



## London Infrastructure Plan 2050

### Consultation Response by The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport

#### Executive Summary

*The Institute welcomes the vision for London's future presented in the Plan. In particular we welcome the recognition of the need to embrace and balance the differing elements which makes London an economic powerhouse with a burgeoning population which needs efficient transport and a healthy and safe environment in which to work, conduct business, to be educated and to live.*

*It is very much in line with the visionary spatial strategies we have called for in our recently published report '[A Vision for Transport Planning – a Framework for Better more Prosperous Places](#)'.*

*It is also in line with our call for city regions to be given control over a large part of their finances, both in raising most of their income locally and in the freedom to decide their priorities.*

#### 1 Introduction

The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (“the Institute”) is a professional institution embracing all transport modes whose members are engaged in the provision of transport services for both passengers and freight, the management of logistics and the supply chain, transport planning, government and administration. Our principal concern is that transport policies and procedures should be effective and efficient, based on objective analysis of the issues and practical experience, and that good practice should be widely disseminated and adopted. The Institute has a number of specialist forums, a nationwide structure of locally based groups and a Public Policies Committee which considers the broad canvass of transport policy. This submission draws on contributions from all these sources.

We have answered a number of the 25 questions in Chapter 25 which are detailed below but in addition we would make the following wider points.

## **2 Funding**

It is unlikely that funding will be available for all of the proposals listed, which is recognized in the report. Therefore we strongly support your emphasis on seeking private and public investment as well as promoting greater efficiencies, sustainability and innovation. We would add that devolving fund raising powers from Whitehall is likely to be accompanied by a cut in existing central government grants, which are funded to a large extent from the transport and business taxes we and the Mayor think London should have.

## **3 Devolution**

The devolution and joined up agenda promoted in London within this document should equally apply to other areas of the UK and we would recommend similar visions for other core cities and regions.

It is important that the stronger economy and local leadership in London and consequent greater ability to 'get things done' than elsewhere does not lead to increasing inequality between London and the rest of the UK in terms of investment and funding levels.

## **4 Sustainability**

We strongly support the emphasis on sustainability e.g. more economic energy generation and use, the circular waste economy, looking for technological solutions and better building techniques.

## **5 Integrated Delivery, Leadership and London Infrastructure Delivery Board**

The importance of integrated delivery, political leadership and overall joined up thinking cannot be understated and is vitally important and it is to be hoped that the London Infrastructure Delivery Board succeeds in achieving its objectives. Within the current deregulated environment services are delivered by a wide range of private companies as well as public agencies who often work in vacuums and do not consider the effect of their actions and decisions on others. Strong leadership will be needed to allow this approach to succeed but the benefits could be massive with limited cost implications.

We also support the proposal to recommend regulatory changes where necessary to facilitate this process.

## **6 Rail Services**

It is important to ensure that the improving rail service within London and the vision of a second underground network does not adversely impact on services to and from destinations away from London which usually share the same tracks as more local services

## **7 Bus Network**

We strongly support the intention to strengthen the bus network in anticipation of considerable population increases. Buses are an inexpensive and accessible way of

increasing passenger capacity provided that adequate road space is available including sustainable and enforced priority arrangements. It is important that adequate funding is available in particular to adapt the bus network to cater for forthcoming population increases.

## **8 Freight Issues**

It is vital that the needs of freight operations are considered whether by road, rail or water. There will always be a need for good, uncongested road access for freight traffic and the risk of placing undue constraints on freight movements including delivery hours needs to be avoided. Improved road and rail river crossings are very important for improving the free flow of freight movements.

## **9 Safeguarding Freight Facilities**

It is important that measures are in place to safeguard freight wharves and riverside railheads from future housing developments in order to promote and protect short sea and coastal shipping. These facilities create opportunities for break bulk and consolidation services but are often under threat from riverside housing developments and once lost are irretrievable.

Answers to the 25 Questions

*Q 1 - Do you agree with the need for an infrastructure plan for the capital?*

Yes

*Q 2 - Is any of the Infrastructure identified unnecessary.....?*

All the proposals should be subjected to a thorough cost/benefit analysis to identify the most cost-effective means of meeting the needs of a growing population. See also answer to 3.

*Q 3 - We have identified a significant funding gap.....*

We support the suggestion that both responsibilities and fund-raising powers should be delegated from Whitehall to London and other major city regions in England. This is likely to form part of any changes needed to put England on a similar footing to Scotland. As part of this process there should be a shift from vehicle and fuel taxes (collected centrally) to distance and time based charges for road use. London should take the lead by extending the present congestion charging zone to a wider area and making it distance related. This could not only provide a major source of funding but also manage demand for road use and the balance between public and private transport. It would be entirely fair to charge road users more at the same time as bus fares are increased to cover operating costs and when the cost to road users of fuel duty is falling in line with improved engine efficiency.

Of the various options promoted in the report the most questionable is the proposed Thames Estuary Airport. Whilst we fully agree with the need for increased runway capacity in the London area the Thames Estuary option would be a high cost and probably high risk option.

*Q 4 - Will the London Infrastructure Delivery Board be enough to ensure best practice joined up delivery of infrastructure in London?*

The Infrastructure Delivery Board is a good idea and the biggest threat is from complacency or lack of commitment/priority from some of the agencies. Strong conviction and drive will be needed to ensure the plans stay on track.

*Q 5 - Where do you think London's growth would be best accommodated?*

This depends on an analysis of the additional infrastructure needs of different spatial strategies. However, we must recognise that the options are heavily constrained by the existing built environment and the feasibility of increasing road and rail capacity. Additional activity in the financial centre and flows into the central area need to be balanced by the development of important centres elsewhere, as the plan proposes. We support the idea of a new urban hub at Old Oak Common, linked with the development of Crossrail and HS2.

The Thames Gateway areas north of the river both within London and in South Essex also have significant potential for growth associated with transport improvements. Crossrail will bring enhanced service to a long corridor which includes inner zones as well as suburbs which could be redeveloped at higher densities. The riverside corridor has many brownfield sites which can be developed with both transport and green infrastructure improvements. South Essex may have been downplayed in the plan because of the proposed developments in North Kent associated with a Thames Estuary Airport. However, if the airport is not developed, then South Essex has great potential, through enhanced road and rail links, to accommodate significant residential and employment growth.

Concentration of development in certain areas needs, however, to be designed in a way so as to avoid a two tier effect where other parts of London and its environs are left behind economically as well as undue congestion arising in the development areas and elsewhere.

*Q 6 - No comment.*

*Q 7 - Regarding technological change do you agree with the proposed approach?*

Improved digital connectivity should increase scope for homeworking or other localised working close to peoples' homes to reduce the need for travel particularly at peak periods. This would reduce peak transport costs and overcrowding as well as creating additional road space for improved public transport and freight.

*Q 8 – How can we change behaviours to reduce demand for key infrastructure?*

See our answer to question 3. Road user charges and public transport fares both have an important role to play in managing overall demand and the balance between the modes. In addition automatic vehicle control will have an increasing role to play as technology develops.

### *Q 9 - Housing*

Whilst we have no comments on the specific question we would draw your attention to point 9 in our general summary in relation to protecting wharves and intermodal railheads from future housing developments in order to safeguard short sea and coastal shipping.

### *Q 10 – Are there other strategic transport projects we have not considered?*

Improved freight distribution methods get limited mention in the report. More consideration needs to be given to freight transshipment within London to rationalise freight movement levels through use of urban hubs served by road and rail with localised low carbon distribution as well as greater rail freight penetration into central London. This issue was considered in the CILT's recent [‘UK Freight Planning to 2035’](#) report.

### *Q 11 – Given funding constraints what projects do we need to prioritise?*

Areas for priority should include those that stack up as most cost effective and bring maximum benefit/payback as well as the most easily achievable and lowest cost options. Reliance on the high cost schemes unless the cost benefit ratio makes them ‘no brainer options’ could lead to unachieved ambitions if future financial constraints are a problem which is anticipated.

### *Q 12 – Which transport innovations do you think would have the most impact and why?*

See our answer to questions 3 and 7. The highest impact will probably come from the major rail infrastructure schemes and strong cost benefit cases will be required to attract the public and private sector funding needed. However other initiatives such as incremental improvements to bus services and cycle facilities would also have a high overall impact if taken together in their entirety the case for the tunnelled ring road needs careful examination, particularly the effect on feeder roads. We think it would be wrong to toll this road separately from a wider road charging system; this could divert traffic onto other less suitable roads.

As automatic vehicle control (including driverless vehicles) develops, this will hopefully lead to more economical and controlled movement of traffic with potentially beneficial effect on congestion levels.

### *Q 13 – How clear is our approach to tackling road congestion?*

Road congestion will never be efficiently tackled until a system of distance and time based charges is introduced. Walking and cycling are both highly important as any initiatives that reduce the need for motorised travel have congestion and environmental benefits. Any cycling solutions have to be designed to avoid unnecessary conflict with other traffic modes that create considerable road safety problems. In addition we would draw attention to comments made in our response to the Cycle Superhighways consultation where we expressed concern relating to potential negative impact on road capacity for buses, delivery and service vehicles.

As mentioned under Q12 automatic vehicle technologies will hopefully have a beneficial effect on congestion levels.

*Q 14 – What do you think of the vision for increasing step-free access to public transport?*

This is good. Step free access to public transport makes travel easier for everyone with specific benefits for the mobility impaired. But there may be stations on the deep tube network in central London where it would be physically difficult to implement and very expensive unless perhaps original lift shafts replaced long ago by escalators can be brought back into use, but even they often do not reach platform level

Green Infrastructure –Questions 15/16 and Digital –Questions 17/18 - No answers as we do not have the detailed expertise regarding these topics.

*Q 19 – Do you agree with our approach to stimulating locally produced energy?*

Yes. It makes sense

*Q 20 - What else should we consider to ensure London's energy supply is affordable, sustainable and secure?*

Keep reviewing new technologies that are being developed to promote greater sustainability in production methods, transport provision etc.

*Water Q21/22/23*

No answers as we do not have the detailed expertise re these topics

*Q 24 – Do you think the name 'circular economy' is best to describe the approach.....?*

The title does not automatically make one think of the process you are trying to describe but we have not been able to come up with a better title and it may be an expression that comes into more general currency in the foreseeable future.

*25. Q Do you agree with our proposed approach?*

The approach makes sense and has to be supported.

*26. Q - How can we incentivise businesses and households to reuse and recycle more?*

General education and rate incentives

Submitted by:  
Daniel Parker-Klein  
Head of Policy  
The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport  
[Daniel.parker-klein@ciltuk.org.uk](mailto:Daniel.parker-klein@ciltuk.org.uk)  
0207 3481981  
07894 620655

October 2014