

The Planning Inspectorate

28<sup>th</sup> June 2023

Dear Sir or Madam,

Your Reference: TR010032

In accordance with Planning Inspectorate OFH2 Orsett Hall 28th June 2023 and at the request of Mr Smith please accept this copy of my verbal submission. The few things I didn't say are marked below toward the end.

My Name is Stuart Dixon. You asked me to introduce myself this has thrown my timings slightly - could I possibly have another minute?

My working life includes successful roles facilitating change.

Business cases I have designed have usually been successful at saving money for the NHS.

As a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce I have been monitoring world events, technology change, and how some local people are thinking about this project, mostly through the Thames Crossing Action Group and Transport Action Network.

Now retired, I had a role as a school governor in a primary school close by the proposed option C during the pandemic so feel reasonably close to the people whose lives will be most likely affected by the LTC.

As a former daily commuter through Dartford I am under no illusion about how commuting by road affects people health and as such I'm hoping to help you to determine a fair outcome for everyone through the planning process and I come to ask a number of questions.

First I want to ask about the chosen option to dig a tunnel and drive a length 'A' road through the spaces either side of it. As we know this crossing was offered as the engineering and construction solution to the problems at Dartford. **No alternatives to digging were considered despite their presence.**

**You do realise this is the most harmful option for local and global communities, don't you?**

**How do we know this project has consulted as many diverse groups as possible, at the right time? That would be in the early stages - when compiling the projects requirements - wouldn't it?**

It seems fair to be mindful of local interests, so what steps have been taken during consultations to prevent commercial interests generated across the whole country, from overriding the wellbeing of local minorities? Or indeed the rest of the planet? Seemingly We're all just stakeholders with one vote. But is that appropriate? Or is it appropriate to apply weighting during the requirements analysis?

AFAIK the deliverables here are clean air, less congestion, sustainable development and commercial benefits in that order of priority. This is a paradox. In that order, don't the requirements of people with lung disease, outweigh those of people who want to repetitively pollute their air supply?

Do the requirements of the riverside towns for maritime jobs which support their cultural heritage carry any weight?

Where are the simple measurements that say how many people will be saved, by digging; or describe pollution levels now and afterwards? How will we know how the solution is performing if we don't know that?

**Things change.** Can you guarantee the design solution is both in date and remains fit for purpose in the current political economic, social, technological and environmental epoch?

I'm not the only one saying Yesterdays engineering solutions have caused massive change to the planet, which is about to fail. The oil we use is toxic and its carbon release that kills. Bugs are in decline, nature is failing.

The question is why is digging even necessary for our solution when today, we have amazing digital technology and expect to deliver with ease, massive commercial gains in ways that are clean and ethical?

When everyone else is now thinking about delivering AI, or thinking about Public Transport or active travel, or working from home, and localisation has been identified as part of a solution to climate change, are you sure this old solution to dig is still the best choice to meet the commercial sectors requirements for productivity gains?

lets talk about **Option C.**

Now I have heard the plan to divert all the heavy goods traffic using Dartford currently, and shift it to cross at Option C, I'm even more concerned about its choice as a route.

People want to know, As Option C has so many schools, leisure areas and playing fields in close proximity, what consideration has been given to recent statements from various health bodies, that PM2.5 has long term impact on the brains and lungs of children and elderly people? What new options and requirements have been generated? I'm asking this for our Granddaughter who is probably scheduled to be educated within a few hundred meters of the proposed road.

Were people disadvantaged by this or the groups that represent them, able to contribute with functional and non functional requirements for clean air and healthy spaces to exercise in? Were they able to sign off on any new requirements this data would generate?

To conclude: Sorry there are more questions :)

In general, I'm sure you'll agree there are many groups with diverse interests and requirements relevant to this project.

**I did not say:**

I can see statutory bodies are consulted but I can't see if they produced any functional or non functional requirements to tell you what they want to achieve and how to do it.

Are you satisfied that the ability of statutory contributors is sufficient to generate enough requirements to give a fair outcome for people in this space?

When the UK climate change committee convened a very successful citizens panel about global warming, it laid out the requirements needed to meet the threat from climate warming. That was four years ago now. A consultation like this at the outset would perhaps have led to a more acceptable solution.

Is there any evidence that the climate committee requirements have been shared or used by Highways England to control how this project develops?

Finally, Do you think it would be useful at this stage to both seek to rapidly develop an interim solution to the health and problems at Dartford, meanwhile reviewing the alternatives to digging to achieve growth and productivity?

A Plan B might be useful.

Yours faithfully,



Stuart Dixon