

Response ID ANON-2TCS-JW5D-P

Submitted on 2014-09-18 22:35:41.414668

Introduction

1 Option 1 – a new ferry at Woolwich by the early 2020s. Please tell us how far you support or oppose this option.

Support

2 Please give us any other comments about a new ferry at Woolwich

Comments:

3 Option 2 – a new ferry service at Gallions Reach by the early 2020s. Please tell us how far you support or oppose this option.

Neither

4 Please give us any other comments about a new ferry service at Gallions Reach.

Comments:

Unhappy about any potential increase in traffic.

5 Option 3 – a bridge at Gallions Reach by 2022 - 2025. Please tell us how far you support or oppose this option

Strongly oppose

6 Please give us any other comments about a bridge at Gallions Reach

Comments:

Economic 'growth' is unsustainable, as is ever more traffic and the pipe-dream of hyper-connectivity for ever-increasing numbers of people. We are already living a 3-planet lifestyle at the expense of other countries, future generations and other species. I do not want 'growth' and do not want a bridge predicated upon it. More traffic = more CO2 emissions and more air pollution. The likely large carbon cost of construction is not quantified in the environmental impact report, or the 'payback time' against any 'off-setting' proposals. Whose emissions are you expecting to be cut to 'pay' for all this and hit the UK's CO2 reduction targets, or is it just more buck-passing?. You claim 1,600 vehicles an hour will make 'Some traffic increase possible'. I suggest bridges will make increase inevitable. Your map show a likely increase up Knee Hill, effectively a country lane. This will create pressure for widening and therefore trashing of the Metropolitan Site of Importance for Nature Conservation that is Lesnes Abbey Woods. Since Bexley Council is two-facedly caving over its previous opposition to bridges, I cannot trust it not to accept widening if traffic goes up. The envt impact report does not explain whether creating 'new' habitat will be at the expense of other kinds of existing habitat (i.e. yet another scheme wishing to try and shove more wildlife into ever less space), or by returning parts of the existing built environment back to nature. Gallions Reach should be restored to marshland to make up for the numerous losses and fragmentation elsewhere, including east towards Belvedere, not covered in roads.

7 Option 4 – a bridge at Belvedere by 2025 - 2030. Please tell us how far you support or oppose this option.

Strongly oppose

8 Please give us any other comments about a bridge at Belvedere.

Comments:

For the same reasons as a Gallions bridge.

9 Which of the options included in this consultation do you believe that TfL should progress? If you believe that more than one crossing is needed, please feel free to select more than one option.

I do not agree that there is a need for more river crossings

10 Please use this space for any other comments you may have, for example on any of the technical reports we have also published.

Comments:

I object to the amount of money TfL has been spending on promoting bridges when they have been rejected, with good reason, before. The claim that 'A majority of respondents supported the new crossings, and we received useful feedback to help us develop our proposals.' is ambiguous - which crossings and what modes?

Please concentrate your efforts (and use of my taxes) on reducing the need to travel to work, on modal shift to low/zero-carbon transport and public transport and NOT more 20th century traffic-promoting schemes. Thank you.

11 What is your name?

Name:

Chris Rose

12 What is your email address?

Email:

chrisrose@gn.apc.org

13 Please let us know your home postcode. This will help with our analysis of responses.

Post code:

DA7 6PU

14 If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name.

Organisation:

15 How did you hear about this consultation?

Received a letter from TfL