

THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE PUBLIC INQUIRY

CHECKLIST OF INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

18 April 2006

The following table lists written questions put by the Inspectors to TFL so far during the Inquiry. It would assist the Inspectors for TFL to identify, in each case, the document and paragraph in which their response to each question is provided. TFL are asked to provide a completed version of the table by the adjournment of the Inquiry at the end of the day's business on Thursday 20 April 2006.

Document	Para	Abbreviated query	TFL doc	TFL para
INQ/15: 20/10/05	1.5a	Comments re. travel benefits		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	1.5b	Please provide assessment of number of cross-river trips		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	1.7a	NPV of transport benefits for various user groups		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	1.7b	Confirmation of completeness of list of transport user groups		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	1.7c	Confirmation of completeness of NPV of scheme by user group		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	2.3a	Would the "package" give rise to higher traffic flows than the Scheme? Etc		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	2.3b	Effect of the "package" on scheme economics of the TGB?		
INQ/15: 20/10/05	2.3c	Summary of other effects of the "package" beyond those of the Scheme?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	1.3(i)	How could the summit of the bridge be raised 1m within the constraints described?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	1.3(ii)	If the summit of the bridge were raised by 1m, how contain earthworks within CPO land?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	2.1	Cycleway gradients in locations described		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	3.3	Revised project programme		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	3.4	Effect of programme change on TFL's other evidence?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	4.3	S76 Port of London Act consent – why expected?		

Document	Para	Abbreviated query	TFL doc	TFL para
INQ/18: 24/11/05	4.3	Marine Works Licence – why expected to be granted?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	4.4	Sea Disposal Licence – is this needed? If so, why? And why is it expected to be granted for the Scheme?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	4.4	Drainage Outfall Licence - is this needed? If so, why? And why is it expected to be granted for the Scheme?		
INQ/18: 24/11/05	4.4	OFCOM Licence for Marine Radar and SHF Radio Links - is this needed? If so, why? And why is it expected to be granted for the Scheme?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	1.1, 1.2	Various details regarding junction assessments		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.1	How were the key junctions identified?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.2	Para 19(a) of TFL/202 – times and days on which “peak periods” would occur?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.4	Extent of discount area		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.5	Need for traffic signals at Woolwich Road/New Road junction?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.6	Inclusion in “with TGB” case of network modifications listed in para 19(c) of TFL/202?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.8	Updated version of TFL/125?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.9, 2.10	Various details, junction modelling		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.11	HA view of current proposal effect on M11/A406 junction?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.12	Increased flow on A206 near A282(T)? If so, views of HA?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.13	Explain projected flows on Eastern Way.		

Document	Para	Abbreviated query	TFL doc	TFL para
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.14	Flows and sufficiency of A406 mainline through specified junctions?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.15	Flows and sufficiency of A406 mainline between specified junctions?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.16	Measures proposed & committed re stated issue?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.17	Proposals for Albert Rd/Woolwich Rd/Heron Rd junction? Included in model?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	2.18	Pettman Crescent traffic re-routing to local roads – where? What effect? How established?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	3.1	Method for merge/diverge facility assessments? Findings?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	3.2	Consistency of some surveyed and modelled flows, Junction 2		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	3.3	Meaning of “Total Delay Sec”		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	3.4	Would Harrow Manor Way be wide enough to avoid congestion?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	3.5, 3.6	Knee Hill junction – various matters		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	4.1	Consistency of definitions		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	5.1	TFL/208 Annex 1 – comments invited		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	6.1	U-turns as specified – included in TFL/208?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	6.2	Soundness of TRANSYT modelling – junction 3		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	6.3	Soundness of TRANSYT modelling – junctions 1, 4, 6 and 24		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	6.4 (first)	Junction 17 – assessment results correctly reported in TFL/210?		
INQ/19: 20/12/05	6.4 (second)	Are the proposed highway alterations included in the model?		

Document	Para	Abbreviated query	TFL doc	TFL para
INQ/19: 20/12/05	6.5	Effect of the Scheme on traffic congestion?		
INQ/20: 14/02/06	5(i) & (ii)	Check of preliminary matters		
INQ/20: 14/02/06	5(iii)	Why would southbound traffic on the A406 reduce as described?		
INQ/20: 14/02/06	5(iv)	Is congestion likely in the stated scenario?		
INQ/20: 14/02/06	5(v)	Effect on journey times in stated scenario?		
INQ/20: 14/02/06	5(vi)	Relative traffic conditions, A406 with TGB, AM vs PM peaks?		
INQ/21: 14/02/06	1	Drawings of junctions 1 & 2, annotated to identify links reported in TFL/210		
INQ/21: 14/02/06	2	Does INQ/21 properly reflect TFL's evidence?		
INQ/21: 14/02/06	3	Comments invited on apparent inconsistency identified		
INQ/25: 28/03/06	1.1	Is the model less "noisy" near the Scheme than in west and south London?		
INQ/25: 28/03/06	1.1	If less "noisy", why?		
INQ/25: 28/03/06	1.2	Magnitude and locations of traffic changes on M25 arising from the Scheme?		
INQ/25: 28/03/06	2.7(i)	Rationale and evidence of reliability of specific aspects of TRANSYT assessment		
INQ/25: 28/03/06	2.7(ii)	Comments on matters discussed in INQ/25		
INQ/25: 28/03/06	3.1	Effect of traffic induction in tables 4a, 4a1, 4a2 and 4b?		