

7/E

**Harberton Road, London N19 3JP**  
**(0)20 7272 9038: [nina.t@virgin.net](mailto:nina.t@virgin.net)**

8<sup>th</sup> August 2006-08-08

**Peter Robottom**  
**Inspector Manager**  
**Majorand Specialist casework**  
**The Planning Inspectorate**  
**Temple Key House**  
**2 The Square, Bristol BS1 6PN**

**Dear Mr. Robottom,**

**Thames Gateway Bridge Inquiry**

Your letter of 4<sup>th</sup> July shows that you were confused by the superfluity of detail in my letter to you of 13th June.


So, to simplify: the salient matter is that the Bridge is proposed as a regeneration of the area. Professor Rosewell's evidence was supposed to prove this

However, George Stern showed that her statistical evidence – some of it based on fuzzy clustering – was wrong. She agreed to withdraw the relevant parts. She did not.

Therefore, the case for the Bridge is based on false assumptions and bad mathematics.

Where do we go from here? Are you prepared to sanction a decision based on a false premise? (You may study this further by referring to George Stern's Closing Statement.)

Yours sincerely,



Nina Tuckman

