



Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute



March 2017

Lower Thames Crossing Consultation

Summary report – Addendum

FINAL VERSION



© 2017 Ipsos MORI – all rights reserved.

The contents of this report constitute the sole and exclusive property of Ipsos MORI.

Ipsos MORI retains all right, title and interest, including without limitation copyright, in or to any Ipsos MORI trademarks, technologies, methodologies, products, analyses, software and know-how included or arising out of this proposal or used in connection with the preparation of this report. No license under any copyright is hereby granted or implied.

Contents

1	About this document	1
2	Summary of responses.....	2
2.1	Stakeholder organisations.....	2
2.2	Members of the public.....	2
2.3	Campaign responses.....	4

1 About this document

At the launch of the Lower Thames Crossing Consultation 2016, Highways England informed consultees that they could not accept responsibility for responses that were sent to any address other than the official consultation response channels (by post, email, or online). Some responses were completed within the consultation period but were not submitted through official response channels, and so were received after the consultation had closed. These were identified as late transmitted responses.

This addendum report summarises all of these late transmitted responses from the public, organisations and groups. None of the late transmitted responses raised any new issues beyond those already identified in the responses submitted before the close of consultation.

2 Summary of responses

2.1 Stakeholder organisations

There were two further responses from stakeholders.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Eric Pickles MP states that he supports the proposed Route 3 north of the River Thames.

Alliance of British Drivers (Kent Branch) indicates that its preference for the Lower Thames Crossing scheme is for a combination of a crossing at Location C, Route 3 and the Eastern Southern Link. Route 3 is preferred due to its shorter length which it is suggested will result in a lesser environmental impact and due to its inclusion of a new, dedicated junction with the M25. In comparison, Route 4 is considered more complex and less favourable due to the utilisation of Junction 29 of the M25 and combining with the A127.

The Alliance of British Drivers (Kent Branch) believes that Highways England has underestimated the likely impact of the proposed crossing in drawing traffic away from Dartford. In order to meet demand and build in future-proofing it is advocated that the proposals are built with three-lanes in each direction. It is concerned that parts of the existing road network are not of a sufficient standard to accommodate the anticipated additional traffic. Examples include Junction 1 of the M2 and the A228 and A249, which would be used by vehicles moving between the M2 and M20. It is suggested that the proposals for the Lower Thames Crossing should also include measures to improve these parts of the road network.

A number of other suggestions are made by Alliance of British Drivers (Kent Branch). These include tunnelling as much of the route through Essex to lessen the impacts on local people, providing land for a new Operation Stack lorry holding area and revising current speed restrictions at the Dartford Crossing to improve traffic flow. It also states that it opposes any form of road tolling.

2.2 Members of the public

2.2.1 Bespoke responses

There were seven further responses from members of public. These were all email or letters which did not follow the response form structure. Of these seven responses, five were additional respondents, while two were from respondents providing additional information following a previous response which was included in the main report, as they were received during the consultation period.

All of these responses are critical of Highways England's proposed option. Comments reflect issues and concerns raised by respondents that have previously been summarised in the '*Lower Thames Crossing Consultation summary report*'. These include:

- Comments on the location of a new crossing
 - That a crossing at Location C would not resolve problems experienced at the Dartford Crossing
 - The present Dartford Crossing should be improved instead

- A new crossing should be built at Location A instead
- A new crossing should be built at Location D instead
- A new crossing should look to include other transport modes, such as rail
- Comments on the propose routes north of the River Thames
 - Impacts on people and community, including the impact on Thurrock particularly
 - Concerns that the proposals will increase traffic in Thurrock including worsen congestion and congestion on the local road network, especially if an incident occurs on the new crossing
 - The impact of pollution on air quality, and the negative impact this could have on health
 - Noise pollution
 - Negative impacts on farmland, green belt fen land and wildlife habitats
- Comments on the proposed routes South of the River Thames:
 - Concerns about the impacts on people and communities, especially Shorne, Chalk and Higham.
 - Suggestion that a new crossing at Dartford would contain the negative impacts of development in an area already used to them rather than spreading them to new areas and communities
 - Concerns about the environment, including impacts on ancient woodland, SSSIs and green belt
 - Noise and air pollution and visual impact
 - Concern about impact on Shorne Country Park
 - Suggestion that the A229 connection between M2 and M20 is not sufficient to handle the increase in traffic

2.3 Organised campaign responses

Five additional campaign responses were received. These were standard versions, without additional comments from the respondent, of Campaign 3 (one copy) and Campaign 13 (four copies). These campaigns are summarised below:

Campaign 13: Higham object to Option C (520) (4 responses)

Summary: This campaign opposes all aspects of the proposals for a crossing at Location C.

The proposals for Location C are claimed to be poorly designed, and based on out of date, biased and unsubstantiated data. As well as taking longer to build and being more expensive, it is claimed that they will not resolve the congestion problems at Dartford.

Concerns are raised about the impact on the local community, in particular noise, and on the environment, including pollution, the encouragement of green belt development and negative impacts on SSSI, AONB and RAMSAR sites. There are also concerns raised about the potential increase of traffic on nearby rural roads.

The campaign indicates that it thinks that a better solution would be to construct an additional crossing at Dartford, on the basis that this is the location of the congestion problem, that the area already has the necessary supporting infrastructure and will be quicker and cheaper to build than at Location C.

Campaign 3: Thurrock objection 3 (504) (1 response)

Summary: This campaign opposes any new crossing of the Thames in Thurrock. Grounds for this opposition include the belief that that a new crossing would not benefit congestion at the Dartford Crossing sufficiently to off-set the resulting loss to the environment, community and economy. It is stated that a new crossing would increase pollution in areas that currently have relatively good air quality.

Concern is expressed about the loss of green belt land, housing and historic sites in order to make way for the proposed scheme.

The stated economic benefits (both local and national) of the proposed scheme are challenged. In particular, that it would fail to support the development of a local port facility.

Rather than reduce the volume of traffic on the M25 it is argued that this proposal would potentially increase congestion at Junctions 30/31 and 29.

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 7347 3000

www.ipsos-mori.com

<http://twitter.com/IpsosMORI>

About Ipsos MORI's Social Research Institute

The Social Research Institute works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methodological and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.