

THAMES CROSSING  
ACTION GROUP

[www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com)

Whilst we obviously remain strongly opposed to the LTC, we have always said that we will try to maintain a two pronged approach of fighting LTC, but also being aware of the need to try and ensure the best worst case scenario if it does go ahead.

We understand the council's comments that as a local authority they need to ensure the best outcome for Thurrock with regard to mitigation. However, we have some questions and concerns in relation to the Economic Mitigation List as we feel there are measures that HE should be fulfilling as standard mitigation, and there are also measures that we consider to be Council responsibility regardless of whether LTC goes ahead or not, so should not feature as LTC mitigation or legacy. We include our key comments on the list below, and are happy to discuss further if the council wish.

The following are our responses to Thurrock Council's commissioned Economic Mitigation List <sup>1</sup>

Point v. of the Exec Summary on page 2 of the document states, "It ***does not meet several national and Highways England strategic policy tests and scheme objectives***, including the delivery of economic growth and achieving sustainable local growth within the Thurrock area."

Can we please have any more detail of what these strategic policy tests are?

**Comments on the 22 measures listed**, should be read in conjunction with the list

**M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M11, M12, M14, M15, M16, CLS9, CLS10, CLS12** – Shouldn't this be standard mitigation, not on a council wish list?

**M6** - Why have only East Tilbury and Chadwell St Mary been named in concerns for noise mitigation, we are sure people in all areas will feel they need and deserve better noise mitigation.

**M7** – We feel that the main reason that this is on the wish list is to try and get HE to be funding towards the Stanford Station improvements after it has all gone pear shaped. Plus we do not believe that construction workers are going to travel further to Stanford, most likely coming past the Tilbury/East Tilbury area, as it will increase the cost of their ticket and their travel time to have to go further on to Stanford and then get on a bus back to the construction sites. We also believe that large numbers of the workers will arrive by road and not on public transport, as has been experienced during investigative works. Whilst we obviously don't want or welcome the huge number of construction workers to our area, we simply do not believe this is a realistic request.

**M8** – We would be interested to know more about what these innovative public transport measures are.

**M9** – Again from experience of how workers travel during investigative works, we highly doubt this is a realistic request, especially since many of the construction sites are not at easily accessible sites for active travel.

**M10** – Surely this is something that HE have already stated they aim to be doing? Whilst we welcome the use of river to get traffic off roads, we also note that river transport can be highly polluting also, and that needs to be taken into account, but as a standard requirement to HE, not a wish list request.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://democracy.thurrock.gov.uk/documents/b17942/Economic%20Mitigation%20list%20Updated%2012th-Oct-2020%2018.00%20Lower%20Thames%20Crossing%20Task%20Force.pdf?T=9>

THAMES CROSSING  
ACTION GROUP

[www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com)

**M13** – Whilst we welcome any forms of reducing noise pollution, we would question whether it is not up the council to ensure that local roads are maintained and noise levels reduced on all roads as standard procedure?

**M17** – What are the Revised Proposals for A13/LTC Junction?

**M18, M19, M20, M21, M22** – Can we please have more detail on what is being suggested on all these points and with the last three in particular why are they limited to these locations? What about other locations like Buckingham Hill Rd, Stanford and East Tilbury/Linford (when Manor Way roundabout is gridlocked)

**CLS1** – We only consider that this should be on the list if the council truly believe that there could be any possible economic benefits. It would be a wasted opportunity to have HE funding this, if the team are not genuinely going to be able to support residents and businesses secure economic benefits.

**CLS2** – We would be interested to learn more about how that scheme would work, and what the criteria would be for businesses to qualify. If this is an option it should not be purely for the big companies.

**CLS3** – Haven't HE already stated that this would be the case, so why is it on the council wish list?

**CLS4** – we would appreciate further details of this so we can better understand what is being proposed, and whether this is actually directly LTC related or just the council trying to get more funding for supporting the unemployed sector. Whilst we appreciate the need to support this sector should it really be considered LTC mitigation?

**CLS5** – Again we would appreciate more info on this so we can better understand what is being proposed please.

**CLS6, CLS11** – More info would be needed on this again please. Would it be purely for areas/businesses impacted by construction, or more in general? If to assist during construction surely this should be standard mitigation and not on a wish list.

**CLS7** – We would appreciate more info on this as we are not familiar with the council's green initiatives scheme.

**CLS8** – Don't Thurrock already have a Community and Public Health Team? Isn't that who did the summary for the HIA update?

**L1** – Clearly this is about supporting the Local Plan and not the best interests of the public. We have all be fighting against the East Tilbury junction/Service Area/ Tilbury Link Rd, and now you are pushing to safeguard it for the future. We are pretty sure that many residents in South Ockendon don't want this either. This is purely the council trying to get assistance towards the Local Plan. New junctions would only add to traffic congestion and pollution issues throughout the borough as they would be used as rat runs whenever there are incidents since HE do not take into account how traffic migrates between the two crossings when there is an incident.

**L2, L4** – Please explain why this is considered a legacy, surely this should be standard business practice to take other developments into account and consideration?

**L3** – Again not sure should be considered a Legacy. Whilst on one hand we can appreciate trying to limit the damage of the haul road within the possible TLR route. It should also be noted that many people are against the TLR and that at this stage it is a pipeline project and has not yet been consulted on or given permission.

**L5, L12** – Is this really a legacy? Isn't it now a requirement that sustainable travel has to be taken into account, not something for a wish list?

THAMES CROSSING  
ACTION GROUP

[www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com)

**L6** – More info please, what is a distributor road and what benefit are they to Thurrock. It sounds like it could just give LTC traffic more access to local areas and roads.

**L7** – What proposed temporary bridge over the Tilbury Loop rail line?

**L8** – We are aware that the reason behind this is again to support the council's Local Plan. This is something that the council should have to do anyway in their own right. We do not consider this to be LTC mitigation.

**L9** – Please explain why priority for buses is needed here as a result of LTC?

**L10** – Yes to improving internet connections, and also mobile phone to a certain extent as the networks will likely be busier as a result of LTC. But many people have concerns over the dangers of 5G. The negative health impacts of LTC are enough without the 5G health risks too.

**L11** – Please explain where and what this means. Is it a temp accommodation compound or actual houses? If temp compound then surely it should have had to be included in the development boundary and therefore consultation stage?

**L13** – this should not be an LTC legacy, this is Thurrock Council's responsibility to repair the damage to the footpath, and it should be dealt with as a matter now, not in the future.

**L14** – Depending on where and what is being proposed we support improvements to PRow.

**L15** – We support all enhancements to green spaces, but they should not be limited to those listed in the document, and should be on as large a scale as possible.

**L16** – Whilst we fully support Coalhouse Fort and it's future, we question why this is on an LTC mitigation list, since it has always had funding, so why can the funding not remain as it has been previously? We're not sure this should be considered an LTC legacy, as it would be managed and funding moving forward regardless of LTC.

**L17** – more detail, does this refer to making it safe? Isn't this something Government/Council should be dealing with anyway, regardless of whether LTC goes ahead or not?

**L18** – Electric vehicles create congestion as much as any other vehicle and give off PM2.5. Also see



**Gareth Johnson** Conservative, Dartford

To ask the [Secretary of State](#) for Transport, what assessment he has made of the potential merits of removing the [Dartford](#) toll charges for owners of wholly electric vehicles.

[Tweet](#) [Share](#)  
[Hansard source](#)  
(Citation: HC Deb, 6 October 2020, cW)



**Rachel Maclean** Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Transport)

The [Dartford Thurrock Crossing](#) was designed to handle up to 135,000 vehicle movements each day, but it is not uncommon for over 180,000 vehicles to use the [Crossing](#).

The [Dartford](#) Road User Charge was introduced in 2003 to manage user demand which currently exceeds the capacity of the [Crossing](#). Given that low or zero emission vehicles also use scarce road capacity, there is a rationale for continuing to charge them to use the [Crossing](#). The Department currently has no plans to remove charges for owners of wholly electric vehicles using the [Crossing](#).

[Tweet](#) [Share](#)  
(Citation: HC Deb, 6 October 2020, cW)

THAMES CROSSING  
ACTION GROUP

[www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com](http://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com)

If Gov have stated they won't do this for Dartford then why would they do it for LTC? If it is not happening at Dartford then it would mean EV users would want to use LTC instead, and we all know there are not adequate connections for this to happen

**L19** – This will simply push more traffic back on to the Dartford Crossing.

**L20** – Carbon Net Zero is something that has to be complied with anyway. The argument should be that LTC should not be going ahead because it would not comply. Again should not be considered a legacy.

**L21** – Love the idea of planting more trees, are there any details of where and on what scale please!? The more trees and forests the better!!!