

Reference number: TR010032
Document reference: TR010032/APP/11.8

Mr Bartkowiak (Case Manager)
The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

A122 Lower Thames Crossing
National Highways
Woodlands
Manton Lane
Bedford
MK41 7LW

National Highways Customer Contact
Centre: 0300 123 5000

26 November 2024

Dear Mr Bartkowiak,

A122 Lower Thames Crossing (Reference Number TR010032)

1 Response to Secretary of State letter of 12 November 2024

1.1 The Applicant is responding to the letter from the Secretary of State published on 12 November 2024.

2 Request for comments from the Applicant

2.1 The Secretary of State's letter of 12 November 2024 sets out that:

(1) The Applicant is requested to set out what further measures could be implemented to reduce the carbon emissions that will result from the scheme as well as details on how these could be secured in the Development Consent Order. The Applicant is invited to update its latest assessment of the impact on carbon to reflect any further suggested measures. If the Applicant is not able to put forward any additional measures, they are invited to set out the reasons why and how the existing measures will ensure the lowest possible carbon impact

(2) The Applicant is requested to set out what further measures could be delivered as part of the scheme to enhance and improve public transport and active travel opportunities. While not a usual requirement but due to the nature, size and complexity of the scheme, the Applicant is exceptionally encouraged to seek views from Active Travel England to help inform their response on this matter. If the Applicant is not able to put forward any further possible measures, they are invited to explain the reasons why this is the position.

(3) The Applicant is requested to set out what further measures could be put in place to minimise disruption to local people during the construction phase of the scheme including how agreed timetables will be met.

2.2 The Applicant sets out responses to each of these questions below.

Carbon Emissions

2.3 The Project's carbon emissions, comprising emissions during construction, and from operation (which includes road users and maintenance), are presented in ES Chapter 15: Climate (Application Document 6.1) [\[APP-153\]](#) and are monetised in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report, Appendix D - Economic Appraisal Report (Application Document 7.7) [\[APP-526\]](#).

Carbon Neutral Construction

2.4 The Applicant has designated the Project as a 'pathfinder' for low carbon construction and set the following ambitions:

- a. To construct it for the lowest practicable carbon emissions
- b. To test low carbon innovation and approaches
- c. To leave a legacy that enables future projects to achieve carbon neutral construction.

2.5 To achieve these ambitions, the Applicant has put forward an innovative Carbon and Energy Management Plan **[7.19 Carbon and Energy Management Plan (rev 5.0)]**, designed for the Project to align with and contribute to securing the Net Zero Strategy (NZS) targets (in terms of carbon intensity reduction that aligns with the net zero trajectory). This Plan sets a new standard for carbon reduction for infrastructure projects by placing construction carbon reduction at the centre of decision making on the Project. This is the first time that a Carbon and Energy Management Plan has been incorporated into a highways Development Consent Order (DCO). The Applicant considers its approach to be industry leading and one that will accelerate the transition to net zero.

2.6 The Carbon and Energy Management Plan ensures that the project will be delivered with the lowest possible construction carbon emissions

2.7 It achieves this through 24 secured carbon commitments¹. Those commitments set an upper limit for the use of carbon in construction, based on current industry best practice but the combined effect of the commitments is to require and incentivise the contractor to go further and to drive carbon emissions to their lowest practical level. These measures are already succeeding – not only is this a ground-breaking approach to carbon reduction for infrastructure projects which is setting new standards for other DCO projects to follow, it has demonstrably galvanised potential contractors to commit to stretch targets.

2.8 These commitments go further than any other major project and the Applicant intends to leave a legacy that enables future projects to decarbonise through the new approaches and innovations it is adopting. During the Examination the

¹ Set and committed to in Appendix E of the Carbon and Energy Management Plan.

Applicant was able to advise the Examining Authority that the project tender process had initiated competition between contractors to secure low carbon outputs. As a result, the Applicant was able to commit to a reduction in the commitment to a maximum level of construction phase emissions from 1.763 million tCO₂e to 1.44 million tCO₂e (as set out in the Carbon and Energy Management Plan submitted at Deadline 9). The commitments ensure that this is a continuing process and following the Examination the Applicant has continued to work with its contractors to reduce the carbon intensity.

- 2.9 The Applicant has recognised the Government's commitment at the recent COP29 to target an 81% reduction in carbon emissions by 2035. Extrapolating to the mid-year of planned construction of the A122 Lower Thames Crossing this would require a target to reduce construction phase carbon emission intensity by 70% against the baseline. The work conducted to date has provided the Applicant with confidence to commit to using reasonable endeavours to achieve this reduction, and therefore to introduce a new 'stretch target' of 0.84 million tCO₂e to align the Project with the government's most up to date and ambitious carbon commitment.
- 2.10 Furthering the innovative approach to construction, the Applicant additionally commits to implement an approach to carbon neutral construction, aligned to ISO 14068 by offsetting residual construction carbon emissions. The Applicant will prioritise investment in carbon reduction solutions ahead of offsetting. This commitment can be amended by the Secretary of State on application in writing by the Applicant, where it is demonstrated to the Secretary of State's satisfaction that residual construction carbon emissions cannot be responsibly offset for less than a mean average cost of £45/tCO₂e (index linked to 2020 prices).
- 2.11 These two commitments have been drafted into a revised Carbon and Energy Management Plan **[7.19 Carbon and Energy Management Plan (rev 5.0)]** which has been included with this submission.
- 2.12 On a precautionary and reasonable worst case basis, construction emissions reported in the ES Chapter 15: Climate (Application Document 6.1) **[APP-153]** and Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report, Appendix D - Economic Appraisal Report (Application Document 7.7) **[APP-526]** continue to be based on the carbon limit of 1.44 million tCO₂e and therefore they do not reflect the "stretch" target or the carbon neutral construction position. It follows that no updates are necessitated to the assessments contained in these documents.

Carbon Emissions During Operational Phase

- 2.13 Operational carbon emissions include emissions within the control of National Highways, such as corporate level operational emissions and emissions

associated with maintenance, and emissions that are not in the control of National Highways, including road-user emissions.

- 2.14 In line with [Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan](#) (National Highways, 2021), carbon emissions from corporate level operations related to the Project (such as network lighting and use of traffic officer vehicles) would be net zero throughout the appraisal period and emissions related to maintenance, repair and replacement would be net zero by 2040.
- 2.15 The Project cannot control the implementation of the policies related to reducing road-user emissions, as the levers to support the net zero trajectory in transport emissions are delivered by the Government. As set out in ES Chapter 15: Climate (Application Document 6.1), implementation of the policies of the [Transport Decarbonisation Plan](#) (Department for Transport, 2021) will have a large effect in reducing road-user emissions associated with the Project and reflects a net zero trajectory consistent with the UK carbon budgets. The Project does not impede the Government from meeting its net zero carbon targets in relation to road-user emissions.
- 2.16 As a result there are no further measures that the Applicant can bring forward to address operational emissions, and therefore no update to the assessment of operational emissions is required.

Active Travel

- 2.17 The Applicant has carefully considered the needs of walkers, cyclist, wheelers and horse riders throughout the design process, with comprehensive consultation and engagement with user groups, local communities and Local Authorities to seek their input. As a result, the Applicant's proposals include around 60km of new or improved pathways designed to encourage active travel. The plans include, but are not limited to:
- a. Seven new green bridges - provide safe and easy crossings for people and wildlife, including an 84m wide bridge in Kent, one of the widest green bridges in Europe.
 - b. New footbridges - two over the A127 and one over the M25 to create safe, easy crossing points and restore links severed by historic road building.
 - c. A network of horse-riding routes - near the borders of Brentwood, Havering and Thurrock, a network of horse-riding routes between Thames Chase Forest and South Ockendon and open green spaces such as the Mardyke and Little Belhus Park. Two new bridges across the A127 will also help connect Cranham, Folkes Lane Woodland and Hole Farm community woodland. These new bridges open up the possibility of one day being able to create an uninterrupted route between Hole Farm community woodland, Thames Chase Forest and the Mardyke.

- d. In Kent, improved connections north and south of the A2, between Shorne Woods Country Park, Ashenbank Woodland and Jeskyns Community Woodland. Our plans also include a new bridleway parallel to Church Road.
- e. A replacement route for National Cycle Route 177 (NCR 177) - NCR 177 will be permanently rerouted south of the A2 (parallel with the High Speed 1 railway line), between a point close to Park Pale bridge (near Shorne) and Valley Drive (Gravesend). During construction of the Lower Thames Crossing, NCR 177 will be rerouted further south and will run through Ashenbank Wood and Jeskyns Community Woodland.
- f. A new 1.8-mile foot and cycle path - separated from road traffic, will provide a safer and easier way to commute between East Tilbury, Linford and Chadwell St Mary.
- g. Improved foot and cycle path - between the local community and heritage sites such as Coalhouse fort and East Tilbury Battery.

2.18 Following the receipt of the letter of 12 November 2024, the Applicant has met twice with Active Travel England. At the first meeting the Applicant provided an overview of the Project proposals and provided Active Travel England with relevant application documents that set out the proposed provision. At the second meeting, Active Travel England set out the key findings of their review. Following the second meeting, Active Travel England provided their response to the Applicant, included as Annex A of this submission, and the Applicant's response to the matters raised is provided as Annex B of this submission. The Applicant would like to thank Active Travel England for their fast and effective engagement on this matter.

2.19 The Applicant considers its proposals positively align with paragraph 3.17 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (Department for Transport, 2014)² namely that "*The Government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. The Government also expects applicants to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure in locations where the national road network severs communities and acts as a barrier to cycling and walking, by correcting historic*

² In accordance with paragraph 1.16 of the National Network National Policy Statement (Department for Transport, 2024), this the [National Policy Statement for National Networks](#) (Department for Transport , 2014) has effect in relation to this application. Notwithstanding this, the substantively same requirement is set out in paragraph 4.78 of the [National Network National Policy Statement](#) (Department for Transport , 2024).

problems, retrofitting the latest solutions and ensuring that it is easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.”

2.20 The Applicant welcomes the confirmation from Active Travel England that “*the LTC scheme has been designed with consideration for various modes of transport, including provisions for walkers, wheelers, cyclists and horse riders (“non-motorised users”) in line with current national guidance. The improvements aim to mitigate the severance caused by the project and enhance connectivity across and along the LTC route”* and that “*the LTC scheme will improve routes for walkers, wheelers, cyclists and horse riders by creating dedicated, safe and accessible routes that integrate with existing networks and improve connectivity between communities”*.”

2.21 Notwithstanding this, following the discussions with Active Travel England, the Applicant has proposed to introduce the following two further commitments to further enhance the legacy in the context of active travel provision provided by the Project:

- a. During the design development of the footways, bridleways and cycle tracks, the Applicant will undertake structured engagement with stakeholders including local authorities, local highways authorities and Active Travel England. This commitment is secured by a revision to the Design Principles (**7.5 Design Principles [Rev8.0]**), included with this submission, through an amendment to principle PRO.07
- b. The Applicant will make available an active travel fund, valued at £1 million, to fund active travel studies and interventions that would enable local active travel provision to better integrate with the new and upgraded provision delivered by National Highways. This commitment is secured by an addition to the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register, included with this submission.

Public Transport

2.22 The Applicant has ensured that the proposed A122 Lower Thames Crossing will both benefit existing public transport provision in the region, and provide new routes for buses and coaches across the River Thames. The A122 Lower Thames Crossing, all local connecting roads and other roads modified by National Highways would be suitable to carry both local and national bus and coach services, thereby providing new route opportunities for cross river travel

within the Lower Thames area and providing a shorter, quicker and more reliable route for longer distance services.

- 2.23 As confirmed at paragraph 2.2.1 of the Road User Charging Statement [[APP-517](#)] local bus services are proposed to be exempt from paying the user charge, as is the case at the Dartford Crossing.
- 2.24 As is set out at paragraph 7.4.4 of the Transport Assessment [[REP4-148](#), [REP4-150](#) and [REP4-152](#)], the Project is forecast to reduce traffic at the Dartford Crossing by an average of 19% in the opening year, with journey time improvements that persist 15 years post opening due to the change in traffic composition at the Dartford Crossing (as set out in Annex A.2 of Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for ISH1 [[REP1-183](#)]). The reduction in traffic, and improved journey times will therefore offer a journey time saving and improve journey time reliability for the existing X80 bus service that uses the Dartford Crossing and increase the attractiveness for other services to use it which would enhance cross river connectivity at the western end of the Lower Thames area.
- 2.25 In relation to the forecast impact on existing bus services, the Applicant presented a summary of the forecast changes in journey time (where these were in excess of two minutes); in Table 7.14 of the Transport Assessment. Fifteen routes would see faster journeys, whilst five would see slightly slower journeys.
- 2.26 To assist local authorities with examining opportunities for local bus routes using the Lower Thames Crossing, the Applicant has, as part of a pilot, begun to share data from the Applicant's transport model with local highways authorities. Initially this will help identify journeys forecast to use the new river crossing, with further data to be shared, such as journey time comparisons between car and buses.
- 2.27 The Applicant does not consider that it would be appropriate for it to provide funding for new or existing bus services, particularly in the context of its statutory functions and responsibilities under its licence granted under the Infrastructure Act 2015. The Applicant considers that decisions relating to existing and/or public transport routes and the funding of them should be made by local authorities or commercial operators. In light of the improvements to journey times set out above, the Applicant considers that those authorities and operators are able to improve existing services and make any further decisions they consider appropriate for the provision of new services.

Minimising disruption to local people

- 2.28 The Applicant recognises that, if the Project is consented, it has a responsibility to build the A122 Lower Thames Crossing in a way that is considerate of the potential impacts of construction on the local community and that where

possible such impacts should be reduced/mitigated. Throughout the design process the Applicant has engaged extensively with key local stakeholders – in particular with the local community and local authorities on potential construction impacts. The following paragraphs detail some of this engagement, frameworks and commitments made to limit the Project’s impact on the local community.

- 2.29 The DCO secures, under Requirement 4 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (**3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [Rev 18.0]**), a requirement for an environmental management plan which must be substantially based on the Code of Construction Practice [[REP9-184](#)]. The second iteration of the environmental management plan will be prepared at the stage of development where construction programmes, and construction methodologies, are further advanced, and will be subject to consultation with a number of stakeholders (including local planning authorities). Following that consultation, the Applicant would then submit the plan to the Secretary of State for approval. The Applicant will then be legally required to implement that approved plan. The Applicant considers that this framework and process ensures and secures the minimisation of disruption to local people, including on how agreed timescales will be met.
- 2.30 The Applicant notes, in particular, the Code of Construction Practice [[REP9-184](#)] ensures a number of robust commitments are carried through to the environmental management plan. These include, but are not limited to, a requirement for contractors to sign up to the Consideration Constructors Scheme (paragraph 2.5), the appointment of an Environmental Manager and a Traffic Manager (Table 4.1) who will monitor and ensure compliance with robust environmental and traffic controls as well as a Community Liaison Officer who will engage with local communities during construction. The Code of Construction Practice also secures an Engagement and Communications Plan which will comprise a helpline, enquiries and complaints procedure (section 5). Community Liaison Groups will be established which would ensure ongoing engagement. Working hours are restricted to minimise disruption (section 6.4). The Code of Construction Practice includes the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which includes a suite of commitments relating to construction, including the use of Best Practicable Means and measures to minimise disruption arising from air quality, noise, landscape and other environmental impacts.
- 2.31 A similar framework exists in the context of managing disruption in the context of traffic management and impacts during the construction period. In particular, Requirement 10 ensures a requirement for a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which must be in accordance with the outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [[REP9-235](#)] which is subject to consultation with local stakeholders, and approval by the Secretary of State. The oTMPfC ensures a number of commitments relating to timing, including a requirement for “interventions and/or changes to traffic management measures required to ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum, at the time of planning, and would

identify where continuous improvements need to be implemented”. Monitoring is secured, as well as a process of ensuring a Traffic Management Forum is able to raise the need for remedial action (see paragraphs 2.4.22 to 2.4.25, Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC and 3.3.22).

- 2.32 In the context of ensuring timescales, the Code of Construction Practice ensures “at least two weeks before planned works are carried out, the Contractors will distribute information sheets relating to the programmed activities. The information sheets will detail the expected disruptions and measures being taken to avoid, minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts of these works” (section 5.3.2). The oTMPfC also sets out a requirement that “Road closures and temporary traffic management must accord with the programmed periods set out in the approved TMP for that part of the Project” and that “Contractors must notify the relevant members of the TMF of any extensions to programme or coverage in advance of amending the associated road booking permit. Notification of an extension of a road closure period must adhere to the permit notice period requirements.”
- 2.33 Throughout the examination, the Applicant positively responded to requests to amend control documents but also put forward a number of bespoke and specific commitments to individual stakeholders in seeking to minimise localised disruption. These commitments are embodied in the Stakeholders Actions and Commitments Register [[REP9A-060](#)] which include specific commitments as to timescales (e.g., SACR-0007 commits to a timescale for the closure of Ockendon Road, SACR-008 controls the timings of the relocation of the travellers’ site, SACR-033 which requires the provision of a programme relating to works). The failure to implement measures under the SAC-R, or approved environmental and traffic management plans would be a breach of the DCO (under Requirements 4 and 10 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO) which, in turn, would be a criminal offence under section 161 of the Planning Act 2008, in respect of which enforcement action could be undertaken under Part 8 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 2.34 In the Applicant’s view, the measures incorporated (covering positive, pro-active general and specific commitments, as well as monitoring and corrective actions) are appropriate, reflect best industry practice, and go further, in light of the complexity of the Project, in ensuring minimisation of disruption. The process of ensuring that stakeholders are consulted, and the relevant management plans are independently considered by the Secretary of State will ensure that further and specific measures, which will be identified at the next stage of development (if development consent is granted) can be incorporated.
- 2.35 In alignment with the requirement to minimise disruption to the road network, as outlined in the oTMPfC, the Applicant continues to refine both design and construction approaches. This ongoing effort includes evaluating potential reductions to planned road closures, such as those on Ockendon Road, St Mary’s Lane, A127, and Brewers Road. The oTMPfC requires the Applicant to establish the TMF, which will facilitate consultation on the Traffic Management

Plans and provide a platform to consult with stakeholders these and other proposed measures.

2.36 The Applicant, during the examination, provided a worked example in the context of the Asda roundabout on how traffic management measures would be sought to be minimised in [REP6-123]. That document elaborates on how measures, including as to timing and further modelling, would assist in seeking to minimise disruption.

2.37 These examples demonstrate how the process and framework set out in the draft DCO will facilitate the ongoing refinement of design and construction methodologies to minimise disruption. As the detailed design progresses in the next development stage, should consent be granted, additional measures and adjustments, such as those to reduce road closure durations, can be incorporated, ensuring that the Project continues to evolve in response to emerging opportunities and stakeholder feedback.

3 Request for comments from the Applicant and Interested Parties regarding outstanding agreements

3.1 The Secretary of State's letter of 12 November 2024 sets out an update that:

(1) The Applicant provided an update to the Secretary of State's consultation letter of the 10 May 2024, regarding the continued safe use of the firearms training facilities. The Applicant outlined that a side agreement had been agreed, subject to final legal review and governance approval from MOPAC and RSPB. The Secretary of State invites the Applicant, MOPAC and RSPB to provide an update on this agreement, providing written confirmation if this has been agreed. If agreement has not yet been reached to provide an update on when this is likely to be agreed.

(2) The Applicant provided an update to the Secretary of State's consultation letter of the 9 July 2024 on two agreements with Essex Wildlife Trust, which had been under discussion during the decision stage. The Secretary of State invites the Applicant and Essex Wildlife Trust to provide an update on these two agreements, and if these have been agreed to provide written confirmation of this position. If agreement has not yet been reached to provide an update on when they are likely to be agreed

(3) The Secretary of State invites the Applicant to provide an update on any other side agreements that currently remain outstanding.

MOPAC/RSPB agreement

- 3.2 The Applicant has continued to negotiate the agreement with MOPAC/RSPB, and RSPB have now instructed solicitors following this engagement. The Applicant is confident that an agreement will be completed in due course.

Essex Wildlife Trust agreements

- 3.3 The Applicant can confirm that the two agreements (one relating to barn owl measures, and another relating to water vole measures) with Essex Wildlife Trust have now been completed.

Other side agreements

- 3.4 Annex C provides an update to the table previously prepared for the Secretary of State. The position on Protective Provisions as set out in Annex D of the [Applicant's letter dated 11 April 2024](#) remains unchanged, except that the Applicant has now completed an agreement with the Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL) (as per the notification sent to the Secretary of State by PoTLL). Updates to PoTLL's Protective Provisions have already made, and the Applicant confirms no further amendments are required to those provisions.

4 Updated dDCO

- 4.1 As a result of updates to the Design Principles, the Carbon and Energy Management Plan, and the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register, the Applicant has updated the version numbers referenced in Schedule 16 (certified documents) to the dDCO to ensure the correct version is referenced. An updated version of the dDCO (**3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [Rev 18.0]**), is included with this submission.

Yours sincerely

Dr Tim Wright

Head of Consents – Lower Thames Crossing

Annex A – Active Travel England letter to the Applicant



22 November 2024

Sent by email

National Highways

Dear Annamarie,

Lower Thames Crossing Scheme

We are writing in response to the Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit's letter of 12th November that advised National Highways as applicant for the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) scheme to set out what further measures could be delivered to enhance and improve public transport and active travel opportunities. The letter advised National Highways to seek views from Active Travel England (ATE) to help inform their response on this matter.

ATE has finalised this response following two meetings with National Highways and its review of public documents prepared as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission. It was agreed that ATE would provide its final assessment by 22nd November to give National Highways time to review and finalise its response to the Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit by 26th November. We have numbered the remaining paragraphs in this letter for ease of reference.

1.0 Summary

1.1 It is apparent from the suite of documents and plans prepared for the DCO that the LTC scheme has been designed with consideration for various modes of transport, including provisions for walkers, wheelers, cyclists and horse riders ("non-motorised users") in line with current national guidance. The improvements aim to mitigate the severance caused by the project and enhance connectivity across and along the LTC route. Specifically:

(i). Proposed crossings and new routes for non-motorised users link into existing networks of foot/cycle paths and bridleways, some of which will be enhanced as part of the proposed works. This will retain and improve connectivity between existing communities and enhance access to rural areas for leisure purposes.

(ii). Routes include level crossings, ramps and sealed surfaces that ensure ease of use for a wide range of abilities. Bridleway improvements will also maintain and enhance equestrian access.

(iii). The scheme also prioritises making routes safe and coherent through lighting and signage.

1.2 Notwithstanding, ATE has provided some general comments and identified opportunities to improve the overall offer, and has set this out below for National Highways' consideration.

2.0 General Comments

2.1.1 The following comments are offered to support the detailed design phase should consent be granted.

2.2 Bridges

- 2.2.1 Consideration should be given to LTN 1/20 section 10.8.12 for the minimum desirable width on bridges, with additional width recommended where vertical features are adjacent to the cycle track elements of the route.
- 2.2.2 In scenarios where equestrians frequently use a bridge alongside pedestrians and/or cyclists, it may be necessary to provide appropriate physical segregation. Additionally, if many horses are expected to cross the bridge simultaneously consideration should be given to increasing the bridge width to accommodate this demand.
- 2.2.3 LTN 1/20 section 10.8.14 recommends a minimum parapet height of 1.8m where equestrians will also use a bridge, and that cycle traffic should preferably be separated from pedestrian and equestrian traffic to avoid conflict and allow cyclists to travel at a comfortable speed.
- 2.2.4 Consideration should be given to suitable approach gradients as referenced in LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility guidance.

2.3 Access Control

- 2.3.1 Access control features can reduce route usability for cyclists, particularly those with disabilities or using non-standard cycles, and should generally be avoided. Barriers such as chicanes, dismount requirements or narrow gaps are often exclusionary and unsuitable for many users, including those on larger cycles, mobility aids or carrying heavy loads. Instead, bollards spaced at a minimum of 1.5m are a more inclusive option, allowing straight-line access for all users while maintaining restrictions. Bollards and barriers should be designed to contrast with their surroundings and include retroreflective materials for visibility in all conditions.
- 2.3.2 Consideration should be given to removal, or adaptation, of any existing barriers on, or adjacent to the proposed network.

2.4 Surfacing

- 2.4.1 Where a route is intended to be used for utility trips, a machine laid, bound and sealed surface is preferred to minimise cycling effort and avoid accumulation of surface detritus.

2.5 Lighting

- 2.5.1 Installation of lighting should be considered on utility routes, with operating hours potentially limited to reduce energy consumption and minimise light pollution in sensitive locations. The provision of lighting should also be considered for traffic-free routes expected to see significant use after dark. This is particularly important on routes used by commuters or as part of safer routes to school networks, where demand remains high during winter months. Additionally, lighting may be necessary where traffic-free routes connect with the highway network or where road safety issues are identified.

2.6 Wayfinding

- 2.6.1 Routes should be designed to ensure that non-local cyclists can navigate them easily without relying on maps. Clear and consistent signage should be installed at all decision points and junctions to provide intuitive wayfinding.

2.7 Crossings and Buffers

- 2.7.1 Where proposed routes cross or run adjacent to the road network consideration should be given to appropriate crossing provision (LTN 1/20 table 10-2) and horizontal separation of routes from the carriageway (LTN 1/20 table 6-1).

- 2.7.2 Consideration should be given to separation of modes at proposed crossing locations, and crossings located to avoid unnecessary travel distance.

2.8 Accessibility and Safety Improvements

- 2.8.1 Where new or improved cycleways are identified alongside the local road network, National Highways should liaise with the relevant local highway authority to determine whether existing speed limits should be reduced in line with the guidance in section 4.4 of LTN 1/20. This can help create a safer environment for all road users.
- 2.8.2 Where footways are not currently present, there should be consideration for their inclusion to provide better pedestrian access and connectivity. This is particularly important in areas where walking/wheeling is a key mode of transport.
- 2.8.3 When routes link into existing residential areas, opportunities should be explored to improve side road treatments, upgrade surfacing, and address infrastructure gaps such as missing dropped kerbs and the installation of tactile paving. These improvements help enhance accessibility and safety for all users, including those with mobility impairments.
- 2.8.4 Attention should also be given to the transitions between shared-use paths and the carriageway. Ensuring smooth and safe transitions is essential to maintain route continuity and protect users from hazards.
- 2.8.5 It is important to assess the potential flood risk of proposed routes. Key routes, particularly those used for utility trips, should consider incorporating flood resilience measures to ensure they remain usable during adverse weather conditions.

2.9 Phasing

- 2.9.1 Sequencing of the construction works should consider the impact on existing users and look to provide suitable alternative routes throughout the project duration.

3.0 Specific Opportunities

- 3.1.1 ATE has identified the following opportunities where a commitment to improve upon the existing submission may be warranted.

3.2 National Cycle Network Route 177 (NCN 177)

- 3.2.1 The NCN 177 is affected by the proposed works, with a new temporary route being installed in advance of the main works to allow stopping up of the existing alignment. The temporary diversion route appears to make use of the existing footbridge over the A2/M2, however, the project documentation states that this footbridge does not meet the requirements for a cycle bridge so cyclists will be asked to dismount to cross the bridge.
- 3.2.2 As some people with mobility impairments will be unable to dismount consideration should be given to improvements to the existing bridge deck, an alternative connection, or phasing of the construction sequence to allow a suitable link to be maintained during the project.
- 3.2.3 As the NCN is used for year-round utility trips consideration should be given to providing suitable bound and sealed surface along with lighting for both the temporary and final alignment of the proposed diversions.

3.3 A226 Gravesend Road

- 3.3.1 There is some opportunity to provide betterment to the existing cycling provision on the A226 Gravesend Road. The current provision is in the form of mandatory on-carriageway

cycle lanes which appear non-compliant with current guidance and are located on a high-volume, high speed interurban link road.

- 3.3.2 National Highways is also encouraged to consider suitable crossing provisions on this route to serve bus stop locations and connection to the existing footway.

3.4 Muckingford Road

- 3.4.1 The proposed foot and cycleway along Muckingford Road would connect the eastern edge of Chadwell St Mary with the western edge of East Tilbury and importantly serve new residential development between these settlements as identified in Thurrock's emerging Local Plan. While this new link is welcome, the western section terminates just before two roundabouts along Linford Road which have wide carriageways that encourage higher speeds and create likely conflicts between cyclists and motor vehicles. Moreover, the eastern section ends just as it enters the village of East Tilbury and a short extension to this would provide enhanced connectivity to the village train station. An extension to the existing route alignment and/or financial contribution towards improving onward connectivity should be considered.

3.5 Express Bus Service

- 3.5.1 ATE could not source any proposal to fund an express bus service(s) that would provide a north-south public transport link via the proposed tunnel. While it is acknowledged that the LTC scheme would be unlikely to support bus stops on the route itself for safety reasons, its junctions with the M25 and A13/A1089 to the north and A2/M2 to the south provide an opportunity to link major settlements and transport nodes on either side of the River Thames via non-car modes that currently doesn't exist.
- 3.5.2 ATE would invite National Highways to consider pump priming a north-south service to support non-car journeys across the river. In support of this proposal, an independent review on the Impact of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund found that, in areas where investment in sustainable transport projects was secured, both car use and carbon emissions fell while schemes delivered social and economic benefits in relation to accessibility and inclusion.

3.6 Area Travel Plan

- 3.6.1 A travel plan to promote the uptake of active travel and public transport for everyday local journeys in the vicinity of the LTC scheme has not been proposed to date. The benefits of preparing such a travel plan include but is not limited to:
- (i). Establishing the baseline modal trip rate for key existing routes that would be diverted (e.g. the NCN 177) and set a target to establish whether the proposed works were successful in increasing trip rates. Funding could be assigned to incentivise the use of routes where this falls below target levels (e.g. improved lighting, addition of play facilities along leisure routes).
 - (ii). Identify opportunities to increase patronage on existing local buses to offset increased motor traffic on the A2/M2 west of Gravesend. In particular, funding to increase the frequency of Arriva's 190 (Chatham to Gravesend) and 700 (Chatham to Bluewater Shopping Centre) bus services may reduce the demand for people to use sections of the Strategic Road Network for local east-west journeys.
 - (iii). There is no cycle parking available at East Tilbury train station that would allow people to transition between different modes of transport, with particular regard to the new cycleway to be provided along Muckingford Road. A financial contribution towards station parking should therefore be considered.

3.6.2 ATE would invite National Highways to consider an Area Travel Plan as a future submission requirement, to include sufficient detail on the active travel and public transport infrastructure to be funded, and how the uptake of new and improved active travel networks will be embedded by appropriate initiatives. Moreover, details of effective and influential actions to be taken if targets are not met should also be set out.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 In summary, ATE is of the view that the LTC scheme will improve routes for walkers, wheelers, cyclists and horse riders by creating dedicated, safe and accessible routes that integrate with existing networks and improve connectivity between communities. We trust that the above assessment is helpful in identifying further opportunities to enhance provision for both active travel and public transport.

Yours faithfully,

Greg Searle
Senior Inspector

Mark Knighting
Head of Development Management

Annex B - Response to comments made by Active Travel England

A.1.1 Table A.1 sets out the Applicant's Response to the general comments and specific opportunities suggested by Active Travel England.

Table A.1 Applicant's responses to comments made by Active Travel England

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
2.0	General comments	
2.2	Bridges	
2.2.1	Consideration should be given to LTN 1/20 section 10.8.12 for the minimum desirable width on bridges, with additional width recommended where vertical features are adjacent to the cycle track elements of the route.	All Walking Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) routes shall be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and other industry best practice, standards and guidance as set out in Design Principle PEO.04 [REP9-227] .
2.2.2	In scenarios where equestrians frequently use a bridge alongside pedestrians and/or cyclists, it may be necessary to provide appropriate physical segregation. Additionally, if many horses are expected to cross the bridge simultaneously consideration should be given to increasing the bridge width to accommodate this demand.	Bridge widths have been sized to accommodate expected usage and space allocation on bridges has been secured via the Area-specific Design Principles, e.g. S1.17 [REP9-227] .
2.2.3	LTN 1/20 section 10.8.14 recommends a minimum parapet height of 1.8m where equestrians will also use a bridge, and that cycle traffic should preferably be separated from pedestrian and equestrian traffic to avoid conflict and allow cyclists to travel at a comfortable speed.	All Walking Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) routes shall be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and other industry best practice, standards and guidance as set out in Design Principle PEO.04 [REP9-227] .

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
2.2.4	Consideration should be given to suitable approach gradients as referenced in LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility guidance.	<p>Design Principle PEO.01 requires the detailed design to consider ‘the convenience of all users and appropriateness to the context of the adjacent landscape character, with changes in level minimised where appropriate’.</p> <p>Furthermore, all Walking Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) routes shall be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and other industry best practice, standards and guidance as set out in Design Principle PEO.04.</p> <p>These design principles, and all other design principles referenced in this annex, are included in the Design Principles (7.5 Design Principles [Rev8.0]) included with this submission.</p>
2.3	Access Control	
2.3.1	Access control features can reduce route usability for cyclists, particularly those with disabilities or using non-standard cycles, and should generally be avoided. Barriers such as chicanes, dismount requirements or narrow gaps are often exclusionary and unsuitable for many users, including those on larger cycles, mobility aids or carrying heavy loads. Instead, bollards spaced at a minimum of 1.5m are a more inclusive option, allowing straight-line access for all users while maintaining restrictions. Bollards and barriers should be designed to contrast with their surroundings and include retroreflective materials for visibility in all conditions.	The Applicant has sought to balance the access requirements for active travel users alongside the need to discourage anti-social behaviour and unauthorised access to land. This is set out in Design Principle PEO.06.
2.3.2	Consideration should be given to removal, or adaptation, of any existing barriers on, or adjacent to the proposed network.	The Applicant notes this recommendation and will work with stakeholders to make further improvements to access control where reasonably practicable.

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
2.4	Surfacing	
2.4.1	Where a route is intended to be used for utility trips, a machine laid, bound and sealed surface is preferred to minimise cycling effort and avoid accumulation of surface detritus.	The Applicant considers that this matter is covered by Design Principle PEO.03.
2.5	Lighting	
2.5.1	Installation of lighting should be considered on utility routes, with operating hours potentially limited to reduce energy consumption and minimise light pollution in sensitive locations. The provision of lighting should also be considered for traffic-free routes expected to see significant use after dark. This is particularly important on routes used by commuters or as part of safer routes to school networks, where demand remains high during winter months. Additionally, lighting may be necessary where traffic-free routes connect with the highway network or where road safety issues are identified.	This advice is noted and will be considered further as part of our newly proposed engagement with Active Travel England under amendments to Design Principle PRO.07.
2.6	Wayfinding	
2.6.1	Routes should be designed to ensure that non-local cyclists can navigate them easily without relying on maps. Clear and consistent signage should be installed at all decision points and junctions to provide intuitive wayfinding.	Wayfinding proposals shall be guided by Design Principle PEO.02.
2.7	Crossings and Buffers	
2.7.1	Where proposed routes cross or run adjacent to the road network consideration should be given to appropriate crossing provision (LTN 1/20	All Walking Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) routes shall be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and other industry best practice, standards and guidance as set out in Design Principle PEO.04.

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
	table 10-2) and horizontal separation of routes from the carriageway (LTN 1/20 table 6-1).	
2.7.2	Consideration should be given to separation of modes at proposed crossing locations, and crossings located to avoid unnecessary travel distance.	This advice is noted and will be taken into consideration during detailed design.
2.8	Accessibility and Safety Improvements	
2.8.1	Where new or improved cycleways are identified alongside the local road network, National Highways should liaise with the relevant local highway authority to determine whether existing speed limits should be reduced in line with the guidance in section 4.4 of LTN 1/20. This can help create a safer environment for all road users.	This recommendation is noted and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07.
2.8.2	Where footways are not currently present, there should be consideration for their inclusion to provide better pedestrian access and connectivity. This is particularly important in areas where walking/wheeling is a key mode of transport.	This recommendation is noted and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07.
2.8.3	When routes link into existing residential areas, opportunities should be explored to improve side road treatments, upgrade surfacing, and address infrastructure gaps such as missing dropped kerbs and the installation of tactile paving. These improvements help enhance accessibility and safety for all users, including those with mobility impairments.	This recommendation is noted and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07.

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
2.8.4	Attention should also be given to the transitions between shared-use paths and the carriageway. Ensuring smooth and safe transitions is essential to maintain route continuity and protect users from hazards.	This recommendation is noted and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07.
2.8.5	It is important to assess the potential flood risk of proposed routes. Key routes, particularly those used for utility trips, should consider incorporating flood resilience measures to ensure they remain usable during adverse weather conditions.	Whilst there are WCH routes through areas that are at risk of flooding, these are predominantly leisure routes rather than those used for utility trips. This recommendation is noted however and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07.
2.9	Phasing	
2.9.1	Sequencing of the construction works should consider the impact on existing users and look to provide suitable alternative routes throughout the project duration.	The Applicant has considered the impact of the construction works on existing users and set out suitable alternative routes within Appendix B of the Outline Traffic Management Plan for Construction (oTMPfC) [REP9-235]. Within Table 2.3 of the oTMPfC the Applicant has also set out a number of differing considerations that various stakeholder groups would have and how these would be addressed in the Traffic Management Plan that would be produced by the Contractors.
3.0	Specific Opportunities	
3.2	National Cycle Network Route 177 (NCN 177)	
3.2.1	The NCN 177 is affected by the proposed works, with a new temporary route being installed in advance of the main works to allow stopping up of the existing alignment. The temporary diversion route appears to make use of the existing footbridge over the A2/M2, however, the project documentation states that this footbridge does not meet the requirements	As noted by Active Travel England, the Applicant proposes to divert NCN 177 on to a temporary route in advance of the main works, and this alignment makes use of Hares bridge, which is an existing bridge over the High Speed 1 railway line and the A2. The Applicant, as acknowledged by Active Travel England, has stated that the bridge is too narrow to accommodate shared use and the parapet height is also too low to safely accommodate cyclists and equestrian users without dismounting. To rectify these issues the bridge would require substantial upgrading, through widening, upgraded parapets, or entire replacement. The Applicant's consideration is that as the diversion across this bridge for users

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
	for a cycle bridge so cyclists will be asked to dismount to cross the bridge.	would be temporary, and that there are alternative routes both east and west of this bridge, that it would not be reasonable for the Applicant to undertake these works.
3.2.2	As some people with mobility impairments will be unable to dismount consideration should be given to improvements to the existing bridge deck, an alternative connection, or phasing of the construction sequence to allow a suitable link to be maintained during the project.	This recommendation is noted, and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07 within the updated Design Principles included in this submission.
3.2.3	As the NCN is used for year-round utility trips consideration should be given to providing suitable bound and sealed surface along with lighting for both the temporary and final alignment of the proposed diversions.	This recommendation is noted, and it is proposed that this matter be discussed further as detailed design progresses, through the process of stakeholder engagement as described in the amended Design Principle PRO.07 within the updated Design Principles included in this submission.
3.3	A226 Gravesend Road	
3.3.1	There is some opportunity to provide betterment to the existing cycling provision on the A226 Gravesend Road. The current provision is in the form of mandatory on-carriageway cycle lanes which appear non-compliant with current guidance and are located on a high volume, high speed interurban link road.	The Applicant proposes to make available an active travel fund, valued at £1 million, to fund active travel studies and interventions that would enable local active travel provision to better integrate with the new and upgraded provision delivered by National Highways. This commitment is secured by an addition to the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register, included with this submission.
3.3.2	National Highways is also encouraged to consider suitable crossing provisions on this route to serve bus stop locations and connection to the existing footway.	National Highways has contributed to a study undertaken by Kent County Council on the A226. It is suggested that an assessment of the issues raised by Active Travel England on the A226 Gravesend Road could be undertaken using this fund if agreed with the relevant authorities.
3.4	Muckingford Road	
3.4.1	The proposed foot and cycleway along Muckingford Road would connect the eastern edge of Chadwell St Mary with the western edge of East Tilbury and importantly serve new	The Applicant proposes to make available an active travel fund, valued at £1 million, to fund active travel studies and interventions that would enable local active travel provision to better integrate with the new and upgraded provision delivered by National Highways. This commitment is secured by an addition to

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
	residential development between these settlements as identified in Thurrock's emerging Local Plan. While this new link is welcome, the western section terminates just before two roundabouts along Linford Road which have wide carriageways that encourage higher speeds and create likely conflicts between cyclists and motor vehicles. Moreover, the eastern section ends just as it enters the village of East Tilbury and a short extension to this would provide enhanced connectivity to the village train station. An extension to the existing route alignment and/or financial contribution towards improving onward connectivity should be considered.	the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register, included with this submission. It is suggested that an assessment of the issues raised by Active Travel England on Muckingford Road could be undertaken using this fund if agreed with the relevant authorities.
3.5	Express bus service	
3.5.1	ATE could not source any proposal to fund an express bus service(s) that would provide a north-south public transport link via the proposed tunnel. While it is acknowledged that the LTC scheme would be unlikely to support bus stops on the route itself for safety reasons, its junctions with the M25 and A13/A1089 to the north and A2/M2 to the south provide an opportunity to link major settlements and transport nodes on either side of the River Thames via non-car modes that currently doesn't exist.	The Applicant agrees that the Project would provide an opportunity to link major settlements and transport nodes on either side of the River Thames via new public transport routes, given the new connectivity that the Project would provide across the Lower Thames area.
3.5.3	ATE would invite National Highways to consider pump priming a north-south service to support non-car journeys across the river. In support of this proposal, an independent review on the	The Applicant does not consider that it would be appropriate to provide funding for new or improved bus services, including a north-south express service. The

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
	Impact of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund found that, in areas where investment in sustainable transport projects was secured, both car use and carbon emissions fell while schemes delivered social and economic benefits in relation to accessibility and inclusion.	<p>Applicant considers that decisions relating to existing and/or public transport routes should be made by local authorities or commercial operators.</p> <p>The Applicant is working with Essex County Council to help them examine opportunities for new cross river services by sharing data from the Applicant's transport model. The Applicant will share further data with the County and with other local authorities to enable wider consideration of the new and improved journey opportunities across the River Thames.</p>
3.6	Area Travel Plan	
3.6.1	<p>A travel plan to promote the uptake of active travel and public transport for everyday local journeys in the vicinity of the LTC scheme has not been proposed to date. The benefits of preparing such a travel plan include but is not limited to:</p> <p>(i). Establishing the baseline modal trip rate for key existing routes that would be diverted (e.g. the NCN 177) and set a target to establish whether the proposed works were successful in increasing trip rates. Funding could be assigned to incentivise the use of routes where this falls below target levels (e.g. improved lighting, addition of play facilities along leisure routes).</p> <p>(ii). Identify opportunities to increase patronage on existing local buses to offset increased motor traffic on the A2/M2 west of Gravesend. In particular, funding to increase the frequency of Arriva's 190 (Chatham to Gravesend) and 700 (Chatham to</p>	<p>The Applicant has developed and submitted a Framework Construction Travel Plan [REP9-233] which seeks to minimise the impacts of its workforce on the road network during the construction phase of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that it would be appropriate to produce an Area Travel Plan which would apply once the Project is operational.</p> <p>As noted above in response to paragraph 3.5.3 the Applicant does not consider it appropriate for it to provide funding for new or improved bus services.</p> <p>The Applicant has however, following consideration of the points made by Active Travel England, determined that it will make available an active travel fund, valued at £1 million, to fund active travel studies and interventions that would enable local active travel provision to better integrate with the new and upgraded provision delivered by National Highways. This commitment is secured by an addition to the Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register, included with this submission.</p>

Ref.	Active Travel England comment	Applicant's response
	<p>Bluewater Shopping Centre) bus services may reduce the demand for people to use sections of the Strategic Road Network for local east-west journeys.</p> <p>(iii). There is no cycle parking available at East Tilbury train station that would allow people to transition between different modes of transport, with particular regard to the new cycleway to be provided along Muckingford Road. A financial contribution towards station parking should therefore be considered.</p>	
3.6.2	<p>ATE would invite National Highways to consider an Area Travel Plan as a future submission requirement, to include sufficient detail on the active travel and public transport infrastructure to be funded, and how the uptake of new and improved active travel networks will be embedded by appropriate initiatives. Moreover, details of effective and influential actions to be taken if targets are not met should also be set out.</p>	

Annex C – Update on other Side Agreements

A.1.2 Table B.1 sets out the updated position of the agreements that were reported as outstanding on the 11 April following a request made by the SoS in the letter dated 28 March 2024

Table A.2 Updated agreements position

No.	Interested Party	Agreement type	Agreements update	Status of agreement on 26 November 2024
1	Hill Residential Ltd.	Voluntary public right of way Dedication Agreement	The Applicant confirms that terms have been agreed, and the Applicant has requested confirmation to enable the agreements to be completed.	Terms agreed, and agreements sent for execution/completion.
2	Whitecroft Care Home	Agreement to acquire	The Applicant continues to engage with Whitecroft Care Home on a voluntary agreement. As set out previously, the dDCO has been updated to secure the acquisition of the site following the beginning of development. This mechanism was previously endorsed by Whitecroft Care Home.	Agreement under negotiation.
3	The Mee Family	Side Legal Agreement including a voluntary public right of way dedication agreement.	Engagement with the Mee Family continues, and the terms have been substantially agreed. The Applicant is confident that an agreement will be reached in due course.	Agreement under negotiation.
3	Tarmac Building Products Limited	Voluntary Access Agreement and Voluntary Acquisition Agreement	There are two agreements under negotiation with Tarmac Building Products Limited (TBPL); Access Agreement and Voluntary Acquisition Agreement.	Agreements under negotiation.

No.	Interested Party	Agreement type	Agreements update	Status of agreement on 26 November 2024
			<p>Access Agreement: the Applicant and TBPL have had extensive engagement and negotiations concerning the Heads of Terms. Upon agreement, the Applicant will seek approval from UKPN and National Grid Electricity Transmission before instructing solicitors to formalise agreement.</p> <p>Voluntary Acquisition Agreement: after a sustained period of negotiations in relation to the Heads of Terms, the Applicant became aware on 1 October 2024 that TBPL rejected the comprehensive form of voluntary agreement which was under negotiation, and requested it be restructured to permit the voluntary acquisition of National Grid Electricity Transmission's new easement only. The Applicant updated and reissued Heads of Terms to TBPL on 13 November 2024 and has received provisional comments back from TBPL's agent, relating to fees, on 15 November 2024. The Applicant will seek to address the fee position and attempt to conclude agreement in due course.</p>	
5	Network Rail	Property Agreements	The Applicant is still engaged with Network Rail to agree the detailed terms and form of the property agreements proposed to give	Agreement under negotiation.

No.	Interested Party	Agreement type	Agreements update	Status of agreement on 26 November 2024
			effect to the acquisition of interests in land in respect of which Network Rail enjoys interests. The Applicant considers its proposed form of Protective Provision provides adequate protection for the reasons explains in Annex D of its letter to the Secretary of State dated 11 April 2024 .	
6	The Benton Family, the Mott Family and Cheale Group	Side Legal Agreement including a voluntary public right of way dedication agreement.	<p>The Applicant offered voluntary agreements for those landowners where a public right of way is proposed to enable voluntary dedication (see sections 3.5.16 and 3.6.10 of Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for CAH3 [REP6-087] further). The Applicant continues to negotiate these agreements but this does not affect the powers sought under the dDCO (see section 3.6.11 of Post-event submissions, including written submission of oral comments, for CAH3 [REP6-087]).</p> <p>The agreement with the Cheale Group is now agreed, and the Applicant is awaiting completion of the agreement.</p>	Two agreements under negotiation, and one agreement where terms are agreed and completion is awaited.