



## Notice of Non-key Executive Decision

<b>Subject Heading:</b>	<b>Draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 – Havering response</b>
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Roger Ramsey
<b>CMT Lead:</b>	Andrew Blake-Herbert - Group Director Communities and Resources
<b>Report Author and contact details:</b>	Martyn Thomas Development and Transport Planning Manager Tel : 01708 432845 E-mail : martyn.thomas@havering.gov.uk
<b>Policy context:</b>	National Planning Policy Framework (2012) Mayor's London Plan (2011) Mayor's Transport Strategy (2010) Havering Corporate Strategy (2014 – 2015) Havering Local Development Framework (2008) Havering Local Implementation Plan (2011)
<b>Financial summary:</b>	The Mayor identifies London's infrastructure for the period to 2050 costing up to £1.7 trillion and regards the draft plan as the means of opening up the debate tackling this. Several measures are highlighted to address the gap compared to existing funding including fiscal devolution, efficiencies in delivery and technological change. The Mayor envisages the public sector using private sector capital to raise finance. The implications for individual boroughs cannot be known at this stage.
<b>Relevant OSC:</b>	Towns and Communities

**Non-key Executive Decision**

<b>Is this decision exempt from being called-in?</b>
--

No
----

**The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives**

- Ensuring a clean, safe and green borough
- Championing education and learning for all
- Providing economic, social and cultural activity in thriving towns and villages
- Valuing and enhancing the lives of our residents
- Delivering high customer satisfaction and a stable council tax

## **Part A – Report seeking decision**

### **DETAIL OF THE DECISION REQUESTED AND RECOMMENDED ACTION**

That the recommended response to the London Mayor 's consultation on the draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 (as set out in Appendix 2) be approved.

### **AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH DECISION IS MADE**

The following elements of the Council's Constitution apply.

Council's Constitution November 2010 Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions

2 Executive Functions – Functions

2.5 (b) Where there are implications for policies of the Council, to agree members of staff's responses to consultation papers from:

- (i) the Government (including White and Green papers)
- (ii) the London Councils, the Greater London Authority, the Local Government Association and all other bodies where those papers affect the services allocated

### **STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

#### **1. Background**

Government planning policy (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework – 2012) requires authorities to plan positively for the infrastructure needs of their area.

In late 2013, the Mayor asked London Boroughs to respond to questions on infrastructure regarding such matters as what will be the key projects for the forthcoming 30 years, what barriers there are towards infrastructure provision and how can behaviours be changed to influence the demand for infrastructure

The Mayor has published his draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 for consultation building on that earlier work.

It sets out London's overall infrastructure needs and the costs of these to 2050. It suggests different options for delivering and financing these. In summary, the Mayor sees this topic as :

- What infrastructure will London need?

## Non-key Executive Decision

- Where will it go?
- How will it be delivered?
- How will it be paid for?

Preparing the plan has encompassed extensive research and intelligence, scenario testing, national and international case studies, 'best practice' reviews, benchmarking against other cities and stakeholder engagement.

This report outlines the key aspects of the plan and suggests a recommended response from Havering.

A copy of the draft plan (and the Mayor's 'London 2050 Bigger and Better' presentation that accompanies it) is in the Members' Resource Room.

### **2. Overview of the draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050**

The aim of the new plan is to better prepare London for its expected population growth over the long term so that London remains competitive globally and economically and is also a better city in which to live.

London is already a densely populated city compared to European and American cities (taking into account overall density across central and suburban areas as well as central areas). The Mayor notes that much of London's infrastructure is operating at or near to full capacity and its resilience has never been tested at full capacity levels.

The plan assumes that London's population will grow by 3.1 million (37 per cent) between 2011 and 2050 to 11.3 million people.

Consequently, the Mayor anticipates the following impact on infrastructure demand :

- 1.5 million new homes needed between 2020 and 2050 (and 49,000 homes each year)
- a 50 per cent increase in demand for public transport which will be unevenly distributed and fall heavily on the Underground (up 60 per cent) and rail (up 80 per cent) rather than roads
- a need to increase aviation capacity
- a modest increase in energy demand (up 20 per cent) but with a significant shift from domestic gas consumption to electricity
- an increased importance of green space to be considered as infrastructure
- the need for fast and ubiquitous digital 'connectivity' in all parts of London
- at least 600 new schools and colleges
- around 40 new waste facilities and re-using or recycling materials both domestically and in the economy

The initial sections of the plan (**Sections A-C and Chapters 1-13**) highlight :

- the growth of London to 2050 and the implications for infrastructure demand
- the close relationship between infrastructure, business strength and competitiveness and 'quality of life'

## Non-key Executive Decision

- new technologies (such as 'solar digital roads' that will transform roads into being both physical and digital links) that will change how we conceive infrastructure in the future and how it will be provided.
- how the Mayor wants to see innovation 'hardwired' and for this to encompass service delivery and procurement as well as technology
- the establishment of an Infrastructure Delivery Board to help provide the right conditions and a more integrated approach to infrastructure planning, procurement and delivery
- the importance of political support and consensus in infrastructure planning and delivery
- how London must deliver its infrastructure in a more efficient way to lead to provision ahead of demand
- the need for changes in the regulatory environment linked to some sectors to improve coordination and 'joined up' delivery

Housing and schools are included in the costs of London's infrastructure to 2050 but there is no detail on how these might be delivered.

Healthcare and other social infrastructure are also not included. This is because the Mayor thinks that there is uncertainty about the mix of healthcare infrastructure investment needed in the near future let alone to 2050.

The Mayor also notes that the London Health Care Commission is already examining healthcare and health and that the NHS is nationally funded. Nonetheless, he sees great potential for infrastructure in general to influence the health of Londoners and has sought to identify infrastructure investments that will enhance health.

**Section D (Chapters 14-19)** sets out strategic infrastructure needs for:

- transport
- green infrastructure
- energy
- water
- resource management and recycling and re-use
- digital infrastructure and connectivity (only up to 2020 because of the likelihood of further significant changes after that date)

### **3. What does the plan say about specific types of infrastructure**

The plan sets out a range of measures and projects to deal with, and meet, the demand across each of the infrastructure types listed above.

Details of these are summarised in Appendix 1.

### **4. Where does the draft plan see growth being located?**

**Section E (Chapters 20 and 21)** looks at where London's growth may be accommodated and what impact spatial planning decisions may have on infrastructure.

## Non-key Executive Decision

The Mayor has looked at 4 alternative scenarios :

- Continue current policies
- Increase densities in locations with good public transport access
- Increase densities in town centres
- Accommodate growth beyond London in areas linked by improved radial rail services

The Mayor will continue to encourage development in the Opportunity Areas such as London Riverside and Intensification Areas (both as set out in the London Plan) noting that the former benefit from significant capacity to accommodate new homes and businesses and are linked to existing or possible future improvements to public transport accessibility. The plan notes that the lack of infrastructure in some locations poses a challenge.

The projected drop in growth of demand for retail may provide scope for delivering good quality housing intensification in town centres where there may be other advantages such as public transport, scope for 'car-lite' schemes, increased resident population and greater range of housing tenures.

The plan confirms the Mayor's determination to retain London's Green Belt boundaries for the present given the large reservoir of brown field land that will accommodate growth to 2025 at least.

It suggests densification of town centres and the suburbs (Outer London) is necessary if London is to accommodate a large proportion of its growth within its boundaries. The Mayor says this must be linked to transport improvements especially for orbital journeys. He says that without improvements in public transport and provision for active travel, there would be increased congestion on key sections of the highway network.

The plan states that London can accommodate its growth within its existing boundaries until at least 2025 and also argues that increased densities in the urban areas of the south east could accommodate an extra one million people.

It notes that there is likely to be further growth outside of London in the form of new developments or additional densification of existing town centres. It says that these are most likely to occur on existing or planned transport corridors.

The Mayor identifies the role of new towns and urban extensions in areas beyond the Green Belt particularly where there is scope to increase rail commuting (such as through the benefits of HS2). The plan estimates that these areas may accommodate up to 1 million by increasing densities. The Mayor sees these areas as benefiting from local regeneration as a result of their residents being able to commute to / from Central London.

The Mayor envisages a new hub airport east of London, together with the supporting infrastructure for road and rail, rebalancing London and the wider region by encouraging more development in areas to the east and in the wider Thames Estuary

## Non-key Executive Decision

where there is development capacity and a need for regeneration. It would also provide the scope for a Regional Opportunity Zone at Heathrow with the potential for homes for 200,000 people and 90,000 jobs.

### **5. What will London's infrastructure cost?**

**Section F (Chapters 22 – 24)** looks at the financial implications and outlines how the Mayor wishes to approach the funding of infrastructure.

Arup (consultants) have provided a detailed cost model (including capital, operating and maintenance costs). The analysis is underpinned by an extensive range of assumptions such as construction cost inflation, progress on policy targets, the benefits to be derived from investing in infrastructure, the delivery of key projects such as an estuary airport and further Crossrail schemes, population projections and economic growth. (The inclusion of projects such as a new hub airport which are not certain to proceed because the Mayor does not have control over them and / or changes in the Mayoralty) may 'inflate' the total cost).

Unsurprisingly, the 'headline' figure is huge – an estimated £1.3 trillion between 2016 and 2050.

Housing and transport account for over three quarters of this investment and energy just over a tenth. ICT infrastructure may be just 1% of overall costs which is very low considering the high value benefits of digital infrastructure.

The Mayor concludes that assuming that existing funding arrangements continue, there is a projected £4.5 billion annual average funding gap for public sector funding across the housing, transport, education and green infrastructure sectors.

The Mayor says a 'business as usual' approach to infrastructure funding will not be enough and infrastructure funding must change to meet London's infrastructure needs. The plan highlights that other 'world' cities such as New York have far greater revenue raising powers than London.

The Mayor identifies several necessary changes including:

- fiscal devolution to give London more control over housing, transport and other infrastructure investment (as set out in the London Finance Commission), including retaining remaining business rates and some property taxes in order to fully capture property value uplift from the delivery of schemes such as Crossrail
- greater use of private sector sponsorship and institutional investors
- ability for some projects to sit outside the public sector's balance sheet and removal of borrowing caps on parts of the public sector
- exploring new sources of local funding, including a regional or London income tax, a motoring duty, hotel bedroom tax and continuation of the Business Rates Supplement after Crossrail 1 is paid for.

The Mayor says the plan's model for infrastructure funding may have application elsewhere with other big UK cities.

## Non-key Executive Decision

The plan argues for :

- more efficient and integrated delivery of infrastructure in London – to save money, improve delivery and generate the political leadership required across London to implement the plan.
- proposes establishing a London Infrastructure Delivery Board made up of representatives from the main infrastructure providers in London, such as regulators, developers, land owners and utility providers to respond to infrastructure being delivered by a range of public and private sector organisations, all governed by their own regulatory regimes and leading to a 'siloed' approach.
- the Mayor having a statutory duty to consult with utility companies and regulators on the London Plan and they should have a duty to consult with the Mayor on their investment plans.

The Mayor will seek to gain political agreement with boroughs about on-going decisions about London's infrastructure needs via the London Congress.

### **6. What others have said about the draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050**

Very few published responses were available at the time of preparing this report.

London Councils considered the issue in mid-October following informal officer engagement with boroughs.

It welcomed the plan saying it is ambitious and timely. It wants to work with the Mayor and other stakeholders to secure vital London infrastructure. London Councils :

- support the technical work underpinning the draft plan and acknowledge that technology and innovation has the potential to play a significant role in how and what infrastructure is delivered.
- broadly agrees with the assessment to increase densities in areas with good transport links but says that the challenges involved in creating sustainable and successful communities will require careful planning.
- recognises the contribution that fiscal devolution may have and suggests that new forms of borrowing and the benefits of rising land values need to be explored.
- acknowledges the role of the London Infrastructure Delivery Board but wants to see strong links between it and delivery partnerships. It also wants the Board to be able to take account of sub-regional issues and influence action within sub-regions.

London Councils comments in detail on specific infrastructure topics such as transport, water and green infrastructure, digital technology, energy and waste and

## Non-key Executive Decision

recycling and a number of overarching points such as :

- omitting detailed analysis of social infrastructure (housing, school and health provision) is a fundamental weakness because they support London's continued growth and sustainability
- pupil growth rates are double those in any other region and should be recognised in infrastructure planning
- health and transport need to be aligned so that medical facilities are supported by public transport
- London should have a greater share of the national affordable housing programme
- underused / unused NHS sites should be released and the receipts re-invested in the NHS estate or housing
- new river crossings in East London are essential to unlock the potential economic growth in the area and will work with the Mayor to ensure appropriate schemes are developed to an accelerated timetable
- Formal consideration should be given to cultural infrastructure as this is an essential part of making a city a good place to live

Finally, London Councils conclude that the plan must be more than a technical and financial strategy and it will require a partnership approach.

### **7. Officer comments on the draft infrastructure plan**

Havering officers consider that the draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 is ambitious and raises important questions about the future of the capital. It :

- illustrates the scale of investment needed
- challenges public and private sector stakeholders to start planning for long-term infrastructure needs
- highlights the need for more radical thinking about how infrastructure is funded in the future

The provision of high quality infrastructure is essential if London is to be able to accommodate the significant growth envisaged and the potential of areas identified for further economic growth and regeneration is to be maximised.

So, it is welcome that the Mayor has raised the challenging issue of long term infrastructure planning for London and has highlighted issues such as finance and delivery.

It is also welcome that that the Mayor has taken a broad and wide – ranging definition of infrastructure but it does not fully explore or resolve the integration and relationship between different types of infrastructure.

It is important that the Mayor is made aware of the importance of seeing infrastructure as more than buildings or facilities. It needs to be seen in a 'holistic' way which

## Non-key Executive Decision

considers its provision from the perspective of when, who and where and with what funding. Maintenance issues also need to be addressed. Tackling these matters will help ensure that businesses and communities are confident that London's growth can be accommodated.

The plan should also address key social infrastructure such as health and other community facilities. These will be crucial to building attractive and sustainable communities and maintaining London's quality of life. They will need to be delivered at the appropriate stage. If London is to accommodate an extra 3 million people and the potential of Opportunity Areas and potential Housing Zones (such as those for London Riverside in Havering) to provide significant numbers of new homes and jobs is to be realised.

The scope for improved infrastructure (such as green infrastructure) to have health and well-being benefits is welcome.

Although the Mayor recognises that more than a large list of projects is necessary and highlights the importance of integrated delivery of infrastructure, the plan's format in looking at infrastructure on a type by type basis may perpetuate an approach that is 'silo-based'.

The clear focus on transport in the plan can be supported but there is only limited consideration as to how an integrated approach can be secured and benefits maximised. More clarity should be given to how different transport projects identified might link and work together.

The Mayor sees transport proposals as enabling economic growth and getting people to work. It highlights key large-scale projects such as further extensions of Crossrail, the Silvertown Tunnel, a tolled inner orbital tunnelled road and other rail-based improvements. The importance of these is acknowledged.

These 'big-ticket' transport infrastructure items are important but the plan should also consider how more modest transport investment may help Londoners carry out other aspects of their lives more easily and comfortably.

The plan should also recognise the importance of other projects to improving 'connectivity' and relieving congestion and afford these a greater priority. These remain important issues in Outer London for boroughs like Havering and will be exacerbated without the necessary investment in improvements to key junctions on the strategic road network like Gallows Corner. If this plan doesn't recognise their importance then there is a concern that they will never be seen as priorities compared to larger projects and programmes.

The plan should recognise the scope for public realm improvements to enhance places and secure business growth and investment and it is suggested that the final plan should also include public realm investment as 'infrastructure'.

The London Plan has an emphasis on the role of planning in 'place – making'. This is supported and the same approach underpins the Council's own strategies. The Mayor's final infrastructure plan should reflect the importance of place-making and

## Non-key Executive Decision

illustrate practically the links between the different types of infrastructure that are crucial for places to function well, be good for business and offer a high quality of life to residents.

It is suggested that the plan's approach to topics such as green infrastructure, energy water and digital connectivity should also be broadly supported.

The plan's commitment to improved digital connectivity in employment areas can be welcomed.

The approach to waste management is generally supported. The challenge of dealing with a topic which is heavily led by local arrangements and contracts needs to be more clearly recognised.

The Mayor's recognition of the scope for brownfield sites to accommodate growth to 2025 rather than the Green Belt is noted as is the scope for town centres to accommodate more growth through 'densification'.

However, the suggestion in the plan that there is scope for considerable growth to be met in the suburbs through higher densities is a significant concern and would be likely to jeopardise the character and local context of these areas. Boroughs are best placed to determine the approach that should be taken to accommodating further growth and their local plans and strategies are the appropriate mechanisms for considering this based on local circumstances.

The Mayor's proposals to improve the co-ordination for delivering infrastructure are welcome. The London Infrastructure Delivery Board should include representatives from London boroughs as key infrastructure planners and providers. However, the final plan should set out much clearer plans for delivery and the importance of a partnership and collaborative approach between stakeholders.

The Mayor should set out how he will ensure that sufficient capacity exists to deliver the infrastructure that London needs and stronger governance arrangements to achieve this. There may be an issue about resources (capacity and skills) in public sector bodies for tackling infrastructure planning in the light of cuts in their budgets and establishments.

A range of advisory groups are being established to advise on the further development and implementation of the London Infrastructure Plan. A balance is needed between developing a strategic overview while leaving discretion for local decision-making and delivery that is responsive to London's diverse communities - for example, when developing a more strategic approach to green infrastructure.

The focus in the plan on infrastructure delivery, new approaches to funding and more collaborative working is important. With the exception of some specific transport projects and programmes, the plan takes a topic-based rather than spatial approach and does not generally link infrastructure to individual locations in London.

Because the plan does not take a spatial approach to infrastructure, it is not readily possible to say with certainty how **Havering** may benefit from it in regard to **identified**

## Non-key Executive Decision

elements of infrastructure. Clearly, the provision of Crossrail and improvements to rail and bus services and linked facilities across London may benefit Havering residents when they journey into London and they may benefit travellers visiting Havering.

The Mayor's commitment to improving links to, and within, Opportunity Areas and specific reference to a new station at Beam Park can also be strongly supported and have been 'championed' by the Council for many years.

Measures to tackle congestion may also benefit Havering provided that schemes and programmes in the borough are identified and prioritised. In this regard, it is recommended that the Council take the opportunity to highlight that improvements to Gallows Corner junction should be a high priority as this is an important 'gateway' into Havering for traffic coming into the borough as well as a 'hotspot' for local traffic using Havering's road network.

The provision of an airport in the Thames Estuary may benefit Havering if the associated transport improvements the Mayor identifies are secured and have 'connections' in Havering. Nonetheless, the Council would need to be satisfied about the environmental implications of any such proposal.

Recent strategies from the Mayor (such as the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan - FALP) have recognised that the London is at the centre of a city-region covering a large part of south east England. The Mayor has indicated his intention to work closely with agencies and authorities in neighbouring regions to develop and implement policies on sustainable growth. He wants to see effective arrangements in place for effective planning for the London city region and to support cross boundary working where appropriate. The FALP sets out a clear commitment to integrating existing and new transport infrastructure with land use and development capacity within London and across its borders. The final infrastructure plan should set out the same commitment and work on it, and its delivery, should follow this approach.

### **8. A recommended response from Havering**

A recommended response from Havering is set out in Appendix 2. It reflects the points above.

The response also takes account of the points submitted to the Deputy Mayor for London in November 2013 when he launched the initial work on the Mayor's infrastructure planning task.

### **9. Next steps**

Subject to Member approval the recommended response will be submitted to the London Mayor. It is expected that the Mayor will publish his final plan in early 2015.

Members will be kept informed on further progress with the infrastructure plan as necessary.

**Non-key Executive Decision**

**OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

The option of not responding to the draft Infrastructure Plan for London 2050 has been discounted because of the importance of infrastructure to the delivery of the planning and economic development priorities in the London plan and borough strategies.

**PRE-DECISION CONSULTATION**

Officers across the Council have been involved in the work on the preparation of this report and the recommended response.

**NAME AND JOB TITLE OF STAFF MEMBER ADVISING THE DECISION-MAKER**

Name: Martyn Thomas

Designation: Development and Transport Planning Manager

Signature: 

Date: November 11 2014

## **Part B - Assessment of implications and risks**

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

There are no direct legal implications or risks that arise from the consultation and responses made in respect of the Mayor's Draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050.

Cleared by Vincent Healy, Legal Manager by e-mail on October 29 2014.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

The Mayor identifies London's infrastructure for the period to 2050 costing up to £1.7 trillion and regards the draft plan as the means of opening up the debate tackling this.

Several measures are highlighted to address the gap compared to existing funding including fiscal devolution, efficiencies in delivery and technological change.

The Mayor envisages the public sector using private sector capital to raise finance.

The implications for individual boroughs cannot be known at this stage.

Cleared by Conway Mulcahy, Strategic Finance Partner by e-mail on November 6 2014.

### **HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS (AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS WHERE RELEVANT)**

There are no direct human resource implications for Havering relating to the draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050.

The recommended response makes clear the importance of the Mayor recognising that there may be skills and capacity issues for boroughs and stakeholders in taking the plan forward.

Council officers in the development planning team (and elsewhere as required) may have to input into further work on the plan as it is developed and progressed by the Mayor. This may have an impact on service delivery but every opportunity will be taken to ensure that this is minimised.

Cleared by Geraldine Minchin, Strategic HR Business Partner by e-mail on November 5 2014.

### **EQUALITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

### Non-key Executive Decision

This decision is London Borough of Havering's response to the Mayor of London's draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 and therefore does not have any direct equalities and social inclusion implications.

However, the response does incorporate a number of equality issues that are missing from the plan such as :

**School facilities** – Havering is expecting an increase in younger populations before 2050 and therefore planning school infrastructure is essential.

**Primary and Community Health Care Provision** – Havering is expected to see an increase in older age groups, in particular over 65 years of age, and therefore health facilities are needed to support people with age related disabilities and health conditions.

**Tackling Congestion and road safety** - Both children and older people are vulnerable road users so any improvements in road safety measures and congestion will have a positive impact for these groups.

Cleared by Paul Green Corporate Policy and Diversity Advisor by e-mail on October 29 2014.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None.

**Non-key Executive Decision**

**Part C – Record of decision**

I have made this executive decision in accordance with authority delegated to me by the Leader of the Council and in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution.

**Decision**

Proposal agreed

Proposal NOT ~~agreed~~ because

**Details of decision maker**

Signed



Name: Councillor Roger Ramsey

Cabinet Portfolio held: Leader of the Council

Date: November 11<sup>TH</sup> 2014

**Lodging this notice**

The signed decision notice must be delivered to the proper officer, Andrew Beesley, Committee Administration Manager, in the Town Hall.

**For use by Committee Administration**

This notice was lodged with me on 12/11/14

Signed  \_\_\_\_\_

**The draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 – key infrastructure requirements (from Section D Chapters 14-19 of the draft plan).**

The plan sets out a range of measures on how to deal with and meet the demand across each of the infrastructure types listed.

**a) Transport**

The plans for transport are the most comprehensive and significant and include key projects and proposals while those for other forms of infrastructure focus more on the approach to infrastructure planning. The Mayor wants to tackle three objectives :

- Support London's growth and economy
- Serve a growing population
- Make London more 'liveable'

The focus is on improving radial lines into London's Central Activity Zone (CAZ), where further agglomeration of jobs and growth is expected despite changes in technology allowing much more mobile and remote working.

Other key actions and projects include :

- increasing train frequencies and peak capacity of the existing Tube network
- increased rail capacity on orbital routes within London (the Mayor refers to this as the 'R25') as well as radial links through London and into surrounding areas
- extending the network (specifically the Bakerloo line to the south)
- modernising key central London stations (including Euston, Holborn, Waterloo and Victoria)
- a four runway hub airport to the east of London
- developing a 24 hour transport system including the Tube but also rail and out-of-hours freight delivery to support a 24/7 city
- further Crossrail projects including increasing the frequency of Crossrail 1 trains and developing Crossrail 2 by 2030
- transforming the national rail network in London by increasing capacity and train frequency so that it operates like a second Tube network
- using transport to support key developments that expand London's central area e.g. Old Oak Common
- faster and high capacity transport links to beyond London's traditional commuter belt, by upgrading links to High Speed1 (HS1) and capitalising on HS2.

The plan also acknowledges that Londoners need to move across the city as well and proposes the following :

## Non-key Executive Decision

- delivery of the Roads Task Force investment programme in recognition of the importance of roads
- enhancing London's bus network
- a series of new river crossings in East London beyond the proposed Silvertown tunnel
- a new inner orbital tolled road tunnel
- further devolution of suburban rail routes into London to the Mayor to improve systems and integration with the rest of London's transport system
- a south London Metro
- enhancing transport accessibility to support the densification of London's suburbs including further bus capacity,
- upgrading the Overground,
- additional orbital rail connections where feasible and
- expanding the cycling and walking infrastructure,
- measures to improve transport in town centres across London.

The plan looks at how extending transport links, increasing capacity and new / improved stations can realise economic development opportunities such as extending the Gospel Oak line to Barking Riverside and the provision of a new station at Beam Park.

The Plan also advocates a new four-runway hub airport and its related transport connections to the east of London suggesting that it would become a significant economic 'pole' with the potential to rebalance London's economic shape.

The plan suggests transport developments to make London a more 'liveable' city, including the development of a comprehensive network of cycle routes, tackling pollution linked to transport, the development of iconic 'place-changing' schemes, minimising the impact of freight and reducing fatal and serious accidents on the road network by 80 per cent by 2040.

### **b) Green infrastructure**

The Mayor wants to see green space seen as infrastructure in its own right. Increased population densities will put more pressure on London's green space. It is suggested that an additional 9,000 hectares of open space will need to be created to meet current standards in response to this.

The Plan highlights the importance of green infrastructure in making London a 'liveable' city. It proposes that it could be better planned, designed and managed to deliver benefits beyond leisure and recreation including mitigating flooding, improving air quality and cooling the urban environment.

It argues for better co-ordination and use of green space with the Mayor establishing

## **Non-key Executive Decision**

a Green Infrastructure Task Force to report to consider new options for governance and funding for green spaces in London and for this to report in 2015.

### **c) Energy**

The Mayor wants to address issues around the demand for energy outstripping supply because he says there has been underinvestment in the national grid.

He wants to tackle :

- security and reliability of supply
- affordability and cost competitiveness of energy
- reductions in CO2 emissions by 2050 in line with national and London policy

Electricity demand is increasing by up to 4% per year. The current approach can significantly delay developments and has led to black outs in central London. The potential solution, however, could require London boroughs, alongside developers, to bear any excess cost if use of the new infrastructure is too low. There are also proposals for reducing energy demand and making London's energy supply more reliable – for example, developing markets for local energy supply.

There are also proposals to improve the regulatory environment for energy so that investment anticipates future demand rather than just reacting to it.

In the shorter term, London needs to build 6 new substations and develop heat networks at key sites such as Vauxhall Nine Elms – Battersea.

The Mayor also wants to see more locally produced energy and improvements in building technology and energy metering.

### **d) Water**

Demand for water in London is predicted to exceed supply by 2016 with a 26% deficit by 2050.

The Mayor wants to see a more integrated approach to water management (including from Government) and removal of organisational 'siloes'.

The plan aims to improve the security and sustainability of London's water supply by investing in new technologies to use existing water more efficiently and reduce leakage and by encouraging longer term investment by water companies. The Mayor will lead on developing a sustainable drainage action plan for London and will lobby to make 25 year plans for wastewater and drainage a legal requirement for Thames Water and ensure that London receives a (risk based) 'share' of the national flood budget to reduce flood risk.

**e) Resource management**

The plan sets out measures to encourage better resource management – in particular, encouraging and accelerating the development of a ‘circular’ economy using London’s waste such that by 2050 very little waste will require disposal and most waste facilities will be for re-use and recycling. This will require working with London waste authorities to introduce more consistent collection and recycling.

**f) Digital infrastructure and connectivity**

Broadband is seen as a ‘fourth utility’. It is vital for London’s economic competitiveness and an important component of modern life for residents.

The Mayor wants London to be the first city in the world to deploy 5G in the 2020s but parts of London still have no or poor internet connectivity (the Mayor calls this a ‘capacity crunch’).

The Plan suggests the following to improve digital connectivity in London:

- working with the telecoms industry to set up a Connectivity Advisory Group to oversee city-wide mapping of high-speed connectivity and identify ways to improve connectivity in the short term.
- the provision of property information to include connectivity details
- improvements in the regulatory environment around communications including bringing planning applications for communications infrastructure within the Mayor’s strategic responsibility
- encouraging London boroughs to have planning rules that support improving connectivity.

Opportunity Areas are seen as the ideal occasion to build in high quality communications networks.

Martyn Thomas  
October 30 2014

**Draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 – response from London Borough of Havering**

Havering welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft London Infrastructure 2050 plan.

Where helpful, the response indicates which consultation questions are being addressed.

**Overview**

Havering welcomes this initiative from the London Mayor (Q1).

Havering strongly supports the preparation of the draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050 to plan for and make provision for the delivery of infrastructure suitable for the UK's capital because London's infrastructure:

- needs continued and significant investment to ensure that London continues to attract and retain businesses and service the needs of its growing population.
- will be placed under significant pressure if London's growth proceeds as expected.
- will underpin future economic success, social well-being and a high quality of life for its residents

Havering strongly considers that infrastructure planning and provision must be regarded in 'holistic' manner instead of just physical facilities such as buildings and utilities. It must be seen in a context which addresses when it is provided, by who and how along with its funding. This more systematic approach will help secure confidence from businesses, the community and other stakeholders (including other infrastructure providers) about the impact of London's growth.

Havering would like to see well co-ordinated and planned improvements in infrastructure provision to support London's future growth, unlock potential development and enable greater connectivity and productivity.

East London's relatively low land values and the high quality of life available in places like Havering could be increasingly important drivers of London's growth if the right infrastructure is identified and can be delivered.

Havering suggests that the provision of social infrastructure such as schools and health facilities must be addressed in the plan. Social infrastructure planning will be fundamental to the delivery of sustainable communities and

## Non-key Executive Decision

must underpin important Mayoral initiatives such as the Housing Zones programme and the focus on Opportunity Areas (Q2).

London faces a growing pressure for school places (both primary and secondary) and traditional methods of funding this are unlikely to be sufficient in areas where development viability is not sufficient to pay for this social infrastructure. Demand for places at higher education facilities may also increase. It will be important to balance increasing provision in areas where higher education already flourishes and breaking into areas where both higher education provision is low and is matched with a correspondingly low level of achievement at degree level. The Mayor's strategy should include investment in higher education facilities in Havering / East London. These could include building on the Havering College Southern Campus and the provision of facilities in Romford and Rainham.

There are likely to be greater demands on primary and community health care provision as a result of the growing and increasing diversity of population and the growing numbers of older people. Havering expects there to be greater emphasis on primary and community care facilities in place of hospitals.

The plan excludes NHS infrastructure and emphasises the linkages between infrastructure and health. The Mayor's commitment to choosing options that enhance health is welcome and strongly supported. Health and mental well-being will be assisted by the provision of infrastructure that supports active travel and recreation focussed on green infrastructure.

Some infrastructure needed to support London's growth has the potential to adversely impact on communities and / or the environment (for example, through adverse impacts from noise and air quality).

The plan must recognise that infrastructure has a role in a 'place-making' in line with the Mayor's approach in his London Plan.

The plan should encompass a spatial approach to infrastructure as well as being topic based because it will :

- address concerns that infrastructure planning and provision remains overtly 'silo'-based
- better show what infrastructure is necessary to support specific parts of London
- better inform the Mayor's spatial priorities such in regeneration and Opportunity Areas
- demonstrate that infrastructure provision needs to be comprehensive and effectively integrated to deliver 'best outcomes'

## Non-key Executive Decision

- assist boroughs in discussions with developers and their own infrastructure planning work (such as emerging Community Infrastructure Levy schemes)

Havering broadly supports the plan's approach to identifying areas for growth with a focus on Mayoral priority areas (such as Opportunity Areas) and town centres well served by public transport (Q5).

The scope for 'densification' where there are good transport links is noted. Recognition of the importance of taking account of local character and context is strongly welcomed. The plan must recognise that densification is likely to give rise to the need for schools and health facilities (Q5).

Havering is concerned about redeveloping suburban semi-detached housing at twice its density even if this remains within the sustainable quality residential density matrix. It would result in the loss of character and appeal of suburban outer London. Much of London's suburbs (including parts of Havering) has low PTAL rating and higher density development would have a significant impact in terms of additional traffic and parking. Increasing densities in suburbs could damage what makes them so appealing at present (Q5).

The focus for increased housing development should continue to be on major brownfield sites, Opportunity and Intensification Areas and town centres with high PTAL ratings (Q5).

It may be unrealistic for London to meet expected population growth if areas such as Havering are to retain their character and appearance. The Mayor should work more closely with authorities adjoining and beyond London to explore the scope for these to help meet growth rather than continue to increase densities in London and place unsustainable demands on its infrastructure (Q5).

Other Mayoral strategies (such as the London Plan and the Mayor's Transport Strategy) recognise that Greater London's administrative boundary is unhelpful for planning purposes. The London Plan, for example, considers the impact of shopping facilities outside London such as Bluewater and Lakeside on established town centres in London. The infrastructure plan should be consistent with this approach and take account of, and integrate with, infrastructure planning in the wider south-east (Q5).

## Non-key Executive Decision

### **Havering's comments on specific topics**

Havering would comment on specific topics as follows.

Investment in transport facilities will be crucial and Havering broadly considers that the correct strategic projects are identified (Q10).

The plan will be stronger if it shows more clearly how the various transport items may be linked and work together.

Havering considers that :

- More emphasis is needed on tackling congestion and road safety 'hot-spots' particularly in Outer London where significant numbers of journeys are by private vehicles(Q11 and Q13)
- the Mayor's Roads Task Force should have a crucial role in the development and delivery of the plan
- there should be investment in main arterial routes into / around Romford and at key junctions such as Gallows Corner (intersection of the A12 / A127 and within 3 miles of the M25 motorway). Recent comments from the TfL Commissioner about TfL looking at wider areas around key nodes such as Gallows Corner to explore the scope for junction and road corridor improvements as a means of addressing the pressures on this location are welcomed. If issues like this are not regarded as important then they may never be regarded as priority projects
- the A13 will become more important to London as new port facilities in Thurrock expand. It is already heavily congested through Barking and Dagenham and Havering at peak times. Early action is needed to improve this important road
- further river crossings are supported in principle after the delivery of the Silvertown Tunnel subject to the comments Havering made in response to the recent river crossings consultation from TfL
- the Mayor should work with the Government and other stakeholders to identify solutions for the Lower Thames (Dartford Crossing)
- Havering will only benefit from any new airport to the east of London if it has good connections to it (both private and public transport)
- increasing the capacity of public transport systems is necessary through projects such as Crossrail and Thameslink particularly where such improvements realise economic development potential

## Non-key Executive Decision

- there is a strong case for improvements to the Essex Thames-side line through London Riverside to provide for longer (12 car) trains and increased capacity with a new station at Beam Park. This will unlock development potential in London Riverside and provide better access to an improved service for passengers. It will assist in the development and regeneration of extensive nearby GLA owned sites which will contribute to the overall development of London Riverside and the provision of homes and jobs in advanced manufacturing, industry and green industries
- Havering supports existing rail stations being upgraded. In Romford, Crossrail is planned to arrive in 2018/9. Currently the proposed interchange with buses is poor and a street level pedestrian southern entrance / exit would improve this and help deliver the improvements that were intended with the project
- Romford station is Havering's 'front door' and investment here will encourage business investment and growth in Romford and open up new residential opportunities. Havering has worked with Crossrail / TfL to prepare a masterplan for the area to the south to improve the integration of the station with its surroundings
- Good bus transport connections from Romford into the southern part of the borough (including a bridge over Rainham Creek) to promote investment in the area and improve access to this large employment area is needed. In addition, this would provide access for visitors to Rainham Marshes and the RSPB visitor centre from Rainham Station
- Important health and well-being benefits are likely to be achieved with investment in public transport particularly where this improves air quality and reduces noise
- transport infrastructure must be accessible and useable by everyone (Q14)
- modest infrastructure investments can sometimes bring about improvements for business and the wider community as well as more expensive 'big-ticket' items (Q11).

Public realm improvements should be regarded as infrastructure. The quality of Romford's urban realm is critically important to the town's ability as a Metropolitan Centre to attract investment. It will be essential for Romford's future viability to be able to capitalise on infrastructure projects such as

## Non-key Executive Decision

Crossrail. The fabric of the town centre urgently needs upgrading to support the growth of Romford and promote private sector development (Q2).

Investment in the public realm will also enable Romford to compete more strongly with Lakeside, Bluewater and Stratford Westfield City. It may also help encourage private investment in the several development opportunities that are in or close to the town centre.

Havering works closely with TfL to deliver public realm improvements and is completing schemes in Victoria Road and the Battis. There is scope for further work including Western Road. Public realm investment here will complement the major new leisure facility that Havering is implementing. Romford ring road needs improvement to make it safer for pedestrians, cyclists and road users.

Havering strongly supports the dialogue between the Mayor and the utilities companies being strengthened to ensure that these companies are better informed about planning for London and that the Mayor / boroughs are better informed in developing and implementing major schemes.

Havering welcomes measures to ensure London's energy provision remains secure and London is able to meet increased demand by increasing diversity, efficiency and sustainability. Investment in energy infrastructure should take place before demand arises.

Havering supports increasing energy capacity and decarbonisation. It wants opportunities for decentralised and local energy explored. The Mayor should support initiatives for decentralised energy networks and local low-carbon / renewable energy generation (Q19).

In Havering London Riverside, there are significant issues with electrical supply as well as opportunities through waste to energy and other 'green' sources of energy. Energy provision must be a fundamental part of the master-planning and planning policy framework for key regeneration and growth areas such as London Riverside. The Mayor should look to realise opportunities linked to energy where he has jurisdiction over sites owned by the GLA.

More emphasis is needed on demand management including energy efficient measures for current buildings as well as new ones.

Energy demand reduction through new building standards and retrofitting existing stock is supported.

Improvements to digital infrastructure to support greater business and household and 'connectivity' are welcomed. A balance is needed between

## Non-key Executive Decision

exclusive (and higher cost) technologies and more 'mainstream' facilities so that digital exclusion is avoided.

Significant investment is necessary to improve the fabric and digital connectivity of London's employment areas to help grow the economy. Havering welcomes recognition of the importance of Opportunity Areas in regard to digital connectivity improvements (Q7).

Improving digital connectivity may impact adversely on other important infrastructure such as roads and transport links.

Efforts need to be directed at reducing and mitigating against long term flooding risks. In Havering, there are particular issues and opportunities in the south of the borough, where directly dealing with fluvial flooding could open up development sites and addressing tidal flooding could bring opportunities to improve facilities, deliver and protect significant numbers of homes, protect and enhance the visitor and wildlife of Rainham Marshes.

Improvements to strategic waste-water systems (such as upgrades and capacity improvements at sewage treatment plants and the Thames Tideway Tunnel) are necessary for public health and ecological reasons.

Havering welcomes that less waste disposal infrastructure is likely to be needed by 2050. It remains important for waste to be disposed of as close to source as possible and for facilities to be distributed across London rather than concentrated in areas such as East London (Q23).

Waste demonstrates very clearly the difficult practical issues to be tackled in developing an infrastructure plan for London. Several boroughs operate their own waste collection services and rationalising contractual and service arrangements will take place against a plethora of local contractual agreements and individual local circumstances (Q23).

On green infrastructure (Q15), Havering considers that :

- the sustainability of green infrastructure should be prioritised especially when budget pressures may result in reductions in investment and maintenance such that it deteriorates and it becomes harder to justify a case for retention
- the circumstances of different parts of London need to be considered (for example between inner and outer London) and in the recognition that land values and competition from other uses will vary
- open space strategies developed by individual boroughs should be reflected in the green infrastructure strategy

## Non-key Executive Decision

---

- some boroughs (such as Havering) have developed effective cross - borough working on green infrastructure
- green infrastructure should be fully integrated into the planning for Opportunity Areas / major development sites. Well planned, designed and managed new green infrastructure can deliver a range of benefits as well as recreational and amenity such as mitigating flooding, improving air quality, enhanced bio diversity and better health. Further investment in Rainham Marshes to create a high quality park ('Wildspace') to encourage visitors and tourists to the Marshes and Rainham Village will be welcomed
- recognition should be given to the role of voluntary groups and friends in managing, promoting and protecting green infrastructure
- promotion and marketing of green infrastructure on a pan London should be addressed. The role of the London Parks Forum should be given greater support
- opportunities for improved access should be explored in boroughs which are well provided with green infrastructure such as Havering
- the plan should highlight the role of measures (such as binding covenants) to provide and safeguard green infrastructure where it is necessary to support existing communities and / or London's growth

Havering considers that relatively little progress has been made in changing behaviour to reduce the demands for infrastructure. More needs to be done by everyone especially when resources for infrastructure are subject to many competing demands. Havering is keen to see a balanced approach taken which weighs the advantages of increasing capacity against changing the way that users behave (Q8).

Changing behaviour linked to the use of energy and natural resources will be much more challenging. It may need to be supported by the actions and programmes of several linked stakeholders and rely on parallel programmes of advertising and promotion (which may themselves be costly).

Transport modes such as walking cycling and public transport may become more attractive if there is sustained increased investment in public transport. This may reduce the mode share of private transport and reduce the need for investment in roads and 'release' resources for other infrastructure investment.

A London Infrastructure Delivery Board is broadly supported. It should include representatives from boroughs and the infrastructure providers (Q4).

## Non-key Executive Decision

The Mayor should recognise that :

- there are different views about London's infrastructure needs. The plan should secure better agreement and establish clear patterns of partnership working to ensure the necessary stakeholders are involved throughout to set out clear mechanisms for delivery. Some issues will not be readily dealt with in a 'one size fits all' approach and, in some cases, there will be a spatial or topic and / or thematic partnerships approach is needed
- preparing and delivering the plan must ensure a fair balance of involvement so that all stakeholders feel they have a role and are not just observers to the delivery of the Mayor's priorities
- relative priorities should be established for London's infrastructure. Current infrastructure planning and delivery strategies do not generally do this although transport themed investment is generally acknowledged as the largest single area that where investment will be needed
- boroughs / stakeholders may need Mayoral assistance in infrastructure planning because of constraints in terms of other work priorities, capacity and skills
- 'anticipatory investment' ahead of need may be necessary and failure to do this may be a barrier to enhancing growth. Havering strongly wishes to see further investment in public transport infrastructure to support growth in London Riverside. The provision of a new station at Beam Park in London Riverside is predicated on the redevelopment of the surrounding areas with homes / jobs. Improved bus networks into / from and within London Riverside ahead of development will also assist. Future energy infrastructure should be built into the planning of key regeneration areas (Q9)
- infrastructure and site delivery are inseparable in regeneration areas like London Riverside. The potential of 'stalled' sites may be realised by looking at the synergies between site assembly and new infrastructure provision. The Mayor will have a key role where the GLA has an interest in sites (Q10)
- many types of infrastructure need pan-London support or support from several authorities because they are used by extensive areas of London (eg. transport facilities, waste and regional recreational facilities). Further work on the preparation of the plan should aim to provide the opportunity for boroughs and stakeholders to work collaboratively and, in appropriate circumstances, provide joint responses

## Non-key Executive Decision

- established ideas about London's regions may have to be re-thought and infrastructure planning and delivery adopt a 'fuzzy boundaries' model
- in line with his draft Further Alterations to the London Plan, the Mayor should commit to working with agencies and authorities adjoining / beyond London to develop policies to help facilitate sustainable growth. Infrastructure should be encompassed within this
- a considerable challenge will be to secure political 'buy-in' and support. The practical difficulties of bringing London into unified arrangements are illustrated by the range of waste management contracts and arrangements across London
- securing the support of the 'market' may be hard as it may have its own ideas about the timing and delivery of some aspects of infrastructure
- the preparation and delivery of the plan should recognise the importance of resilience in both individuals and organisations involved

Martyn Thomas  
November 10 2014