

Submission ID: 19376

Dear Inspector/ Minister of state

I have grown up in this area Gravesend side of Thames gateway when I cannot afford a car feel compete isolated from neighbours in Essex this scheme does very little perhaps nothing to answer that a provision for cross river active travel, not viable for public transport due to lack of adequate connections. Freight and passenger Rail alternatives Evidence relied upon quoted in LTC consultation's refer back to studies (such as Parson & \*Brinckerhoff 2013 study) discounting the need for Rail freight and cross river public pre date COP 26 and Next Zero targets.

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20100513123749/http://www.dft.gov.uk/about/s-trategy/capacityrequirements/dartfordrivercrossing/>

\* I cannot find further more up to date evidence on DCO yet and I am lead to understand now this over 10 year old Study is still the evidence base that allows this application to override common sense, social inclusion, poor value for money and the practically over ride our environmental commitments enshrined in law since.

to provide extract as evidence page 118 of above state Parson Brinkerhoff in 2009 states.

As a result, there is unlikely to be any significant "generated" demand leading to modal shift to rail resulting from the provision of a direct rail passenger service between these groups of stations.

Moving forward.

Looking example in Wales in relation Climate change and commitments made at COP 26 Net Zero targets the Thames estuary area should by using up to evidence to raise the bar for where new roads are the right response to transport problems compare to investing in real alternatives, including investment in active rail, bus, Tram and Public transport connectivity Not be good value for money with a benefit-cost-ratio (BCR) of only 1.22 ( I understand this is meaning for every £1 spent, there will only be £1.22 of economic benefits) so is "Low" value for money according to government guidelines.

Compared to available guidance of a "BCR of 2.0" for (Advised for in RIS2 2020 to 2025) "Bypasses and link roads "

For an example East-West Rail reports to have BCR of between 1.3-1.7 and gives a far lower environmental impact.

or other similar cross river public transport schemes apart for being lower cost ,clean and great social benefits are reported to have a higher BCR than £8B the LTC.

Quotes are from the CPRE (Campaign for protection of Rural England ) end of the road report and relate to value for money and poor economic case - Roads - induce traffic, that is, generate more traffic " often far above background trends over the longer term ? lead to permanent and significant environmental and landscape damage ? show little evidence of economic benefit to local economies.

I also have seen evidence that. Would not solve the problems suffered due to the Dartford Crossing Induced demand " increase in cross river traffic (around 50%) Lack of adequate connections, especially when there are incidents Safety concerns since the proposed LTC would be a "Smart' Motorway by stealth Increase in carbon emissions (around 6.6 million tonnes)

Loss and impact to thousands of acres of farmland threatening food security Destroy and impact woodland (inc ancient woodland), trees (inc ancient/veteran), hedgerows, greenbelt Devastating impact on wildlife and habitat, inc protected species Increase in air and noise pollution, whole route fails on WHO-10 levels for PM2.5 Destruction and impacts to homes and communities Concerns about construction impacts Doesn't meet scheme objectives.

As an example on 14th February 2023 the Welsh government announced the suspension of all major road building over environmental concerns, particularly increased climate impact. Cost benefit: we remain to be convinced that the BCR figures are reliable, as demonstrated by the recent climb in claimed costs to Â£9bn for the project.