



Submission by the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport

to the

National Infrastructure Commission call for Evidence:

London's transport infrastructure

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 has been prepared by the Institute's London and South East committees.

1 What are the major social and economic challenges facing London and its commuter hinterland over the next two to three decades?

- 1.1 Continuing population growth due to migration from other parts of the UK, Europe and beyond, increasing life expectancy and increases in younger populations.
- 1.2 Acute accommodation shortages and/or major expansion of housing stock requiring major increases in transport provision (bus and all forms of rail) to meet the demand for ever longer commuting journeys.
- 1.3 Changes to personal mobility patterns due to driverless personal transport which could have major implications for transport requirements as well as causing major difficulties for road capacity and parking provision in congested areas. NB the technology is as yet unproven and could be of little use where there is conflict with pedestrians, cyclists and other non-automated road users.
- 1.4 Changes to relationship between UK and Europe and break up of UK could have a huge effect on the viability of London and the south East which could cause either a strengthening or serious decline in the importance of London as a world

class centre. The result of the European Referendum could lead to major changes to London's importance in the world that at this stage are difficult to quantify.

1.5 Technological changes that could disperse working locations, particularly the increase in homeworking although effects of this on commuting are as yet relatively limited.

1.6 Increasing inequality, which risks resulting in options for funding transport enhancements through charges or higher fares being rejected as unfair and politically infeasible.

2 What are the strategic options for future investment in large-scale transport infrastructure improvements in London – on road, rail, and underground – including, but not limited to Crossrail 2

2.1 The options will depend on where the increase in the housing stock and in workplaces to accommodate the projected growth in London's population and employment is to be built.

2.2 Material increase needed in road and rail capacity on a number of routes within around Greater London. Currently capacity constraints are particularly acute on lower Thames river crossings as well as a number of key trunk routes in the South East and London. Whilst alternatives to car use and road freight transport need to be constantly sought to minimise the need for road capacity expansion it has to be accepted that free commercial traffic movement on key routes is essential for local, regional and the national economy.

2.3 Improved freight capacity and facilities needed within London and wider south East to cater for population increases, changes to travel patterns brought about by technological changes, particularly the move to online ordering and delivery. Transshipment between trunk and local movements will be essential both within road transport and between sea, rail and road. Ways of increasing non-road freight route capacity need to be found which could be around rather than across London. Ways would also need to be found to attract freight operators towards routes where there is greater potential capacity as opposed to routes already seriously constrained.

2.4 Future airport and runway decisions will have a considerable impact on transport flows in South East. Consideration needs to be given to developing other airports around London for freight and passenger movements (e.g. Stansted, London City, Luton and Southend) as well as the reopening of Manston, which could reduce traffic movements in critical areas of the road network. Building up some of these airports would also help strengthen local economies by improving local connectivity and job creation.

2.5 Greater use of River Thames and canal systems in and around London needs to be considered including what improvements to infrastructure are needed to make best use of these resources. The Thames can be used for passenger as well as freight flows. NB Wharfage has to be protected from high end housing schemes to allow future developments to happen.

2.6 Improvements to public transport in the areas outside the London boundaries would improve local connectivity and reduce car dependency which would reduce pressure on road and rail infrastructure within Greater London (See Section 6 below).

How should they be prioritised, taking into account of their response to London's strategic transport challenges, including their impact on capacity, reliability, journey times and connectivity to jobs?

What might their potential impact be on employment, productivity and housing supply in London and the South East?

2.7 Assuming that the current demographic and employment trends continue housing supply throughout the south East will need to grow considerably although a change to London's economic performance could slow this down or even reverse the requirement although population increases are likely even if the economy weakens considerably

2.8 Automation and homeworking could reduce the pressure within London and encourage more people to live further out. They would also materially affect the transport network and future assumptions regarding network capacity.

2.9 Unless there is increased public and private investment there will be a considerable housing shortage for the foreseeable future

2.10 Both Transport for London and the Department for Transport have well-established decision-making processes set out in the respective organisation's Transport Business Case. Priorities should continue to be determined against these criteria.

3 What opportunities are there to increase the benefits and reduce the costs of the proposed Crossrail 2 scheme

3.1 Integrate as much as possible with existing rail infrastructure and any disused rail corridors still extant to minimize construction costs

4 What are the options for the funding, financing and delivery of large-scale Transport Infrastructure improvements in London, including Crossrail 2

- What is the appropriate local and regional contribution- given the potential distribution of benefits to business, residents, transport users and the wider economy- and how could this be achieved?

4.1 Better cooperation and integration of planning, infrastructure, housing etc. between Greater London and surrounding authorities (as per City Regions in rest of UK). Also closer working between the authorities outside Greater London.

- What innovative funding mechanisms could be considered to support delivery of key schemes?

4.2 Regional/local taxation

4.3 Road user charging and expansion of congestion charge – This will be vital if automated personal transport takes off

4.4 More effective use of developer contributions which could include a levy on developers in addition to or as an alternative to the current mixture of measures, some of which encourage wasteful spending by developers.

5 How have major metropolitan areas in other countries responded to similar challenges and priorities? Are there lessons to be learned and applied in London?

5.1 Do European and other major Regional Transport Authorities provide a model for London to follow or does the London model work just as well?

5.2 Highway planning and management and bus services are dealt with differently outside the TfL area which inevitably constrains development. Funding in Shire and unitary areas is seriously constrained and getting ever more so year by year. This needs to be reviewed and changed if necessary.

5.3 UK Transport policy is based on the premise of maximising farebox contribution (usually involving annual fares increases at above-inflation rates) which is not the case in many other countries, particularly in Europe. The benefit of minimising subsidy against the extra capacity that would be required to accommodate demand from greater support levels needs to be reviewed and whether the provision of greater passenger transport capacity at more affordable fare levels and resulting increased usage would free up alternative road capacity for freight movement. There is also an affordability issue for lower paid workers who are paying a larger proportion of their income on transport in London than in major cities outside the UK.

6 General Comments and Points for Consideration

- 6.1 Clarity is needed on what constitutes London and what constitutes the south East and how far away from London the review should consider. For example improved transport links between Oxford and Cambridge, East Coast ports and the Midlands, along the south coast and between Kent and the Crawley/Gatwick/South London areas could all reduce vehicle and passenger movements into and out of London. What is good for London may not be good for the South East as a whole and vice versa. Transport needs, funding, provision, infrastructure and charging regimes should be less constrained by political boundaries. If current population trends and housing supply constraints continue people will continue to migrate outwards from London although transport affordability and in many areas, availability, raises a constraint to such outward migration as does an overloaded road and rail network.
- 6.2 Relative employment opportunities between London and the South East need to be considered as a whole with a view to spreading benefits to reduce the effects of overheating on the London economy and strengthening other economies that have suffered severe decline (e.g. south eastern seaside communities). This also needs to take into account the economies of regions throughout the UK and particularly within the northern super-region i.e. joined up thinking is essential for the UK as a whole.
- 6.3 Spending money on improved infrastructure in the South east may be more effective and deliverable as well as cheaper than directing the lion's share of expenditure into the Greater London area.
- 6.4 More clarity is needed as well as consistency within the region on what the priorities for transport related expenditure should be e.g.;
- Public v private transport and the role of cyclists and pedestrians
 - Passenger v. freight
 - The level of constraint on demand and desire for sustainable transport options
 - Road v rail and water
 - Airport capacity and locations
- 6.5 Other infrastructure considerations that have to be considered include;
- Funding the effects of climate related issues including coastal erosion from extreme weather (the current closure of the rail link between Dover and Folkestone is an example) or the loss of bridges, road damage etc. from flooding. These problems appear to be increasing due to the effects of global warming.

- The potential to damage to transport or other subterranean structures as a result of the increasing amount of below-ground building to provide additional residential capacity by building down rather than extending upwards which would be unlikely to receive planning permission. Planning regulations are probably the solution to this issue.

6.6 Overall Connectivity both within the South East and Beyond

- A high proportion of total transport movements between the UK and Europe travel through South east England and Kent in particular. As was seen in summer 2015 these movements are prone to major disruption whether due to industrial action, security issues or severe weather in the English Channel. Adequate capacity for freight transport to and from Europe is essential, particularly parking and driver rest facilities as well as provision of improved terminal facilities at other ports to allow for use by large ships when problems arise at the regularly used ports. Strengthening of rail capacity to the channel tunnel and ports is also needed (including around London to encourage trunk movements from the rest of the UK) to reduce the dependency on road networks. Continued development of North Sea and Thames Estuary ports with improved rail links should also be encouraged.
- As already alluded to outside the Greater London area public transport provision is generally to a much lower level, particularly on the majority of routes that are not rail-linked. Bus services are generally infrequent outside urban areas and often non-existent outside the core Monday to Saturday daytime period. The bus network (as well as the local charging regime) is almost entirely designed around what the commercial operators deem to be profitable that may or may not be the optimum network for a particular area and provision levels can vary considerably between comparable areas and bus operator groups. The road network is generally full to capacity at busy periods, Funding within non-metropolitan areas has been to traditionally lower levels than in London and is declining annually at an alarming level. If the current culture of car-dependency with its consequent resulting in an inefficient and environmentally questionable transport network is to be tackled a rethink is needed on how South Eastern England's transport network is funded and managed and how the planning system could be improved to reduce conflicting travel flows. The alternative will be a declining local economy due to the difficulty of moving freight and people around the South east and increasing inequality of movement for those without easy access to private transport.

- Regardless of London the South East is a very diverse area economically and demographically. There are a limited number of large cities but some major conurbations covering wide areas including the Brighton/Hove/Worthing conurbation, the Medway Towns, the South Thames side area, the Crawley/Gatwick/Redhill area and further afield the Solent area conurbation that includes Portsmouth, Southampton, Eastleigh, Fareham and surrounding areas. Transport links in and to and from these areas are in most cases poor when compared with comparable areas in other parts of the country as well as being heavily congested.

6.7 Whatever changes are made to discourage unnecessary movements within the Greater London area a balance has to be struck between the core London economy and the economies of the wider South East (and beyond). Evidence has been found (and which has been used to make the case for Crossrail 2) that productivity is higher in central London than elsewhere, even when differences in skills etc. are accounted for and concentrating high value employment in high cost areas generates income and revenue to fund the level of infrastructure needed in central London which would be unlikely to be justifiable anywhere else. Therefore a balance has to be struck between the differing economies in different areas. i.e. there is a need for joined up thinking that crosses political boundaries, business sectors, vested interests etc. that leads to decisions that benefit the UK as a whole as well as both London and the outer South east.

Submitted by:
Daniel Parker-Klein
Head of Policy
The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport
[email address and telephone numbers redacted]
January 2016