From:
Lower Thames Crossing

Subject: concerns to bring to the inspectorate please

Date: 29 June 2023 10:57:20

To whom it may concern i attended the virtual second meeting and did have some difficulty with the I.T. as my internet is very poor at my location in East Tilbury village very near coalhouse fort . i have some burning concerns which i would like to bring to the attention of the inspectorate body on this D.C.O. examination .

Firstly i believe APP058 (agreements required) my opinion as a resident due to be greatly affected by this scheme in Thurrock with questions. Section 106 town and country planning act is to mitigate the development and make it more acceptable in planning terms , primarily where there is pain you offer gain . As a very disenchanted resident of thurrock council. I look on with dread when i here a kings council exploring and suggesting that Thurrock council in their current unmended phase request to be the discharging authority for 70% of the project. This in my opinion and that of our local forum is quite frankly an unworkable decision and should not be facilitated in any shape or form. there recent ineptitude in the delivery of large projects such as the A13, the stanford le hope station, the grays underpass, their own "town hall" speaks volumes about their capability to deliver efficiently and on time. As residents we feel if this project proceeds this council should NOT become the discharging authority as they have requested as we the residents would see no benefit from this method of delivery and any financial recompense would be culled by their involvement we would rather you talked to us direct as we have a huge lack of infrastructure and moneys meant to be used for this in our area have been spirited away by those in positions of power with little if any benefits to the wider community, huge feasibility studies, huge admin bills, expensive surveys with no results. i have too many examples to start quoting. officers in this authority have acted unscrutinised for too long and not for the benefit of residents. we can not take the chance, please deny this request.

Secondly AP505 (Agreements with 6 authorities) would this actually be done by thurrock for the people of thurrock and not controlled by the overseeing commissioners as they do not represent the people of thurrock and have been appointed by the government and people far enough removed from thurrock to be in favour of this project. Thurrock council was supposedly opposed to the project although i suspected this was not the case from the beginning. i believe in honesty and integrity and giving the people of thurrock a fair crack of the whip is essential in this process .A comment made by Ben standing that thurrock were broadly happy with things over the last four years and agreed the structure of the D.C.O is worryingly supports my suspicion. we have no local plan in place and are becoming the victims of residential developments unfettered by any form of efficient plan (its been longer than the second world war to develop) Since i attended parliament and spoke to mr Potts and his original team with stephen metcalfe an undertaking and effectively challenge by the community of east tilbury has been very much ignored to do with monitoring pollution. An off the cuff remark about benefits to the community saying the workforce would need milk and papers was meant to rebuffed by a community involvement in negotiations has been mainly ignored.

Thirdly an observation; Recently a large number of persons have been searching the area for a source of water i surmise this would be to source for their two drilling machines which need copious amounts of water to operate. Recently Kent had a nationally publicised issue with availability of drinking water . obviously water used for a drill will be contaminated and therefore no longer fresh water so quite simply will the lack of drinking water be an issue which may be greatly aggravated by this drilling procedure? in the event of public need would the drilling cease and has this possible conflict been built

into the time frame worst case scenario . Is this in danger of being an HS2 number 2. Has this extraction of a fresh water source been featured into any studies of the effects on biodiversity in the area . i am conscious that the financial envelope for this projects dictates processes used however the use of water from the thames having to go through a cleaning process could be a far more workable solution even though more expensive , this could be used to recycle the foul water used by the process for repetition and not affect our local water table

Fourthly and already highlighted is the smart motorway issue which i shall not expand on other than to say initially in the plans we were supposed to have a service station forced on us and a tilbury link road . there was legislation about service station distances and legal requirements. The initial plan was drastically reduced by presumably financial restraints now we are calling things minor refinements . i was under the apparent misapprehension that the final D.C.O was non negotiable and not for reinterpretation, obviously i am not any good at legal semantics but i am assuming this is why the kings councils are present. i did note the warning about costs being sought by any interpreted disruption of the examination process which did come as a vieled threat and in my opinion would indeed cause persons not to openly join in with this process .which is meant to be open to all already governed by certain time restraints to register but with the additional statement about costs etc i have to ask myself if the process is open and honest as it purports to be .i know that i felt if i spoke or if it slowed the process i would be searching for money to pay all those expensive K.C.s this was o deterent to openess which is why i thought i had to take the oppurtunity of writing this to meet the 19th july deadline. i would be obliged if i could get a reply to acknowledge someone has looked into my worry and considered it . Thankyou David Bowling