

I remain opposed to the Lower Thames Crossing. It is not future proofed and the astronomical monetary cost is ludicrous, especially at this current time. The huge land take it requires and the negative impact on communities, the environment and wildlife cannot be justified.

From NH's Environmental Statement it seems clear that alternative locations would have been more future proofed with provision for alternative transportation. The financial cost would have been less and so would the negative impacts.

NH have done nothing to convince me that the current route provides a solution to the Dartford Crossing issues or that it is cost effective financially, socially or environmentally.

The junction designs at Orsett Cock and the A2/M2 will not work. More congestion would be created at the junctions and beyond.

Residential areas will be subjected to a 6 year nightmare of Construction works and will then have the continuing nightmare on completion.

What provisions will be made to ensure emergency services can respond safely and rapidly over the years of construction.

Commuting to and from places of work, schools, hospitals etc. will take longer and be extremely stressful with proposed road closures, traffic controls, increased LGV & HGV movements etc. For approx 6 years there will be increased congestion, increasing Carbon emissions. This is not acceptable with the Climate Change situation.

I don't believe NH have given due regard to the velocity of the winds and the marsh fogs emanating across the Mardyke Valley. These are frequent and give rise to prospective safety issues.

The visual impact of the LTC cannot be mitigated satisfactorily within a reasonable time frame. 6 yrs construction plus 15 yrs to projected landscape image = 21 years.

The vast negative impacts render this project untenable.