



From: Bob Rudge [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2024 4:32 PM
To: HAIGH, Louise <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Lower Thames Crossing Decision

Dear Transport Secretary

I understand that you are due to announce a decision on the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) Infrastructure project in due course. I would like to offer my perspective & opinion on why it should be declined even though I support the necessity for a new crossing. First and foremost among reasons for it to be cancelled is it is not fit for purpose and does not address the actual congestion problem on either side of the river Thames. As I understand it the new crossing would need to take over 25% of the current traffic from the Dartford Crossing, the proposed LTC it seems would only take 4% of that traffic.

This is clearly, poor value for money as current estimates between 8 & 9 billion pounds. How much might that increase during the build period is anyone's guess. I believe that the Benefit-Cost-Ratio (BCR) is just 0.48 which fits into the Department of Transport's Poor category in the 'value for money framework'. Furthermore National Highways has declined to produce updated value for money figures, one wonders why? But one can guess.

In the 'Overview' section of the Lower Thames Crossing Accounting Officer Assessment, fails to even mention solving the problems at the Dartford Crossing, one of the original tasks of a new crossing. That aspect is mentioned in the 'Conclusion' section but is again misleading as it fails to identify that the Dartford Crossing would still remain over design capacity even if the proposed LTC goes ahead.

Could the current plan pass an Investors Due diligence investigations? Moreover, I believe the Nov 2022 LTC Development Consent Order (DCO) application documents the Accounting Officer Assessments (AOA) that was published relied on figures that are more than two years out of date and taken from the 2020 Outline Business Case (OBC).

The planned tunnel is to utilise 'Smart' technology that is now being replaced on many motorways because it doesn't work effectively and has been shown to cost lives.

There are inadequate provisions DCO provisions for Construction & Operational Arrangements

It has been calculated that this project will add over 6.6 million tonnes of CO2 into the atmosphere.

The biodiversity target for this project haven't been met

There is no provision included in the DCO to improve Local Network resilience potentially leading to gridlocks across north Kent during any incident. It is bad enough now this would only add to the problem.

When the original Dartford crossing was built the area around it looked much like East Gravesend does today. This plan will destroy this area over time and the very narrow green belt between Gravesend and the Medway towns could quickly disappear.

I hope this new Labour government can finally give the people of Gravesend some good news, by cancelling this poorly thought out massive waste of money as soon as possible.

Kindest regards
Robert Rudge

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
