

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Lower Thames Crossing](#)  
**Subject:** Reply to consultation on Lower Thames Crossing (corrected)  
**Date:** 01 March 2025 13:52:20

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Consultation on the Proposed Lower Thames Crossing  
Department of Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London, SW1P 4DR

Interested Party Reference number: 20034734

1 March 2025

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing in response to the letter of 28 February 2025 inviting comments on the

**Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

**Application by National Highways (“the Applicant”) Seeking Development Consent for the Proposed Lower Thames Crossing Scheme (“the Proposed Development”).**

In particular, my concerns relate to **7.6 Road User Charging Statement**. The Statement suggests that the charging regimes for the existing Dartford Crossing and the new Lower Thames Crossing be ‘aligned’ in terms of charges and applicable times in order to avoid unintended bias when choosing a crossing route that might lead to potential extra unnecessary mileage or unwanted congestion at either site.

I have always supported this but am unclear from the document whether or not this means a single entity collecting the charges for the two crossings. I have previously supported a combined charging mechanism so that commercial users and private users do not have the administrative burden of maintaining two accounts in order to allow flexible use of either crossing. This would apply particularly where there is a problem at either crossing, which unfortunately we know to be an all too common occurrence already.

Further to this I note that the document suggests that, uniquely among all users, those in the Kent-side Local Residents Discount Schemes would have to pay different charges at either crossing. In practice it is very unlikely that many drivers from Dartford would go the long way round to use the new Lower Thames Crossing, and vice versa, other than when one crossing has suffered an incident of congestion or closure.

This difference to every other user of the crossings seems unwarranted, punishing those who had been given some recognition of the inconvenience they routinely suffer because of the crossings’ proximity. Similarly any loss of revenue would surely be too insignificant to justify this somewhat nit-picking distinction.

I trust that these comments are helpful to your consultation.

Yours faithfully

J P Finnegan

Mr J P Finnegan, 

Interested Party Reference number: 20034734