

**Application by Port of Tilbury London Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for a Proposed Port Terminal at the Former Tilbury Power Station ('Tilbury2')**

**Deadline 2**

**Highways England Response to Thurrock Council's Response to First Written Questions**

<b>FWQ</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Thurrock Council's Response</b>	<b>HE Comments</b>
1.18.1	Regarding Network Rail's need [RR-013] to have agreements in place to safeguard Network Rail's interests and the safety and integrity of the operational railway:		
	a) What is the current position between Network Rail and the Applicant?		
	b) What matters remain to be resolved?		
	c) Can Network Rail confirm that it will table a Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant at Deadline 1 (20 March 2018)?		
	d) Is Network Rail content with the Protective Provisions in dDCO Schedule 10 Part 6 For the Protection of Railway Interests?		
1.18.2	With reference to Royal Mail's interests [RR-029] and its request for the Applicant to give careful consideration to potential cumulative construction traffic impacts and remediation measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the capacity of the highways network; to acknowledge the		

	<p>requirement to ensure that major road users are not disrupted through full consultation at the appropriate times during the DCO and development processes; and to fully consult Royal Mail in advance on the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and name Royal Mail in the list of transport operators for consultation on usage of the network:</p>		
	a) What is the current position between Royal Mail and the Applicant?		
	b) What matters remain to be resolved?		
	c) How does Royal Mail envisage its needs being met in the dDCO?		
1.18.3	With reference to ECC's relevant representation [RR-018]:		
	a) Would ECC give more detail on its outstanding concern regarding M25 J30 on which the Council requires further clarification?		
	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?		
	c) Would the Applicant state its response to ECC's request for clarification, information and mitigation concerning sustainable travel modes and provision of public t		
	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?		
1.18.4		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":		
	a)	What are the Applicant's and HE's response to this concern of GBC?		
1.18.5		With reference to HE's relevant representation [RR-020], in which HE raises a number of concerns:		
	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?		
	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?		
	c)	What is HE's current position on the effects of the Proposed Development on the strategic road network and whether they can be can be mitigated so that the residual impacts are not severe?		
	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?		
	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?		
1.18.6		The ES [APP-031] Chapter 13 paragraph 13.3 et seq cite the Transport Assessment [APP-072], the 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:		
	a)	Would the Applicant state where the Transport Assessment is secured in the dDCO?		
	b)	Would ECC and TC state whether they are content with the Transport Assessment as currently drafted?	TC has areas of concern with the Transport Assessment particularly regarding the proposed mitigation measures and impacts on the local highway network as well as the proposed Active Travel Measures along the new port access road. These concerns are detailed further in the answer to question 1.18.10 below.	HE shares TC's concerns relating to the impacts on the highway network and proposed mitigation measures. HE is attempting to address outstanding queries with the applicant regarding the trip generation of the proposed development. Subject to the concerns being satisfactorily addressed, HE will reach an informed view of the impact on the operation of the Asda Roundabout and the level of mitigation which is required. However, based upon the predicted traffic flows set out in

			<p>the Transport Assessment, the currently proposed level of mitigation is considered to be unacceptable to HE.</p>
c)	<p>Would ECC, TC and HE state whether they are content with the Framework Travel Plan and Sustainable Distribution Plan as currently drafted?</p>	<p><u>Framework Travel Plan:</u> Generally, the FTP is acceptable, subject to some suggested amendments.</p> <p>A primary point of issue is that the FTP is for the new development only. TC suggests that the FTP should extend across the whole of the Port development within the control of the Applicant. Elsewhere across the Borough, when there are additions to a development, travel plans are required to be inclusive of the whole site, not just the new development. It is accepted that existing occupiers, except any managed by the Applicant, should not be forced to adopt the FTP, however any new occupiers on the existing Port site, and any occupier on the proposed Tilbury2 site should be made to adopt the FTP across the whole port site. For example, should company 'A', who have been present on the existing Port for 10 years, choose to add an additional presence at Tilbury2, the FTP and TTP's must be adopted across both sites. The purpose of any travel plan is to promote and manage sustainable travel within communities, and this process provides a mechanism to enable a higher inclusion of organisations to be contributing sustainable travel and its impact on the local community. The Applicant could implement the FTP across all operations within their wider site. This request was made by TC in their initial response to the FTP in October 2017.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed Tenant Travel Plans, these should be submitted to and approved by the Sustainable Travel Steering Group prior to bringing the Tenant's site into use, or at the earliest opportunity. All TTP's must use the objectives within the FTP as a minimum requirement, though there will be an expectation for the TTP's to go above and beyond the FTP.</p>	<p>HE has provided a response to this point in our submission to the FWQs. HE is in discussion with the Applicant about amendments to both the Framework Travel Plan and the Sustainable Distribution Plan.</p> <p>HE is in discussion with the Applicant about the Framework Travel Plan. HE has 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>The majority of the points that TC has raised are common with the points that HE has raised and therefore support the issues have raised by TC on the FTP.</p>

		<p>The Steering Group should be chaired by the Applicant, as well as undertake any secretarial functions.</p> <p>Cycle Parking – Para 6.2.4 states that cycle parking will be provided in line with the TC’s parking standards. It is recommended that cycle parking be delivered in consultation with TC Highways Development Control and Sustainable Transport Teams, to ensure there is adequate provision for immediate use, and sufficient provision for growth in cycling, as well as potential safeguarding of space for additional parking.</p> <p>Within the Walking and Cycling section, a recommendation was also made in relation to making security alarms available for staff when travelling to and from the site. Given the relative remoteness of the site, staff who chose to walk and cycle to the site should have some security of a siren/flashing alarm to attract attention when they feel there are being threatened or in danger.</p> <p>The monitoring of the travel plan should take place annually, with an annual staff survey across the site. TC’s response in October 2017 stated that a survey every two years was considered unacceptable on a site of this size. Para 8.4.3 states that the first travel survey will be undertaken within 6 months of first occupation. TC would like to see staff surveys undertaken within 6 months of the occupation of each tenant site on the development. This will help steer targets specific for each TTP within a short time relative to each tenant site being brought into use.</p> <p>TC’s response in October 2017 also suggested a number of considerations for inclusion within the FTP. The primary request was for an on-site Parking Management Plan, to ensure HGV’s and staff vehicles are correctly managed on site. Any car parking management plan would also help to determine how car sharing spaces will be managed and enforced.</p> <p>TC has re-launched the former Freight Quality Partnership. The Thurrock Freight Logistics and Transporting Partnership has been in place since October 2017. TC are grateful for Tilbury Port’s attendance, however all</p>	<p>HE is in discussion with the Applicant about the Sustainable Distribution Plan. HE has requested that a number of amendments be made. HE agree with the points raised on the SDP within this section of the FWQs.</p> <p>In addition, HE would like the opportunity to review the updated SDP and FTP when they become available.</p>
--	--	---	--

new site occupiers should become members of the FLTP following occupation of the site.

The Five year travel plan period should commence once all works on site have been completed, and not from the period of first occupation. There may be aspects of the site which are not brought into use within five years of any first occupation.

Sustainable Distribution Plan:

Upon reflection, it is recommended that the SDP could be merged into the FTP, to manage all aspects of sustainable travel and transport under one umbrella. The SDP already mentions that the issue of freight will be discussed at the FTP Steering Group meetings.

It is pleasing to see that the site is proposing for approximately 44% of aggregates to be transported by rail. It would also be encouraging if other freight arriving at the port is also moved via rail, significantly removing the number of HGV's from the local road network. However the greatest concern is what happens should this quantity or proportion of aggregate movement by rail, and by water (approx. 10%) is not achieved. There is concern that there is insufficient capacity on the rail network beyond the London-Tilbury-Southend railway line, particularly freight paths through London which will allow such capacity movements. There is additional competition from other ports in the area and region, as well as existing demand from Tilbury. The SDP does not state what the outcomes are to be if these targets are not achieved.

The SDP alludes to the use of a Vehicle Booking System without outwardly saying so, however this will most likely be used to manage demand. Within Thurrock, the greater issue is the availability of freight parking for vehicles which have arrived early or need to rest. There are currently insufficient details of these proposals within the SDP. There is also a requirement to support some overnight parking within the area created by additional HGV traffic within the area.

		<p>As per the FTP, the SDP monitoring states that it will be monitored for a period of five years after first occupation. TC believes the monitoring should commence upon first occupation, and for a period of five years following the completion of the development and full occupation. Monitoring should also take place each year, and not once every two years.</p> <p>Overall, the submitted FTP and SDP are not sufficiently drafted to be acceptable. However, with some minor amendments based on the comments TC has provided, these can be considered acceptable. Accordingly there currently remains a need for the Applicant to remain in contact with TC.</p>	
	d)	Would the Applicant state whether it intends to update the Framework Travel Plan and Sustainable Distribution Plan during the Examination?	
1.18.7		KCC states [RR-021] that it supports modal shift from road to sea and rail, notes that the application proposes 2 or 3 train movements per day, and asserts that the application must ensure capacity of available train paths through London:	
	a)	Would the Applicant state how it is proposing to ensure capacity of available train paths through London, whilst not adversely affect passenger rail services?	
	b)	In response to KCC's call for consideration of lorry parking to be provided as part of the Proposed Development, due to the significant HGV movements associated with the application, what is the Applicant's position on this matter?	
1.18.8		With reference to resident Mr Colin Elliott's relevant representation [RR-001], in which he asserts that "the existing road	

		that goes around the Ferry fields could be upgraded rather than putting a new road near to residential area”:	
	a)	What is the Applicant’s response to this assertion by Mr Elliott?	
1.18.9		With reference to PRE’s relevant representation [RR-028], in which PRE states that its priority is to ensure the continued efficient and effective operation of its terminals:	
	a)	What assurance can the Applicant give to PRE and its related group companies with regard to the continued functioning of the M25 (notably J30) and the A13 during both construction and operations?	
	b)	How does the Applicant intend to take account of the existing planning permissions with Thurrock Council for development at Purfleet Thames Terminal (PTT) with regard to transport impacts?	
	c)	How will the Applicant ensure the continued access to, and use of, the River Thames by vessels serving PTT and Dartford International Ferry Terminal (DIFT)?	
	d)	Would PRE highlight any mitigation measures that it wishes to propose?	
1.18.10		With reference to TC’s relevant representation [RR-031], TC states that it disagrees with some of the assumptions and opinions within the submitted Transport Assessment [APP-072], in	

	particular in relation to the local road network:		
a)	Would TC specify the matters on which it disagrees with the Applicant?	<p>TC's view is that there are three main areas of concern comprising (i) direct traffic impact on the Asda roundabout junction, which is Highway England's asset; (ii) the proposed Active Travel provision along the new port access road including onward links to Brennan Road; and (iii) the efficiency and resilience of the A1089 for planned maintenance and emergency road closures.</p> <p>i. Whilst the direct traffic impact cannot be directly objected to in relation to the intensification of access at this junction, there is concern with the proposed mitigation measures for this junction which will see a worsening to the RFC on the Dock Road, Tilbury and Thurrock Park Way arms at peak times. Both of these arms are TC highways assets.</p>	<p>HE share TC's three main areas of concern.</p> <p>(i) Based on the current trip generation, (which it should be noted is not yet agreed between HE and the Applicant), Table 6.19 of the TA shows that the PoT2 scheme is currently predicting 174 HGVs (equivalent to 400PCUs, assuming an HGV = 2.3PCUs) in the AM Peak hour (0800-0900) and 97 HGVs (equivalent to 225PCUs) in the PM Peak hour (1700-1800), all of which will pass through the Asda Roundabout. In addition to the HGVs, there are car trips to consider which equates to 46PCUs in the AM Peak Hour and 70PCUs in the PM Peak Hour. In total, this equates to a significant impact – a total of 446PCUs in the AM Peak hour and 295PCUs in the PM Peak Hour.</p> <p>In addition, the busiest hour for HGVs is 1100-1200 when 191 HGV movements are generated</p>

		<p>ii. With regard to Active Travel provision, the proposed crossing facility should be relocated to the new junction between Ferry Road and the port access road and consideration should also be given to signalling the junction. TC notes that the Applicant suggests that the junction would operate in relation to the proposed priority junction status. However, TC is concerned that when pedestrian and cycle movements are factored into the operation of this junction, as well as the significant movements of HGVs and car between Tilbury2 and Gate 2 (existing Port pre-delivery and inspection facilities) then this would meet the criteria to consider a signalised junction with toucan phase. No assessment of this junction as a signalised junction has been forthcoming and the Applicant</p>	<p>by the site (equivalent to 439PCUs). This demonstrates that the proposed site will generate significant volumes of HGV movements in a 24hr period, with the highest volumes (97-191 per hour) being generated between 0700 and 1700. All of these trips will route via the A1089 and the Asda Roundabout. These represent very significant flow increases as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant should provide mitigation to Asda roundabout to offset capacity issues in accordance with the policy in Department for Transport Circular 02/2013.</p> <p>(ii) HE has recently improved the shared pedestrian/cycle link along the western side of the A1089 to the north of the Asda Roundabout and is also in the process of upgrading the crossing facilities on Thurrock Park Way from an informal crossing to a Toucan Crossing. HE considers that further mitigation /improvement measures would assist TC/HE to improve / join up / provide the</p>
--	--	---	---

is encouraged to undertake this assessment. With reference to proposed cycle links along the port access road, these appear to terminate at the point where Fort Road starts to progress north over the existing railway over-bridge. The existing bridge structure does not have sufficient road space to provide a cycle facility and no footways exist on the north side of the bridge linking to Brennan Road. TC has requested that the Applicant consider a potential onward link to Brennan Road, particularly as TC has aspirations to designate National Cycle Network 13 through the centre of Tilbury, along Brennan Road and then south to Tilbury Fort along Fort Road. This is considered as suitable mitigation against the closure of the at-grade crossing facility (FP 144) between the Hairpin Bridge and Fort Road bridge by maintaining two enhanced facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to access the riverside and Tilbury-Gravesend ferry.

iii. The Local Impact Report submitted by TC referred to the efficiency and impact of the development if and when the A1089 is subject to road closures, either planned maintenance or as a result of an incident. These events can cause significant congestion and HGV movements in and around Tilbury, due to the 24-hour operation of the existing Port, to the detriment of highways safety, efficiency and amenity. TC has requested the Applicant and Highways England to investigate whether strategic maintenance crossover facilities on the A1089 could be provided, which would aid the efficient use of that road and would enhance the efficiency of the existing and proposed extended port.

necessary the facilities on pedestrian and cycle desire lines in Thurrock. This would encourage more travel by walking and cycling modes of transport.

iii HE considers that a strategic cross-over would permit vehicles to continue using the A1089 during closures which would prevent HGVs from having to travel along a diversion route (through residential areas) which is not considered to be either suitable or appropriate for the levels of HGVs travelling to/from the port, especially given the predicted increases through the 24hour period.

Provision of a crossover may well be required in order to construct mitigation works at

			Asda roundabout without unacceptable impacts on surrounding routes.
	b) Would TC specify its outstanding issues regarding impact on the Asda roundabout junction and associated mitigation proposals, and state what other mitigation measures it would propose?	TC is of the view that alternative mitigation measures should be advanced that do not affect the Dock Road, Tilbury and Thurrock Park Way arms of the Asda roundabout junction. During pre-submission discussions TC suggested the assessment of full or part signalisation of the junction. The Applicant has suggested that full signalisation would not be feasible without significant change to the junction and this is agreed. However, the feasibility of part signalisation has not been provided. As a minimum, this should be investigated to determine feasibility and assess whether this could be a viable mitigation measure. In any event, TC would take the lead from Highways England and will look closely at their representations on this matter.	HE considers that with the increasing volumes of pedestrians and cyclists that are using the Asda Roundabout as a result of the developments in the area, the applicant should consider mitigation measures which include reducing the speed limit on the Asda Roundabout from 70mph to 40mph and signal controlled pedestrian / cycle crossing facilities provided on the A1089 approach arms as a minimum. The full or part signalisation as suggested by TC could include the crossing facilities that HE consider are required.
	c) Would the Applicant state how the Proposed Development has addressed vehicle movement on the local roads network?		
	d) Would the Applicant state how it has addressed the needs of non-motorised users (local walking and cycle network, including public rights of way)?		
1.18.11	With reference to the relevant representation of London Gateway Port Limited (LGPL) [RR- 022], LGPL asserts that the assessment carried out in support of the Tilbury 2 proposals does not appear to have considered available		

		capacity on the regional/national rail network to accommodate the predicted rail movements:	
	a)	What is the Applicant's response to this assertion from LGPL?	
1.18.12		The ES [APP-031] makes numerous references to an Active Travel Study for improvements to pedestrian and cyclist connectivity in the area which is stated to be secured through the draft DCO and a s106 agreement with the council. There appears to be no reference to an Active Travel Study within the draft DCO, although it is appended to a draft Heads of Terms for the s106 in Doc Ref 6.3:	
	a)	Would the Applicant state how the dDCO will secure the Active Travel Study?	
1.18.13		ES [APP-031] Table 4.1 identifies existing buildings on the site which would be demolished as part of the Proposed Development. It states that material would be crushed and potentially reused on site. Without guarantee of the material being retained on site, the ExA will need to be satisfied that a worst case assessment of traffic impacts has been undertaken:	
	a)	Would the Applicant confirm whether the traffic movements associated with potentially moving this material off site have been taken into account?	
	b)	If not, would the Applicant comment on, and justify, whether these movements would have any bearing on the assessment presented within the ES?	

1.18.14	<p>ES [APP-031] paragraphs 2.57-2.63 explain that the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) will not be assessed for cumulative effects because of the limited information available. However, it should be noted that the scoping report for LTC was received by PINS on 2 November 2017 and there is a clear overlap of the application site boundaries along the infrastructure corridor. The Applicant was advised to update its assessment in post acceptance section 51 advice:</p>		
	<p>a) Would the Applicant state its current position with regard to the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development and the LTC?</p>		