductions in traffic flow associated with temporarily closed lanes. The use of such technology would mean the new road would include more safety measures than existing A roads.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Furthermore, collision data shows that while hard shoulders are perceived as places of safety on a conventional motorway, there are still significant risks of being in a collision for those who stop in them. On the contrary, emergency areas are safer places for vehicles to stop, largely because they are set back further from moving traffic.		
Community Fund Community Fund (Principle)	2.1.81	Kent County Council considers that a Community Fund should be provided and secured by S106 Agreement.	It is agreed that a Community Fund will be provided and secured by <u>the SAC-R</u> .	<u>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]</u>	Matter Agreed
Community Fund Community Fund (Criteria)	2.1.82	Kent County Council considers that the Community Fund should fund and facilitate community and environmental enhancement projects within a certain distance of the Project, and include criteria for environmental enhancement projects. This should include historic landscapes and heritage assets as well as the natural environment.	The Applicant has provided Terms of Reference for the Community Fund within <u>the SAC-R covering</u> the proposed criteria for the Community Fund, which does not exclude those suggested by Kent County Council but sets out additional parameters for the Funds.	S106 Agreements – Heads of Terms [REP4-144] <u>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]</u>	Matter <u>Agreed</u>
Community Fund Community Fund (Scale)	2.1.83	Kent County Council <u>agrees</u> to the scale of proposed Community Funds.	The <u>scale of the Community Fund is set out within the SAC-R having formerly been provided for within a draft Section 106</u> Heads of Terms.	<u>Stakeholder Actions and Commitments</u>	Matter <u>Agreed</u>

Deleted: ¶
This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the Applicant's position set out here.

Deleted: a S106 Agreement and this has been included within the draft S106 Heads of Terms within the DCO application

Deleted: S106 Agreements – Heads of Terms [REP4-144]

Deleted: draft

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: draft Heads of Terms for

Deleted: Section 106 Agreement and awaits Kent County Council comments in order to reach agreement on

Deleted: and National Highways are undertaking discussions

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: agree

Deleted: .

Deleted: Applicant has

Deleted: for the Section 106 Agreement and awaits Kent County Council comments in order to reach agreement

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
				Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]	
Community Fund Community Fund (Implementation and Governance)	2.1.84	Kent County Council <u>agrees to</u> the implementation and governance of proposed Community Funds.	<u>The scale of the Community Fund is set out within the SAC-R having formerly been provided for within a draft Section 106 Heads of Terms.</u>	Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register [Document Reference 7.21 (7)]	Matter <u>Agreed</u>
Nitrogen Deposition					
General Methodology/Modelling/Alternatives Principle of Approach to Nitrogen Deposition	2.1.85	In principle Kent County Council supports National Highways' proposals for compensating for the effects of Nitrogen Deposition (i.e. that it is agreed that the selection of compensation planting as opposed to other mitigation, e.g. physical barriers or lower road speeds is appropriate).	It is agreed that the principle of the Applicant's proposals for compensating for the effects of Nitrogen Deposition is appropriate, subject to Kent County Council's detailed review of the approach to consideration of alternative options set out within the planning application materials as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information set out in appendices to the Terrestrial Biodiversity ES Chapter – Appendix 8.14: Designated Site Air Quality Assessment and Appendix 8.22: Terrestrial Ecology Surveys at Nitrogen Deposition Compensation Sites. Project Design Report Part D (General Design South of the River) – Section 3.2: Burham and Blue Bell Hill nitrogen 	ES Appendix 8.14: Designated Sites Air Quality Assessment [APP-403 to APP-406] ES Appendix 8.22: Terrestrial Ecology Surveys at Nitrogen Deposition Compensation Sites [APP-418] Project Design Report – Part D – General Design South of the River [APP-509]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: S106 Agreements – Heads of Terms [\[REP4-144\]](#)

Deleted: and National Highways are undertaking discussions to agree

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: National Highways has

Deleted: for the Section 106 Agreement and awaits Kent County Council comments in order to reach agreement

Deleted: S106 Agreements – Heads of Terms [\[REP4-144\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			deposition compensation details the justification of choice for compensation land in this area.		
General Methodology/Modelling/Alternatives Methodology relating to Nitrogen Deposition	2.1.86	Kent County Council notes that the lack of detail around the methodology and the rationale for why these particular compensatory sites were chosen means that Kent County Council is unable to advise on whether the approach is appropriate.	The Applicant considers that detail on the site selection methodology has been appropriately set out within the application materials listed above in Matter 2.1.85) and through a Nitrogen Deposition compensation Site Selection Methodology Note which was shared with Kent County Council in July 2022, along with subsequent engagement following submission of the application (referred to in Appendix A).	N/A	Matter Not Agreed
Site Selection and Surveying Nitrogen Deposition and Cultural Heritage	2.1.87 RRE	Kent County Council considers that National Highways need to undertake a thorough historic landscape assessment and archaeological field investigation of each potential Nitrogen Deposition compensation site in order to finalise the choice of each site.	It is agreed that historic landscape assessment and archaeological field investigation of each potential Nitrogen Deposition compensation site is appropriate in considering the choice of each site. The Nitrogen Deposition compensation Site Selection Methodology Note shared with Kent County Council in July 2022 describes that screening was carried out which has avoided potential impacts to designated sites such as scheduled	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116]	Matter Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: ¶
The Applicant considers that based on the information above and engagement with Kent County Council that this is now a matter agreed.

Deleted: generally

Deleted: Under Discussion

Deleted: However, this matter remains Under Discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the application materials referenced here.¶

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas.</p> <p>The remaining sites were subject to a desk-based assessment on archaeological remains, built heritage and historic landscapes, and incorporated into the cultural heritage ES Chapter 6.</p> <p>Further archaeological assessment will take place prior to detailed design as the design of the habitats will include both woodland and grassland planting, which will seek to avoid impacts to buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>The detailed design will reflect the existing landscape character and opportunities will be explored to potentially reinstate historic landscape features.</p>		
General Methodology/Modelling/Alternatives Nitrogen Deposition and Traffic Modelling	2.1.88	Kent County Council is concerned that the increase in traffic that warrants mitigation for Nitrogen Deposition effects should also result in mitigation for traffic congestion on the routes themselves particularly Bluebell Hill (A229) and M2 J3.	The Applicant wishes to clarify that the additional compensatory land proposed to address nitrogen deposition impacts is not the result of an increase in predicted traffic over previously modelled levels. This is instead due to the Project implementing new best practice in consultation with Natural England to model and compensate for the effects of nitrogen deposition that	N/A	Matter Not Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			were not required to be considered in this way in the past. The assessment work presented in the Local Refinement Consultation utilised traffic modelling information that was consulted on at the Community Impacts Consultation and has already been released to the authority.		
Site Selection and Surveying Nitrogen Deposition and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)	2.1.89	Kent County Council considers that any designs for Nitrogen Deposition compensation areas reflect the existing landscape as much as possible.	The Applicant agrees that designs for Nitrogen Deposition compensation areas should reflect the existing landscape as much as possible. <u>Landscape design principles for habitat creation on the nitrogen deposition compensation sites are set out in the oLEMP.</u> <u>Principles for retention of key vistas are included in the sections on area-specific principles.</u> Screening was carried out as part of the site selection methodology. This has avoided impacts to designated sites such as scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas. The remaining sites were subject to a desk-based assessment on all three topics, archaeological remains, built heritage and historic landscapes,	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [REP4-116] oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>and incorporated into the cultural heritage ES Chapter 6. The detailed design will reflect the existing landscape character and opportunities will be explored to potentially reinstate historic landscape features.</p> <p><u>It is noted that while the principle of the approach is agreed, the Applicant recognises that KCC is not able to agree that the detailed approach is acceptable at this time.</u></p>		
<p>Site Selection and Surveying Nitrogen Deposition and Air Quality</p>	2.1.90	<p>Kent County Council would like to see more detail on the nitrogen level increase in traffic around the A229 Blue Bell Hill and other local roads, and understand what the impacts are for other pollutants/particulates, and consideration in terms of the M20/Maidstone Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Kent County Council consider that impact on the AQMA is not acceptable and further indicates a need to mitigate the traffic impact of Lower Thames Crossing via improvements to the A229 funded by National Highways.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided a cordon of the Project's transport model to enable Kent County Council to examine in more detail the Applicant's forecast impact on local roads.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the air quality assessments within the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and further information on impacts and mitigation has been shared in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality as part of the DCO submission.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that air quality impacts have been predicted at 18 worst-case human receptors in the Maidstone AQMA, which includes parts of the A229 and the M20 including M20 J6, and these</p>	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-143]	Matter Not Agreed

Deleted: Further archaeological assessment will take place prior to detailed design as the design of the habitats will include both woodland and grassland planting, which will seek to avoid impacts to buried archaeological remains.

Deleted: This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the ES Chapter 6.

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>are presented in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality. The changes in nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) associated with the Project are predicted to be imperceptible (i.e. changes are 0.4µg/m³ or less) at all these receptors. The maximum annual mean NO₂ concentration predicted at any of the receptors in the AQMA with the Project in operation is 26.4µg/m³ (LTC136) which is well below the annual mean air quality objective of 40µg/m³; therefore, the Project is not considered to prejudice any potential revocation of the Maidstone AQMA.</p> <p>This includes impacts on the M20 both within the AQMA and outside of the Maidstone AQMA, including changes in pollutants as a result of the Project.</p>		
Landscape Nitrogen Deposition and Decarbonisation options	2.1.91 RRE	Kent County Council is concerned about whether the decarbonisation rate assumptions used to identify mitigation for Nitrogen Depositions are approved by DfT.	<p>An assessment of road user greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during the operational phase has been presented in ES Chapter 15: Climate.</p> <p>The road user GHG emissions associated with the future use of the existing road network have been estimated using the outputs from the Project's transport model and the latest TAG GHG emissions</p>	ES Chapter 15: Climate [APP-153]	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>workbook and Emission Factor Toolkit version 11 (EFTv11).</p> <p>The current GHG emission forecast tools do not take account of the effects of the latest net zero policy for surface transport and therefore a sensitivity test has also been presented in ES Chapter 15 to highlight the potential positive impact that policy measures set out in the Department for Transport's decarbonisation plan published in 2021, 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' would have on road user GHG emissions over the appraisal period.</p> <p>With respect to other traffic emissions which will reduce as a result of decarbonisation, including those with the potential to impact designated sites, they have been modelled as part of the air quality impact assessment using the same inputs and assumptions outlined above. Further information has been included within the DCO application regarding the assumptions within the approach, and the methodology for ensuring that the approach taken to mitigation/compensation is appropriate.</p>		

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			Further engagement with Kent County Council has been undertaken on the Matter, including a workshop on 21 February 2023.		
Air Quality Nitrogen Deposition and Terrestrial Ecology	2.1.92	Kent County Council suggests that consideration should be given by National Highways to the use of Nitrogen Deposition compensation sites for conservation grazing.	The Applicant agrees that consideration should be given to the use of Nitrogen Deposition compensation sites for conservation grazing, and notes that the Project's legacy and benefits projects may offer limited opportunities for conservation grazing. These will be further explored through the detailed design stage if suitable partners can be identified. This Matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's consideration of the Applicant's advice that compensatory grazing may be implemented on nitrogen deposition compensation sites where appropriate and agreed with stakeholders as part of consultation on detailed design (the process of which is set out in the oLEMP), and in-line with the eventual manager of each site's management/maintenance plans.	N/A	Matter Agreed

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
Detailed Design/ Management Plans/ Implementation Nitrogen Deposition and Ecological Surveys	2.1.93	Kent County Council considers that there is a need for surveys to be carried out on Nitrogen Deposition compensation sites to consider the impact of the proposed planting on protected/notable species, and nesting birds (as the sites are currently arable). Kent County Council is engaging with the Applicant regarding the undertaking of additional surveys. Where it is agreed by KCC that specific surveys are not required to be undertaken during the examination, then Kent County Council consider that the draft DCO should include a Requirement for the Applicant to undertake these surveys prior to start of construction. Kent County council considers that mitigation strategies should be continuously updated following new survey results, and a long-term monitoring programme is needed to understand the impact of increased emissions on Shorne Woods Country Park and vulnerable species which	The Applicant agrees that surveys must be undertaken, and have been, the requirements of which were determined by the Phase 1 habitat survey. The Applicant can confirm that as a result, significant effects will not be introduced through the establishment of nitrogen deposition compensatory land and this is set out within ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity. Further engagement with Kent County Council has been undertaken on the Matter, including a workshop on 21 February 2023. This matter remains under discussion subject to Kent County Council's review of the following references to ecological surveys and impacts/monitoring related to protected species and nesting birds on nitrogen deposition sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity, Section 8.8, paragraph 8.8.2 ES Appendix 8.22: Terrestrial Ecology Surveys at Nitrogen Deposition Compensation Sites 	ES Chapter 8: Terrestrial Biodiversity [Document Reference 6.1 ES Chapter 8 (2)] , ES Appendix 8.22: Terrestrial Ecology Surveys at Nitrogen Deposition Compensation Sites [APP-418] ES Appendix 8.16: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Bats [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.16 (2)] , ES Appendix 8.17: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Great Crested Newts [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.17 (2)] ES Appendix 8.18: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Dormouse [Document	Matter Agreed

Deleted: [\[APP-146\]](#)

Deleted: [\[APP-408\]](#)

Deleted: ES Appendix 8.17: Draft EPS Mitigation Licence Application – Great Crested Newts [\[APP-409 to APP-413\]](#) ¶

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		should be secured through a Requirement of the draft DCO or the S106 Agreement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES Appendices 8.16, 8.17, 8.18, 8.19 and 8.20 CoCP (REAC Ref. TB014, TB015, TB016, TB017) oLEMP Section 8.2, paragraph 8.28.8 	<p>Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.18 (2), ES Appendix 8.19: Draft Badger Development Licence Application (CONFIDENTIAL) [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.19 (2)], ES Appendix 8.20: Draft Water Vole Conservation Licence Application [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 8.20 (2)], ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP and REAC [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (9)] oLEMP [Document Reference 6.7 (7)],</p>	
General Methodology/Modelling/Alternatives Nitrogen Deposition and Ecological Surveys (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA))	2.1.94	Kent County Council notes that if the survey data is older than two years then there will be a need for an updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted as part of any submission.	It is not agreed that an updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is required. However, the Applicant has undertaken a validation exercise of environmental survey data to ensure it remains current and	N/A	Matter Agreed

Deleted: [\[APP-414\]](#)

Deleted: [\[APP-415\]](#)

Deleted: [\[APP-416\]](#)

Deleted: ES Appendix 2.2: CoCP and REAC [\[REP6-038\]](#)
oLEMP [\[REP4-140\]](#)

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			representative throughout the application process, and further pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to validate draft protected species licensing and other consenting requirements, as agreed with statutory environmental bodies.		
Site Selection and Surveying Compensatory Land Arrangement – Principle	2.1.95 RRE	Kent County Council considers that National Highways should seek to secure a similar arrangement south of the river to the proposals at Hole Farm. Kent County Council considers that a 50ha+ area of compensatory land should be leased through the Forestry England Woodland Partnership as mitigation measures would be more successful with a permanent base on the Kent side to manage the conservation work.	The Applicant considers that a sufficient area of compensatory land across a number of sites is already planned to be provided by the Project. The Applicant is seeking to identify partners for the management of sites to the south of the river, and Forestry England Woodland Partnership is one of the potential partners for these sites.	N/A	Matter Agreed
Detailed Design/ Management Plans/ Implementation Public Access to Nitrogen Deposition compensation sites	2.1.96	Kent County Council supports the Kent Downs AONB Unit's request for carefully managed public access to be secured across large parts of the compensatory site, to connect into the North Downs Way national trail.	It is acknowledged that Kent County Council has supported the AONB Unit's request for carefully managed public access to be secured across large parts of the compensatory site, to connect into the North Downs Way national trail. While not directly related to the purpose of the	N/A	Matter Not <u>Agreed</u>

Deleted: The Applicant has taken a landscape scale approach to nitrogen deposition compensation, to enable predominantly wooded enhanced ecological connectivity.¶
Nitrogen deposition compensation sites were selected using a robust site selection methodology agreed with the Kent Downs AONB Unit and Natural England. ¶
The methodology included an assessment of the ecological suitability of land parcels using a proximity analysis. This considered proximity and therefore connectivity to other important existing ecological features (located both inside and outside of the AONB), planting provided by the Project as part of the landscape design and the area affected by potentially significant nitrogen deposition changes. The size of the land parcel was also considered, with larger land parcels being categorised as more suitable than smaller ones. ¶
The land parcels were then reviewed by a multi-disciplinary group of specialists, to assess the potential opportunities and constraints for each site to refine the site selection. Factors considered include cultural heritage, landscape (including the AONB management plan), utilities, land referencing and planning. The sites were further refined following the Local Refinement Consultation held in 2022.¶
Suitable sites identified through this process which are located entirely within the AONB are the Blue Bell Hill and Burham sites. Additionally, the site to the south of Shorne lies partially within the AONB.¶

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
			<p>compensation, <u>prior to detailed design and under the terms of the oLEMP</u> the Applicant will work with all stakeholders and any third party who may be commissioned to manage the areas to investigate the potential for additional accesses.</p> <p><u>As this is a specific matter about public access it would be dealt with through detailed design at each site. As such, while the principle is agreed, the level of detail cannot be agreed at this stage.</u></p>		
Protective Provisions					
Drainage Drainage Protective Provisions	2.1.97	Kent County Council considers that the approach to Drainage Protective Provisions set out by National Highways and to be included within the DCO is acceptable, subject to a requested amendment from Kent County Council of the proposed 28-day timeframe for deemed approval (to 2 months).	The Applicant considers that Kent County Council's proposed amendment is acceptable, and the parties have signed a letter to agree detailed wording within the draft DCO.	<u>Draft DCO [Document Reference 3.1 (11)]</u>	Matter Agreed
Land and Property					
Special Category Land Exemptions	2.1.184 (DL-6)	The Applicant relies on exemptions under Sections 131 and 132 of the Planning Act 2008 where no replacement land is required for areas of open space affected by the A122 Lower Thames Crossing. The reason for relying on the exemptions is set out in 7.2 Planning		Planning Statement - Appendix D - Open Space <u>[REP3-108]</u>	Matter <u>Not Agreed</u>

Deleted: Draft DCO [\[REP6-010\]](#)

Deleted: Under Discussion

Topic	Item No.	Kent County Council Comment	The Applicant's Response	Reference	Status
		<p>Statement - Appendix D - Open Space. The replacement land exemptions for open spaces affected in Kent are as follows:</p> <p>Shorne Woods Country Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-area C S132(3) • Sub-area D - temporary possession only so Sections 131 or 132 of the Planning Act are not engaged <p>Roman Road open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-area A - 131(5) • Sub-area B - S132(3) <p>Cyclopark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-area A - S132(3) <p>Jeskyns Community Woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-area A - S132(3) • Sub area B - temporary possession only so Sections 131 or 132 of the Planning Act are not engaged • Sub Area C - S132(3) • Sub Area D - temporary possession only so Sections 131 or 132 of the Planning Act are not engaged <p><u>The Applicant notes that KCC has not been able to confirm agreement on this matter at the end of the examination period and therefore this remains a matter not agreed, albeit as a result of the matter not being resolved, rather than reflecting an area of disagreement between the parties.</u></p>			

Deleted: Kent County Council are reviewing information provided by the Applicant.

Appendices

Appendix A Engagement activity

Table A.1 Engagement activities between the Applicant and Kent County Council since the DCO application was submitted on 31 October 2022

Date	Overview of engagement activities
7 November 2022	Meeting to discuss post-submission Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) and next steps/plan to resolve SoCG Matters
14 and 16 November 2022	DCO Briefing
16 November 2022	Monthly meeting to discuss Wider Network Impacts
25 November 2022	Lower Thames Crossing Ecology and Biodiversity Briefing
8 December 2022	Monthly meeting to discuss Wider Network Impacts
15 December 2022	Meeting to discuss Construction Traffic Effects and Mitigation
12 January 2023	Monthly meeting to discuss Wider Network Impacts
13 January 2023 to present (fortnightly)	Fortnightly meetings between Lower Thames Crossing and KCC to discuss SoCG matters
8 February 2023	Meeting to discuss discharging of DCO Requirements, Side Agreements and Transfer of Assets
9 February 2023	SoCG Workshop – technical discussion framed around resolution of SoCG Matters relating to construction
15 February 2023	SoCG Workshop – technical discussion framed around resolution of SoCG Matters relating to noise/vibration and air quality
16 February 2023	Monthly meeting to discuss Wider Network Impacts
21 February 2023	SoCG Workshop – technical discussion framed around resolution of SoCG Matters relating to terrestrial biodiversity and nitrogen deposition
8 March 2023	SoCG Workshop – technical discussion framed around resolution of SoCG Matters relating to population, health and socio-economics
14 March 2023	SoCG Workshop (joint with Gravesham Borough Council) – technical discussion framed around resolution of SoCG Matters relating to Cultural Heritage
20 March 2023	Meeting to discuss cultural heritage mitigation - woodland planting and removal and land management agreements for archaeology
4 April 2023 6 April 2023	Meeting to follow up on SoCG Matters and share technical information relating to terrestrial biodiversity/ecology
17 April 2023	Stakeholder Landscape and Ecology Working Group (Inaugural Session)
18 April 2023	Meeting to discuss cultural heritage mitigation - methodology for different environmental mitigation and how this might impact archaeology. Discussed mapping historical periods more accurately in the GIS data
5 May 2023	Monthly meeting to discuss Wider Network Impacts

Date	Overview of engagement activities
9 May 2023	Meeting to follow up on SoCG Matters and share technical information relating to road drainage and the water environment
24 May 2023	Meeting to follow up on SoCG Matters and share technical information relating to skills and employment
19 July 2023	Meeting to discuss cultural heritage – sharing of approach to archaeological mitigation data.
9 August 2023	Meeting to discuss Land and Property issues
16 August 2023	Meeting to discuss KCC's Wider Network Impacts study
16 August 2023	Workshop to discuss cultural heritage mitigation - LTC set out in detail and discussed the evidence base and process informing the archaeological mitigation design.
17 August 2023	Meeting to discuss Section 106 obligations including SEE Strategy, Severance and Officer Contributions
24 August 2023	LTC South Employment and Skills Group
25 August 2023 and 4 September 2023	Meetings to discuss LTAM and KTM modelling
19 September 2023	Meeting to follow up on SoCG Matters and share technical information relating to terrestrial biodiversity/ecology
20 September 2023	Meeting to discuss cultural heritage mitigation - informal catch-up on mitigation design progress and recap of previous informal data issues.
25 October 2023	Legal meeting to discuss Section 106 obligations including SEE Strategy, Severance and Officer Contributions, and Kent Downs AONB, and other matters raised as potential S 106 items by KCC
1 November 2023	Follow-up legal meeting to discuss Section 106 obligations including SEE Strategy, Severance and Officer Contributions, and Kent Downs AONB, and other matters raised as potential S 106 items by KCC
7 November 2023	Further follow-up legal meeting to discuss Section 106 obligations including SEE Strategy, Severance and Officer Contributions, and Kent Downs AONB, and other matters raised as potential S 106 items by KCC
7 November 2023	LTC South Employment and Skills Group meeting
14 November 2023	Meeting to discuss cultural heritage mitigation.
21 November 2023	Meeting to discuss outstanding SoCG Matters for finalisation
4 December 2023	Meeting to discuss Wider Network Impacts

Appendix B Glossary

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
A122 Lower Thames Crossing	Project	A proposed new crossing of the Thames Estuary linking the county of Kent with the county of Essex, at or east of the existing Dartford Crossing.
Adequacy of Consultation Response	AoCR	-
Air Quality Action Plan	AQAP	A plan whereby local authorities, in collaboration with national agencies and others, will state their intentions for working towards the air quality objectives through the use of the powers they have available
Air Quality Management Area	AQMA	An area, declared by a local authority, where air quality monitoring does not meet Defra's national air quality objectives.
	-	A document submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the application for development consent.
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	AONB	Statutory designation intended to conserve and enhance the ecology, natural heritage and landscape value of an area of countryside.
Code of Construction Practice	CoCP	Contains control measures and standards to be implemented by the Project, including those to avoid or reduce environmental effects.
Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report	ComMA	The purpose of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report is to inform decision makers and stakeholders on how the evidence underpinning the business case has been developed, from the initial identification of the underlying problem through the collection of data and the production of any supporting traffic models and forecast impacts of the Project on traffic to the eventual economic appraisal.
Community Impacts and Public Health	CIPH	-
Community Impacts and Public Health Advisory Group	CIPHAG	-
Compensation Code	-	Legislation, case law and established practice concerning the rights to compensation for those affected by compulsory purchase and the procedures for assessing the correct amount.
Compulsory acquisition	-	The compulsory acquisition of land or buildings for public interest purposes.
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	Defra	The government department responsible for environmental protection, food production and standards, agriculture, fisheries and rural communities in

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
Department for 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.
Emissions Factors Toolkit	EFT	The Emissions Factors Toolkit (EFT) is published by Defra and the Devolved Administrations to assist local authorities in carrying out review and assessment of local air quality as part of their duties under the Environment Act 1995.
Environmental Impact Assessment	EIA	A report prepared for a consenting authority who, when deciding whether to grant consent for a project which is likely to have significant effects on the environment, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision making process.
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 Masterplan	-	A package of information on existing and future environmental commitments and objectives, ongoing actions and risks to be managed, handed over to those responsible for future management and operation of the asset. The Environmental Masterplan for the Project is provided as Figure 2.4 of the ES.
Environmental Statement	ES	A document produced to support an application for development consent that is subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which sets out the likely impacts on the environment arising from the proposed development.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Examining Authority	-	The Examining Authority is appointed by the Secretary of State to examine an application for a Development Consent Order and make a recommendation.
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.
Geographic Information System	GIS	An integrated collection of computer software and data used to view and manage information about geographic places, analyse spatial relationships and model spatial processes.
Green bridges	-	Bridges over linear infrastructure projects like roads and railways, constructed to enable safe crossing by animals, reducing severance.
Greenhouse gas	GHG	Gases able to absorb infrared radiation emitted from Earth's surface and reradiate it back to Earth's surface, thus contributing to the greenhouse effect. Carbon dioxide, methane, and water vapour are the most important greenhouse gases.
Health and Equalities Impact Assessment	HEqIA	A systematic process used to identify the potential health and equalities impacts arising from policies, plans, programmes and projects, to identify the distribution of those effects amongst the population and to identify mitigation measures to address these effects, thereby minimising adverse effects on the local population.
Health Impact Assessment	HIA	An assessment of potential impacts on human health. Not a legal requirement but good practice and will almost certainly be done for the Project.
Heavy Goods Vehicle	HGV	A large, heavy motor vehicle used for transporting cargo.
High Speed 1	HS1	A 109km high-speed railway between London and the UK end of the Channel Tunnel. The line carries international passenger traffic between the UK and continental Europe; it also carries domestic passenger traffic to and from stations in Kent and east London, as well as Berne gauge freight traffic.
Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	LEMP	A document which provides details on the delivery and management of the landscape and ecology elements identified in the Environmental Masterplan for the Project, including their success criteria.
Landscape and visual impact assessment	LVIA	Part of a planning application or environmental assessment that looks at the impact of development on the character of a landscape.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Local Plan	-	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.
Local Road Network	LRN	-
Lower Thames Area Model	LTAM	The strategic highway model produced by Highways England to appraise the impacts of the Lower Thames Crossing
National Planning Policy Framework	NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework was published in March 2012 by the UK's Department of Communities and Local Government, consolidating over two dozen previously issued documents called Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Practice Guidance Notes (PPG) for use in England. The NPPF was updated in February 2019 and again in July 2021 by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.
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.
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 extensions, major road projects, etc. that require a development consent under the Planning Act 2008.
Nitrogen dioxide	NO ₂	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.
Order Limits	-	The Order Limits are the outermost extent of the Lower Thames Crossing indicated on the Plans by a red line. This is the Limit of Land to be Acquired or Used (LLAU) by the Lower Thames Crossing. This is the area in which the DCO would apply.
Outline Materials Handling Plan	oMHP	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 Traffic Management Plan for Construction	oTMPfC	A plan setting out the strategy and measures to be adopted with respect to highway and transportation issues for the Project. The oTMPfC supports the DCO application and would be embedded within the eventual construction contractor documentation and will form an

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		overarching and comprehensive management procedure for the contractor to adhere to.
Outline Written Scheme of Investigation	OWSI	Sets out the scope, guiding principles and methods for the planning and implementation of essential archaeological mitigation
Post Opening Project Evaluation	POPE	Checks whether investments in Major Projects are delivering the outcomes documented in the Appraisal Summary Table published prior to scheme approval. National Highways produces the reports 'one year after' and 'five years after' road opening.
Preliminary Environmental Information Report	PEIR	An early output of the EIA process, and part of the DCO application process.
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 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 (ES Appendix 2.2).
Rest and Service Area	RASA	A public facility located next to a large thoroughfare such as a motorway, expressway, or highway, at which drivers and passengers can rest, eat, or refuel without exiting onto secondary roads.
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. RIS3 sets out the Government's aims and proposals for investment in the strategic road network from 2025 to 2030.
Scoping	-	The process of identifying the issues to be addressed by the Environmental Impact Assessment process. It is a method of ensuring that an assessment focuses on the important issues and avoids those that are considered unlikely to be significant.
Secretary of State	SoS	The Secretary of State has overall responsibility for the policies of the Department for Transport.
Shorne Woods Country Park	SWCP	-
Site of Special Scientific Interest	SSSI	A conservation designation denoting an area of particular ecological or geological importance.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Site Specific Travel Plans	SSTP	-
Skills, Employment and Education	SEE	-
Southern Gas Networks	SGN	British gas distribution company which manages the network that distributes natural and green gas to 5.9 million homes and businesses across Scotland and the south of England.
Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register	SACR	-
Statutory Consultation	-	The statutory pre-application consultation held by the Applicant on the Project proposals between October and December 2018.
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.
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	A plan setting out the strategy and measures to be adopted with respect to highway and transportation issues for the Project. The TMP supports the DCO application and would be embedded within the eventual construction contractor documentation and will form an overarching and comprehensive management procedure for the Contractor to adhere to.
Transport Analysis Guidance	TAG	National guidance document produced by the Department for Transport.
Transport Assessment	-	Thorough assessments of the transport implications of development
Travel Plan Liaison Group	TPLG	A group set up by National Highway to administer the Framework Construction Travel Plan.
Trip End Model Presentational Program	TEMPro	DfT software for viewing data from the DfT's National Trip End Model
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.

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Wider Network Impacts Management and Monitoring Plan	WNIMMP	Plan setting out a traffic impact monitoring scheme to be carried out a year prior to opening and one and five years after the road opens.

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