

## Highways England First Written Questions Responses

FWQ: 27 February 2018  
Responses due by: 20 March 2018

1.18.3	Applicant/ Essex County Council (ECC)/ Highways England (HE)/ Network Rail (NR)	<p>With reference to ECC's relevant representation [RR-018]:</p> <p>a) Would ECC give more detail on its outstanding concern regarding M25 J30 on which the Council requires further clarification?</p> <p>b) Would the Applicant and HE state their response to ECC's request for them to take account of respective proposals to ensure junction capacity?</p> <p>c) Would the Applicant state its response to ECC's request for clarification, information and mitigation concerning sustainable travel modes and provision of public transport to coincide with shift patterns?</p> <p>d) Would the Applicant and NR state their response to ECC's request for clarification on the cumulative impacts on the rail network, passenger and freight capacity, connectivity and network resilience between Essex and London?</p>	<p>Highways England is seeking clarification from Essex County Council about the Council's concerns regarding M25 J30. Highways England has identified M25 J30 as a location that may require mitigation in order to render the Proposed Development acceptable. Highways England has asked the Applicant for further information about the impact of the Proposed Development on M25 J30.</p> <p>ECC's relevant representation [RR-018] states in their third point that "<i>Lower Thames Crossing - ECC expect Tilbury 2 &amp; LTC to take account of respective proposals to ensure junction capacity.</i>"</p> <p>Highways England is currently revising the traffic model for the LTC, also incorporating Highways England's latest thinking on detailed design of LTC. If the Applicant used the current assumptions for LTC in a cumulative assessment of the Proposed Development with LTC, that assessment may be unrealistic. Furthermore providing further detailed information on the traffic model and on the route of LTC prior to a formal consultation would compromise the integrity of the planned consultation. Highways England accepts responsibility for assessing the cumulative traffic impacts</p>
--------	---	---	---

## Highways England First Written Questions Responses

FWQ: 27 February 2018  
Responses due by: 20 March 2018

			<p>from the Proposed Development and LTC in Highway England's application for LTC.</p> <p>Highways England considers that any mitigation necessary at M25J30 as a result of the Proposed Development should be made a Requirement within the dDCO, rather than relying on any mitigation that might in due course be provided by Highways England at M25J30 as a result of LTC.</p>
1.18.4	Applicant/ Gravesham Borough Council (GBC)/ Highways England (HE)	<p>With reference to GBC's concern [RR-019] to see a SoCG between the Applicant and HE agreed to ensure that the traffic impacts on Gravesham "generated by the Port of Tilbury by virtue of the Lower Thames Crossing once built, are comprehensively modelled and mitigated for and don't fall between these 2 NSIP projects":</p> <p>a) What are the Applicant's and HE's response to this concern of GBC?</p>	<p>Highways England is currently revising the traffic model for the LTC, also incorporating Highways England's latest thinking on detailed design of LTC. If the Applicant used the current assumptions for LTC in a cumulative assessment of the Proposed Development with LTC, that assessment may be unrealistic. Furthermore providing further detailed information on the traffic model and on the route of LTC prior to a formal consultation would compromise the integrity of the consultation planned by Highways England. Highways England accepts responsibility for assessing the cumulative traffic impacts from the Proposed Development and LTC in Highway England's application for LTC.</p>
1.18.5	Applicant/ Highways	<p>With reference to HE's relevant representation [RR-020], in which HE raises a number of</p>	<p>a) There are two issues here that need to be addressed, these are the fitness for purpose</p>

## Highways England First Written Questions Responses

FWQ: 27 February 2018  
Responses due by: 20 March 2018

	England (HE)	<p>concerns:</p> <p>a) What is HE's assessment of the fitness for purpose of the Transport Assessment (cited in ES [APP-031] Chapter 13 paragraph 13.3 et seq), including its compliance with WebTAG?</p> <p>b) What is the Applicant's response to HE's request for justification of the absence of proposed mitigation works at certain locations, namely A1089/A126 (Marshfoot Road junction), A1089/A13 merge and M25 junction 30?</p> <p>c) What is HE's current position on the effects of the Proposed Development on the strategic road network and whether they can be mitigated so that the residual impacts are not severe?</p> <p>d) Re HE's assertion that circular 02/2013 requires developers' proposals to comply with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, does the Applicant agree with this assertion?</p> <p>e) Would the Applicant and HE state the extent to which the Proposed Development complies with the DMRB, and highlight all areas in which it does not comply?</p>	<p>of the Transport Assessment (TA) for the Proposed Development and the TA's compliance with WebTAG.</p> <p>Examining the fitness for purpose of the TA, Highways England considers that the submitted TA has been prepared in accordance with DfT Planning Practice Guidance Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements which supersedes the previous DfT WebTAG methodology in the "Guidance on TA". However, we are currently in ongoing discussions with the Applicant to resolve a number of fundamental issues with the TA, which include trip generation, forecasts, traffic impact assessments and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>In terms of the TA's compliance with WebTAG, the TA provides a reference to the National Policy Statement for Ports (January 2012) in paragraph 5.4.4 which states that "If a project is likely to have significant transport implications, the applicant's ES should include a transport assessment, using the WebTAG methodology stipulated in Department for Transport guidance".</p> <p>On closer examination, paragraph 5.4.4 of</p>
--	--------------	--	---

Highways England First Written Questions Responses

FWQ: 27 February 2018  
 Responses due by: 20 March 2018

			<p>the National Policy Statement specially makes a reference (included in the footer) to the DfT Guidelines for Transport Assessments published in March 2007. This was withdrawn in 2014. It should be noted that the DfT Guidelines bear no relationship to WebTAG. For the purpose of clarity, WebTAG provides specific guidance on procedures for transport modelling and appraisal. It does not offer any guidance on the circumstances where a traffic model should be used to support a Transport Assessment. As such, compliance with WebTAG is only applicable when a transport model is being used to support a Transport Assessment. Highway England does not consider a traffic model is needed to assess the impact of the Proposed Development on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p>c) The HE's current position is that the traffic generated by the Proposed Development has not been agreed nor its impact on the SRN. As set out in Q1.1.2 the Applicant has proposed alterations to the Asda roundabout on the A1089 but the HE has not agreed the design of these or that they suitably mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development. It is possible that mitigation may be needed at other locations on the SRN. If further mitigation is needed</p>
--	--	--	---

Highways England First Written Questions Responses

FWQ: 27 February 2018  
 Responses due by: 20 March 2018

			<p>its design needs to be agreed                  In addition the Applicant has not completed the design of drainage and flood risk assessments to a stage where Highways England can be satisfied that the Proposed Development would not result in severe harm to the safe and effective operation of the Strategic Road Network.                  Until these matters are resolved it is not possible to assess the effects of the Proposed Development on the SRN and whether they can be can be mitigated so that the residual impacts are not severe. The HE has been in discussion with the Applicant on these matters, these discussions are active and ongoing.</p> <p>e) Discussions on the location and design of mitigation are ongoing and no mitigation has yet been agreed. Therefore it is not currently possible to answer this question. Furthermore detailed design of mitigation to the SRN will continue after the agreement of any DCO for the Proposed Development. Therefore the dDCO should contain provisions requiring mitigation to or affecting the SRN to be designed to DMRB.</p>
1.18.6	Applicant/ Essex County Council	The ES [APP-031] Chapter 13 paragraph 13.3 et seq cite the Transport Assessment [APP-072], the	c) HE is in discussion with the Applicant about amendments to both the Framework Travel

## Highways England First Written Questions Responses

FWQ: 27 February 2018  
Responses due by: 20 March 2018

	<p>(ECC)/ Thurrock Council (TC)/ Highways England (HE)</p>	<p>Framework Travel Plan [APP-073], and Sustainable Distribution Plan [APP-074]. The latter two documents are secured within the dDCO [APP-016] Schedule 2 Part 1 by Requirement 11:</p> <p>a) Would the Applicant state where the Transport Assessment is secured in the dDCO?</p> <p>b) Would ECC and TC state whether they are content with the Transport Assessment as currently drafted?</p> <p>c) Would ECC, TC and HE state whether they are content with the Framework Travel Plan and Sustainable Distribution Plan as currently drafted?</p> <p>d) Would the Applicant state whether it intends to update the Framework Travel Plan and Sustainable Distribution Plan during the Examination?</p>	<p>Plan and the Sustainable Distribution Plan. The Framework Travel Plan is under discussion with the Applicant. We have requested a number of amendments that includes the provision of a minibus link between the port, Tilbury Town train station, Ferry dock and population centres like Tilbury, Grays and Basildon by the applicant. This has been requested due to the remote location of PoT2 and that the majority of footways in the area, where present, are unlit which raises safety concerns.</p> <p>In terms of the Sustainable Distribution Plan, it is again under discussion and we have requested that a number of amendments are made.</p>
--	--	---	--