

Net Zero Review Consultation

Introduction

Thames Crossing Action Group is a community group which represents thousands of people who are strongly opposed to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). The £8.2bn+ LTC would be hugely destructive and harmful; it would not meet the project objectives¹, and is not fit for purpose².

Background

We are responding to this Net Zero Review consultation³ because amongst our many concerns about the proposed Lower Thames Crossing, is the fact that it is predicted to emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon from construction and the first 60 years of operation if it goes ahead⁴.

We therefore strongly believe that government needs to urgently review not only Net Zero plans and policy, but also huge projects like the proposed LTC that would emit millions of tonnes of carbon at a time of climate emergency.

Response

1. How does net zero enable us to meet our economic growth target of 2.5% a year?

The whole reason for net zero and our legal commitment to reach net zero is due to the fact we are living in times of climate emergency.

With this in mind, unless we start acting in ways to back up the talk and targets it will not matter what economic growth targets you set, because without a planet that can support a healthy sustainable existence money is worthless.

Try counting your money when there is no clean air to breathe, clean water to drink, or food to eat. It is essential that we protect and enhance our natural environment and climate at all costs.

¹ <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/ltc-project-objectives/>

² <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/ltc-not-fit-for-purpose/>

³ <https://beisgovuk.citizenspace.com/nzs/call-for-evidence-on-net-zero-review/>

⁴ <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/ltc-carbon-emissions/>

2. What challenges and obstacles have you identified to decarbonisation?

We appear to have a government that are not backing up the talk with actions. We need urgent action taken to stop hugely destructive projects like the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.

This road project alone is predicted to emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon if it goes ahead. How can this be considered acceptable by a government that have legally committed to Net Zero, and at a time of climate emergency?

Not only that but National Highways, a government company, are attempting to greenwash the LTC with misleading info and purely speculative claims.

For example, in July 2022 they claimed an 80% reduction in carbon emissions ⁵, this was based on government policies including the ending of the sale of new petrol and diesel cars and vans.

There are no guarantees that this will reduce the carbon emissions, as there are no guarantees that people will instead move to cars and vans powered by electric and other non-fossil fuels.

Also in July, the High Court ordered the government to outline exactly how its net zero policies will achieve emissions targets⁶.

National Highways have no way to back up their claims of an 80% reduction in carbon in this way, and it is a serious concern that they continue to attempt to greenwash such a hugely destructive project like this.

Additionally, the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) is under review, following the threat of a legal challenge. The policy which governs roads is outdated and does not reflect things such as the legal commitment to Net Zero.

Yet National Highways and the government continue to progress huge carbon emitting projects like the proposed LTC whilst the review takes place. Calls to suspend the policy whilst the review takes place have been ignored, and destructive and harmful projects continue to be pushed through.

So again we call on government to back up the talk on Net Zero and protecting our natural environment with real actions, and hold those who are working on your behalf accountable for their actions.

⁵ <https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-roads/lower-thames-crossing/news-and-media/news/government-decarbonisation-plans-drive-down-projected-carbon-emissions/>

⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/jul/18/court-orders-uk-government-to-explain-how-net-zero-policies-will-reach-targets?>

3. What opportunities are there for new/amended measures to stimulate or facilitate the transition to net zero in a way that is pro-growth and/or pro-business?

There are other alternatives to the proposed LTC that are not being given adequate consideration.

In this day and age, and at a time of climate emergency, when we are supposed to be seeking more sustainable options for things like transport, why does the Port of Dover not have a rail connection? Why are they relying on road freight?

Rail improvements between Ashford and Reading for a cost of around £4bn would negate the need for the proposed LTC⁷. We need to be taking freight off of roads and onto rail.

The proposed LTC has no provision for cross river active travel, and would not be viable for public transport, due to the lack of rail and lack of adequate connections for buses.

Kenex Tram at a cost of around £800m would provide a much-needed cross river public transport option. This would provide a more sustainable option for people to cross the river and travel more sustainably for both leisure and work, resulting in benefiting both businesses and the public.

Another aspect to consider is that projects like the proposed LTC are not only destructive and harmful to the environment, but also threaten our health and well-being which results in more unwell people. Unwell people that can't work. People who can't work have less money to spend. People who are unwell and can't work cost the country more in healthcare costs, sick pay and benefits etc.

Put simply an unhealthy environment and unhealthy people are not beneficial to businesses or the economy. If you are determined to focus on growth and businesses then you should take this into account. The question also needs to be asked why you are focusing so much on growth and businesses, see our response to question 1.

4. What more could government do to support businesses, consumers and other actors to decarbonise?

We need legislation to stop greenwashing. We need more monitoring of environmental claims to ensure companies are doing their bit, and not attempting to greenwash, or avoid their responsibilities.

Buying your way out of environmental responsibility cannot be considered acceptable. Companies and government should not be allowed to rely on carbon offsetting as a way out of taking proper responsibility either, as this is all too often ineffective. We live on a planet with finite resources, but are living as though they are infinite, it cannot continue.

⁷ <https://www.thamescrossingactiongroup.com/rail-and-tram-alternatives/>

The Climate Change Committee stated in their June 2021 report ⁸ that new roads should only be built if they can be shown not to increase emissions.

Over 7 million tonnes is a huge increase, and therefore the proposed LTC should not be progressed.

We are seeing far more being invested into destructive and harmful projects than into saving, protecting, and enhancing our natural environment, this has to change.

Better protections for the natural environment need to be put in place immediately.

Projects like the proposed LTC would destroy thousands of acres of greenbelt land, as well as large amounts of trees and habitat including irreplaceable ancient woodlands.

Ancient woodlands that are precious ecosystems that have come about over hundreds if not thousands of years. As the saying goes, the best time to plant a tree was 20 years ago, the next best time is today. Why therefore is it deemed acceptable to be destroying so many mature trees and ancient woodlands?

The protections offered to trees is greatly lacking, with no real protection at all for individual ancient and veteran trees.

Evidence of continuous woodland since 1600 has to be provided to gain ancient woodland status. There is very limited evidence of this kind of thing dating back so far, as maps and records of such things were only for the rich back then, and even then were often basic by today's standards.

We have the new Long Established Woodland status, but it appears to be taking time to introduce this new status and level of protection.

Even the protections we have in place, or coming into place, need to be stronger, because when it comes to NSIPs (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects) like the proposed LTC it seems government are intent to let growth and economy trump our environment. Again, we refer you back to our response to question 1.

We need to see hugely destructive and harmful projects like LTC stopped now.

5. Where and in what areas of policy focus could net zero be achieved in a more economically efficient manner?

We need more focus put on more sustainable options in the decision-making processes.

Why do we still have a government body/company called National Highways? Why the focus on highways, if government are genuine in their move to a more sustainable net zero

⁸ <https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/2021-progress-report-to-parliament/>

future? Why do we not have National Transport or National Travel that focuses on all aspects of sustainable travel as a way forward?

New roads create induced demand, more roads more traffic. More traffic results in more congestion. More congestion results in calls for more roads.

Electric (and other non-fossil fuel) vehicles do not address or solve the problem of congestion. In fact, if people believe that such vehicles are greener and cleaner they are likely to be more inclined to use them more, and so the vicious circle grows and snowballs into more and more congestion and calls for more and more destructive and harmful roads.

Why are government so intent on continuing to push ahead with projects like the proposed LTC, and not instead considering more sustainable options like the Ashford to Kent rail improvements, or Kenex Trams for example? Why not more investment into more reliable, affordable, safe public transport and active travel options?

Also, if discussing efficiencies, government should investigate and address the many inadequacies of their companies like National Highways.

The proposed LTC is just one example of a project that has been subject to inadequate consultation, resulting in ongoing delays and issues, as well as growing opposition.

There are calls for quicker decision-making processes to enable growth, but the reality is that as well as consideration of more sustainable options, the adequacy and efficiency of National Highways needs to be investigated and addressed.

6. How should we balance our priorities to maintaining energy security with our commitments to delivering net zero by 2050?

We hear all the time from National Highways and others how electric (and other non-fossil fuel) vehicles are the way forward, but evidence shows they are not the panacea that many like to claim and believe.

As a country we are suffering enough as it is with our energy needs, without the additional pressure on energy that electric vehicles will bring.

Not only are road projects like the proposed LTC destructive and harmful in their own right, it then adds to the issues that need to be addressed ongoing by the very nature that if the vehicles that would use them are electric this puts further stress on the need for more green electric.

The result would be that in addition to all the destruction and harm from building the LTC, if it goes ahead, further land would likely then be taken for more solar farms, which are currently being built on huge scales on our agricultural land, further impacting our ability to be self sufficient and address our food security issues.

Permissions are being granted to these solar farms for 35-40 years, but what guarantees are there that the land will ever be farmed again?

The more and more you look into it the more and more obvious it is that building more and more roads, like the proposed LTC has an ongoing detrimental effect.

7. What export opportunities does the transition to net zero present for the UK economy or UK businesses?

As already highlighted the proposed LTC would destroy thousands of acres of agricultural land, including some grade 1 listed land. This negatively impacts our farming and food security.

We currently export food and drink around the world, the continued destruction and loss of farming land does not support export opportunities.

That said it is hard to see at this time how export opportunities can be a genuine part of a net zero future. Particularly when you again look at the fact that the Port of Dover that brings so much in and out of our country doesn't even have a rail connection. How can we ever reach net zero if everything that comes into the country via places like Dover is being put on HGVs and roads, rather than more sustainable options?

The proposed LTC began life as a scheme to fix the problems suffered at the Dartford Crossing, but has since morphed into being about additional road capacity between the ports in the South East and the Midlands and beyond.

This is not sustainable, and as currently being presented is also a false economy. National Highways ruled out a route option named C Variant, which connected the M20 to the M2/A2 (Bluebell Hill). How do they expect port traffic coming up the M20 to reach the proposed LTC off the A2?

Kent County Council are instead having to consult and progress the Bluebell Hill Improvements road project, as a separate project, as a direct result of the proposed LTC.

The Port of Dover have publicly stated that if the LTC goes ahead the A2 near Dover would need to be dualled. Again, another stand-alone project that would be needed as a direct result of the LTC, but not being taken into account in regard to benefit cost ratio.

The Port of Tilbury only ever agreed to route option C3 (the current proposal) if they got a connection for the port. National Highways put the Tilbury Link Road in to garner their support, and have since removed it. The Tilbury Link Road is now being considered as yet another stand-alone project, and again not being taken into account in regard to the benefit cost ratio.

Other ports that along with the Port of Tilbury that make up the new Thames Freeport, such as DP World and London Gateway, would be negatively impacted if the proposed LTC goes ahead too. Due to the poor design and lack of adequate connections some LTC traffic will have to take what has become known as the Stanford Detour, whereby traffic has to detour all the way down the A13 eastbound to the Stanford A1014 junction, go up around the already busy traffic lighted roundabout (alongside all the DP World, London Gateway, Thames Enterprise Park traffic) then back westbound on the A13 to the LTC slip road just past (but not accessible from) the Orsett A128 junction.

It is very clear for these and many other reasons that the proposed LTC is neither compliant with net zero, nor will it offer growth or economic benefits as is being portrayed by National Highways. You have to question why they refuse to publicly share the current estimated figure for economic growth. Surely if it were as good as they suggest they'd be shouting the figure from the rooftops?!

8. What growth benefits/opportunities have you had, or do you envisage having, from the net zero transition?

Having the threat of the proposed LTC over our heads, and the region as a whole, it is negatively impacting and stopping plans and opportunities.

Not only that but any growth that is happening would also be negatively impacted if the proposed LTC goes ahead, because it is not fit for purpose. Along with the fact that the impact on people's health and well-being as a direct result of the proposed LTC, if it goes ahead, would negatively impact their ability to be healthy enough to work, further impacting businesses. This would be both directly by loss of work hours and productivity, and also because people who are unwell are also less likely to be able to afford or be well enough to spend time and money with businesses.

9. What barriers do you face in decarbonising your business and its operations?

Again, the proposed LTC is negatively impacting plans and growth throughout the region on both sides of the river. Local Plans are being held back, business plans are on hold, people's lives are on hold.

With such huge carbon emissions the proposed LTC would also eat up regional carbon allowances, further hindering other plans.

Whilst National Highways are selling the proposed LTC as a solution to the problems at the Dartford Crossing, the evidence proves differently.

The current crossing has a design capacity of 135,000 vehicles per day, yet regularly sees 180,00 per day. That means we'd need to see a reduction of more than 25% to bring it

back below capacity. Yet the proposed LTC would take as little as 4% in the am peak and 11% in the pm peak⁹.

The proposed LTC would also create around a 50% increase in cross river traffic.

In addition, National Highways are not planning how traffic would migrate between the two crossing when there are incidents, if the LTC goes ahead, and there would not be adequate connections.

There are currently around 3000 incidents per year at the Dartford Crossing, and numbers are likely to remain high since it would still be over capacity.

If the LTC goes ahead, when there is an incident at the Dartford Tunnels and traffic comes off the M25 onto the A2 coastbound to get to the LTC, it would find there would be just one single lane from the A2 onto the LTC.

An incident at the QE2 bridge would see traffic come off the M25 onto the A13 eastbound and having to take the previously mentioned Stanford Detour. If alternatively traffic comes off the M25 onto the LTC directly, the M25 at this point would be 5 lanes of traffic, going onto 2 lanes southbound on the LTC until past the A13.

Clearly the proposed LTC will not solve the problems at the Dartford Crossing, and the result of an incident would be yet more chaos, congestion and pollution. This does nothing to improve journey times for anyone, and would negatively impact growth and businesses. How does this help businesses to decarbonise?

10. Looking at the international market in your sector, what green opportunities seem to be nascent or growing?

We see so many other countries who are investing in more sustainable travel options. Improvements in infrastructure and reliability. Reductions in cost, some even offering free travel options.

Other countries are moving away from road building because they can see the harm it does and the fact it doesn't solve the problems of congestion.

The UK needs to seriously reconsider their obsession with road building. For many of us driving a car is our only option, because there simply isn't a reliable, affordable, safe public transport or active travel option.

⁹ <https://lowerthamescrossingthurrock.co.uk/wider-debate-is-needed-on-the-merits-of-ltc-creating-a-new-m25-outer-orbital-route>

11. What challenges has the net zero transition presented to your business?

As an action group fighting the proposed LTC one of the biggest challenges the net zero transition has presented us with is the fact that government policies are outdated and do not reflect the legal commitment to net zero etc.

Another challenge is the fact that National Highways continue to share misleading information and greenwash. This is not just to the public but also to government. The fact there is little to no option for the public to report and trigger investigations into such issues is challenging and frustrating.

If government truly wish to transition to net zero, and back up the talk with actions then provision needs to be made for reporting to be made, and investigations and reviews to be carried out.

12. What impacts have changing consumer choices/demand had on your business?

In the years we have been fighting the proposed LTC we have seen a clear change in public opinion. This had added to the weight of our campaigning, and united the opposition.

People care about the environment, they care about the local community, they want to support our local farmers, they want more sustainable options. They don't want destruction and harm, they don't want to be lied to, they want to be listened to and heard.

However, National Highways have been oblivious, or simply ignored, the changes. They refuse to truly listen to us, and avoid meaningful engagement on all levels from the public through to our local authorities.

13. What impacts have decarbonisation/net zero measures had on your business?

The more evidence and measures that come out in regard to net zero, and other climate and environmental issues, the more evidence we have for why the proposed LTC is not fit for purpose and should not go ahead.

14. What more could be done to support your business and/or sector to decarbonise?

We need the government to listen to us, listen to the evidence, hear us, engage with us in a meaningful way.

STOP THE LOWER THAMES CROSSING!

15. Do you foresee a role for your business within an expanded UK supply of heat pumps, energy efficiency, electric vehicles, hydrogen economy or clean power?

Within our campaigning we continue to voice concerns that electric vehicles (EVs) are not the panacea that many like to portray and believe.

In addition to our previous comments on increased pressure on energy from electric vehicles, we also have concerns about the deadly PM2.5 from EVs.

These are particles so tiny, from things like brake dust, tyre and road wear, they get into our organs through our bloodstream.

EVs emit these deadly particles, and we have serious concerns that this fact is being overlooked, and that the consequences are deadly.

Not only deadly to our health and well-being, but EVs also don't solve the problems of congestion, and then we're back to the vicious circle of calls for more road building as already detailed previously.

Roads that are hugely destructive and harmful, roads that emit millions of tonnes of carbon emissions. Our role is also to draw attention to the fact that nobody appears to be paying attention and considering the cumulative impacts of road building, in regards to carbon emissions, loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife and habitats, and more.

We simply cannot keep doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome. Building more and more roads does not work, we need and deserve better.

16. For clean power industry: what barriers to entry have you found in deploying new plant and technologies?

Whilst we are not part of the clean power industry, we would like to use this question as an opportunity to comment about the ever-rising costs of the proposed LTC.

We heard at the LTC Road to Net Zero industry summit that National Highways held, that it costs more than 3 times as much for cleaner greener construction equipment/machinery, than traditional fossil fuel options.

Whilst we are of course all for saving and protecting the environment, the associated cost has to be considered, especially when we are already talking about a project that has an upper budget of £8.2bn allocated, and is estimated to rise to over £10bn+.

All of this at a time when there is a cost of living crisis, public services look set to be cut, and ultimately evidence to show that the LTC fails to meet any of the scheme objectives and is not fit for purpose.

17. How many green jobs do you estimate will be created in your sector by 2030?

The environment is one of the main concerns in regard to our fight against LTC, and our work includes having to fight the greenwashing attempts from National Highways about LTC, including their laughable claim of the LTC being the 'greenest road ever built'. All this claim really does is go to show how low the bar is, and how road building is anything but green. We've said it before and we'll say it again, the only way the LTC could be the

greenest road every built, if it goes ahead, is if National Highways intend on painting the whole thing green!

18. Have you or are you planning to take personal action to reduce your carbon emissions (for example through how you travel, what you buy, how you heat your home)? If so, how?

We continue to call for better, more sustainable alternatives than the proposed LTC that would emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon emissions.

We'd love to have more sustainable travel options that are reliable, affordable, and safe to use. The proposed LTC does nothing to help attain such options.

19. Do you face any barriers to doing this? What are they?

See above, plus there is the factor that the threat of the proposed LTC, and the LTC if it goes ahead, stops other greener options and projects to be progressed.

20. What would help you to make greener choices?

As a group it would help for government to listen to us when we present the evidence that proves the proposed LTC would be hugely destructive and harmful, and is not fit for purpose.

It would help if we didn't have to rely on roads, because there are no other viable options. It would help to have safe, reliable, affordable sustainable alternative travel options.

21. What is working well about the measures being put in place to reach net zero?

Our response to this consultation is as a group that are commenting on relevant points to the proposed LTC, as that is what our group represents people on.

In regard to the proposed LTC, there is nothing working well in regard to measures to reach net zero. Far from it. The proposed LTC does nothing to ensure we can reach net zero, it does the complete opposite.

22. What is not working well about the measures being put in place to reach net zero?

National Highways are being allowed to progress such hugely destructive and harmful road projects, as the proposed LTC, that would emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon if it goes ahead.

We need more consideration to the cumulative impacts of road building, particularly carbon emissions. It is not good enough that they are being measured in the way they are, which doesn't take the cumulative impacts into account. This is no way to reach net zero.

We need to see more actions to back up all the talk from government. We need alternative solutions, because evidence shows that road building just creates induced demand, and the vicious spiral continues. It has to stop, we need and deserve better.

23. Do you have any further comments on how efforts to tackle climate change are affecting you?

People, including our group, are seriously concerned about the impacts of road building like the proposed LTC, that would be hugely destructive and harmful, and not fit for purpose.

This has effects on us all, it is frustrating, it is annoying, it is stressful having to fight our own government to protect our homes, lives, health and well-being, communities, greenbelt land, agricultural land, woodlands, wildlife and habitats, and natural environment.

The proposed LTC is already harming our lives, health and well-being, but the fight continues.

24. What are the biggest barriers you face in decarbonising / enabling your communities and areas to decarbonise?

Put simply the biggest barrier our communities face when it comes to decarbonising our area is the proposed LTC. Having a project that would emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon is unacceptable.

25. What has worked well? Please share examples of any successful place-based net zero projects.

In regard to the proposed LTC nothing is working well, all we get is greenwash attempts from National Highways, rather than them facing up to the fact their project would emit huge amounts of carbon and is not fit for purpose.

26. How does the planning system affect your efforts to decarbonise?

Government have made legal commitment to net zero, yet continue to push ahead with the proposed LTC that would emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon if it goes ahead.

We have a planning system which is loaded in favour of the developer, especially those like National Highways who are government companies.

Policies are outdated and currently being reviewed, yet instead of doing the right thing and suspending the policy whilst it is reviewed and updated, we have to fight our government to try and stop hugely destructive and harmful projects like the proposed LTC that would fail against updated policies and legislation.

Too much power is given to the applicant when it comes to the Development Consent Order (DCO) process. For example, National Highways are withholding so much

information that has been requested by us and others, including local authorities. They tell us it will be available in the DCO documents, yet even when the first attempt of the DCO was submitted in 2020 they instructed the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) not to release the application documents until the application was accepted, which obviously never happened in 2020.

National Highways know that we and others, including local authorities, will be overwhelmed with the sheer volume and complexity of the DCO application documentation when it is eventually released, if it progresses to DCO acceptance.

This does not reflect democracy or transparency, nor is it adequate consultation to withhold so much information. This is not a democratic process, it is a process that is geared up in favour of the developer/applicant, and this is not acceptable.

27. How can the design of net zero policies, programmes, and funding schemes be improved to make it easier to deliver in your area?

Government policies should be regularly reviewed, especially when there are changes in legislation. At times when review is carried out and particularly when it is already known that updates are needed to reflect changes in legislation, the policies should be suspended until they again reflect legislation.

Data on carbon emissions should be based on fact, not manipulated by speculation to suit National Highways wants and needs to try and make a project like the proposed LTC look better than it truly would be, if it goes ahead.

It should be possible to hold government companies, like National Highways accountable for their actions. They should not be allowed to mislead people, or present information and projects in a biased manner. It should be compulsory for them to ensure meaningful engagement with all parties, which is not the case when it comes to the proposed LTC.

28. Are there any other implications of net zero or specific decarbonisation projects for your area that the Review should consider?

Consideration should be given to the fact that the threat of huge projects like the proposed LTC pause and stop projects throughout the area. This has been exacerbated by the ongoing delays caused by inadequate consultation and lack of meaningful engagement from National Highways.

There is also the issue that the 7 million tonnes of carbon emissions from the proposed LTC, if it goes ahead, would use up regions north and south of the River Thames carbon budget all on its own.

29. How can we ensure that we seize the benefits from future innovation and technologies?

Technologies must be adequately proven, especially if they are to be used on a large scale. They must be safe, and they must be delivered according to the remit that they were signed off. We cannot have a repetition of 'smart' motorways that are dangerous, and have not been delivered in the manner to which they were agreed and signed off.

Innovation and technologies must be adequately assessed and to a level that can ensure we are not simply moving from one issue by creating something else that becomes the next issue.

As already highlighted electric vehicles are not the panacea that many portray them to be. We cannot simply move from fossil fuel to EVs, and ignore the issues and risks of such a move.

Additionally, we must remember that it is essential to consider the cumulative impacts when considering and progressing things. We must consider the long-term outcome, and not just solutions which may be seen as a quick term fix for now, knowing that they will later cause more problems to resolve.

The proposed LTC has been designated a 'pathfinder' project. This cannot be used as an excuse to continue pushing ahead with hugely destructive and harmful projects like LTC. National Highways are using this title as though it is a 'get out of jail free' card. This designation is wording, it does not guarantee that the project would reduce carbon emissions or be any less destructive and harmful.

If considering using new innovations and technologies just to push ahead with projects like this, especially on such a huge project, there is a real danger and risk that these innovations and technologies are not truly ready for the real world, especially on such a scale as the LTC, and that could lead to more problems rather than a real solution.

With National Highways behaving in the way they are, and have been, we have no confidence of any claims of the proposed LTC being the 'greenest road ever built'.

30. Is there a policy idea that will help us reach net zero you think we should consider as part of the review?

Yes, review the LTC, and whole of RIS2, and evaluate them against reviewed and updated policy and legislation, rather than continuing to progress them through a process governed by outdated policy and laws that you know need to be updated.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we call upon you, as part of your Net Zero Review, to review the carbon assessments of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing and other RIS2 projects, and to evaluate them against reviewed and updated policies and laws.

We call on you to listen to the Climate Change Committee when they say that new roads should only be built if they can be shown to not increase emissions.

We call on you to stop the hugely destructive and harmful proposed £8.2bn+ Lower Thames Crossing that would emit over 7 million tonnes of carbon, if it goes ahead.

There are better and more sustainable alternatives, and we need and deserve better.

Other Comments

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to take part in the consultation. Should you wish to discuss any of our comments, and/or our fight against the proposed Lower Thames Crossing, please don't hesitate to visit our website and/or get in touch.

This response was prepared and submitted on behalf of Thames Crossing Action Group by Laura Blake, Chairperson. We agree to our response being published.

Email: admin@thamescrossingactiongroup.com