



## **Mayor's Transport Strategy Consultation**

### **Local London Partnership Response**

The Local London Partnership welcomes the opportunity to provide its comments on the Draft Mayor's Transport Strategy

#### **Introduction**

The Local London Partnership was established in February 2016. Membership is made up of eight London Boroughs; Barking & Dagenham, Bexley, Enfield, Greenwich, Havering, Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest. Members of Local London work in partnership with the aim of delivering growth and to identify opportunities for devolution to this London sub-region.

The Local London boroughs have established a statutory Joint Committee to manage their programmes and regular meetings of the leaders, Mayor and Chief Executives of the boroughs set the strategy and direction of the Partnership.

Working together our mission is to realise the huge potential of our boroughs which are at the heart of London's future economic growth. We have a shared vision of a vibrant, dynamic and prosperous region and we work together to drive delivery and support growth to meet the ambitions and needs of our residents, current and future.

Already we are a significant contributor to the strength and potential of London. Our eight boroughs have a population of more than 2.1 million, enough to put us in the top five UK cities if we were freestanding. London's population is set to reach 10.5m by 2041 and Local London will account for more than 34% of that growth. By all measures Local London's ability to absorb and deliver this growth sustainably is fundamental to London's success and the Mayor's vision for a fairer, greener, healthier and more prosperous city

Key to achieving this vision and delivering growth in jobs, population and housing in Local London is the provision of the enabling investment in strategic transport infrastructure and the development and implementation policies to address the pan-Local London air quality issues. Local London boroughs are individually responding to the consultation on the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) from a local perspective, addressing the full range of policies and proposals in the MTS including those where strategic infrastructure impacts on the local. There is no merit in rehearsing all these detailed responses again at a Local London level. Rather, this collective statement is intended as a unified response to those transports schemes, issues and policies that Local London-wide and will have a major impact upon our ability to achieve good and sustainable growth. It does not supersede local borough responses but complements them. For this reason we have submitted a response that does not respond to each of the consultation questions.



## **General Comments**

Generally we support the overarching ambition and aspiration of the Strategy, the holistic approach being taken to the environment and health, including the proposals for 'good growth'.

We are not clear how the policies and proposals in the MTS relate to the London Plan given that a full review of the London Plan is currently underway and will not be completed until 2019. This is particularly important if, for instance, the new London Plan contained policies aimed at providing significantly more housing than does the current Plan. Logically, the reviewed London Plan setting out the vision and spatial planning policies for London should be published first and the MTS should then be developed to set out how the policies in the Plan related to or enabled by transport policies and investment can be realised. However, since the beginning of the GLA it has been the practice to produce the MTS first and it is assumed therefore that this MTS's policies and proposals are derived from the spatial policies in the current London Plan. However, there is a strong argument for a further review of the MTS in autumn 2019.

There is much that is good and positive in the draft Strategy related to localities and places and borough comments reflect that. This response on the other hand is intended to highlight our concerns and priorities for transport strategic policy and investment in Local London. There are two key areas of concern that we briefly highlight here and then expand on in our detailed comments.

**Pace and deliverability:** We are concerned that the pace of delivery of major new infrastructure set out in the draft MTS is inadequate to meet the demands of the projected growth in the Local London area. Infrastructure investment should come in advance of development or at the same time and not follow on, often much later. Inextricably linked with this is the evident problem of funding the proposals that are in the Plan. Pages 266-267 succinctly set out the severe constraints on the ability of TfL to fund infrastructure investment. Little of the major infrastructure proposed has a clearly identified source of funding. The Strategy states that 'additional sustainable funding sources and project specific grants are needed to deliver the aims of this Strategy alongside contributions from London boroughs and the private sectors'. However, these are not secured and the approach to realising new sources of funding is high level and not fully spelt out. So we are concerned that without further vigorous, robust and innovative approaches to funding key aspects of the MTS are simply aspirational and are not deliverable which will severely adversely impact on the quality of life of our current residents and the delivery of 'good' housing and employment growth. To understand the impact of not being able to resource the policies and proposals in the Plan one of more 'what if' scenarios should be produced to understand the impact on congestion and overcrowding, public health, housing and employment growth and on the vision for London as a sustainable and prosperous city. This would also provide the data needed to underpin the case for investment from Government and for the flexibility to adopt innovative financing



mechanisms. Local London would want to work with the Mayor in building the case for investment in order to secure more funding.

**Adequacy of investment:** The MTS needs to deal with current challenges – overcrowding, congestion, air quality, accessibility, etc. - which require investment as well as the additional investment required for good growth. Local London is concerned that the current policies and investment proposed in the MTS will not tackle the existing issues let alone enable the good growth Local London needs to deliver our and the Mayor's vision. In this circumstance Local London wishes to work with the Mayor to secure more funding.

### **Specific Key Issues for Local London**

**Spatial Approach:** We are concerned that the MTS does not fully recognise or address the transport challenges of the outer London town centres and areas of housing and employment growth. Even the mapping provided to explain policies and proposals is based on corridors radiating from the CAZ and does not address how orbital/sub-regional radial movements generated by these centres/sites will be accommodated. Despite much work being done over many years by boroughs and TfL/GLA on polycentric growth and transport needs and demands in outer London little of note is set out in the strategy to promote and enable a modal shift from cars to more sustainable modes of transport.

**Healthy Streets:** We support the Mayor's healthy streets agenda and the importance of active travel in providing excellent facilities for walking and cycling. Closer engagement with public health professionals is needed to actively encourage walking and cycling journeys to be made and thus achieve the Mayor's physical activity targets. There is also a need to address the overdependence on car travel and its links to inactivity and road danger and work with the police to address poor driving.

**DLR:** The DLR network is an essential potential enabler of 'good growth' in the Local London area. We support an early extension of the DLR to Thamesmead and its further extension to Belvedere to improve the connectivity of this area of the Thames Corridor. We would also like to see a Lower River Roding crossing linking Barking Riverside with Beckton providing a DLR link to Gallions Reach/Royal Docks. We are concerned, however, that the speed of the capacity enhancement programme for the DLR has already fallen behind demand impacting adversely, for instance, on development in the Royal Docks.

**Barking - Gospel Oak Line:** We endorse the proposal for an extension of the Barking – Gospel Oak line from Barking Riverside to Abbey Wood to link with Elizabeth Line services

**Elizabeth Line:** We strongly support the extension of Elizabeth Line to Ebbsfleet.

**Crossrail 2:** We strongly support the opportunities created by Crossrail 2 to unlock housing growth in the deprived Upper Lea Valley. We also support as a precursor to



Crossrail 2 the early four-tracking of the West Anglia Main Line between Tottenham Hale and Broxbourne.

We are disappointed at the treatment in the MTS of the potential eastern extension of Crossrail 2. An eastern extension would create hundreds of thousands of much-needed new homes and jobs across East London and South Essex, attracting major investment and boosting the national economy. This has been recognised by the National Infrastructure Commission which found it would bring a £20.5 billion boost to the economy, support 265,000 new jobs and 233,000 new homes as well as contribute significantly to commuter capacity.

**River Crossings:** We are concerned that the MTS is not addressing with any urgency the severance issues caused by the River Thames. We are concerned that the timing of such consideration pushes the prospect of additional river crossings too far into the future and will limit the potential for growth in east London and the Thames Corridor. We urge the Mayor to engage as early as possible in dialogue with the riparian boroughs in Local London to accelerate consideration of the need for crossings in the locations indicated in the MTS.

**Suburban rail services:** We strongly support the devolution of further suburban rail services to the Mayor at the earliest opportunity. Alongside this there should be ongoing investment in existing London Overground infrastructure to make sure that all stations served by TfL have a minimum four train per hour, as far as possible even interval, service throughout the day and night. There should also be a commitment that service levels will not be reduced and that key hub stations, such as Tottenham Hale and Edmonton Green, will still be directly served by longer distance operators.

**Accessibility:** We strongly support making the transport system accessible to all, particularly addressing the currently low number of rail and underground rail stations that are step-free.

**Bus/Bus transit networks:** Buses are and will remain the crucial transport provision in outer London so we welcome proposal to improve bus reliability and times and the introduction of new routes in areas of new development. We consider that there is a need to improve the consultation process in the planning and provision of bus routes as boroughs have a better understanding of local needs and how future regeneration areas should be served. We also support measures for the relocation of bus resources to outer London, subject to safeguards. We support the proposals for the development of bus-transit services and in particular the contribution they could provide to orbital transport services in outer London. Early schemes should include a north-south transit connecting Marks Gate to Barking Riverside; an east –west transit connecting the key town centres and growth areas in London Riverside; an east – west transit/s for the Upper Lee Valley; North Greenwich to Slade Green. We welcome TfL’s intention to commission a study looking at



options for an east London Bus Rapid Transit service serving London Riverside and further north towards Romford.

**Tram Link:** Subject to the outcome of the current feasibility work TfL should consider support a tram link serving Romford and Rainham and Beam Park with potential links to Collier Row.

**A13 Riverside tunnel:** This project to underground a 1.3km stretch of the A13 to reduce severance, improve air quality and to unlock land at Castle Green for redevelopment as well as improve traffic flow supported by a new station at Castle Green on the recently approved London Overground Extension is supported.

**Gallows Corner:** TfL's current consideration of improvements to Gallows Corner does not go far enough and do not address the severance that this junction causes. A more radical overhaul of the junction would have the potential to provide land for development. The MTS should include a commitment to a detailed investigation of the fundamental changes that could be made to the junction in terms of its physical layout and its operation. "Sinking" the junction in the same way as the A13 in Barking and Dagenham would have considerable benefits.

**Rivers and Canals:** We strongly support the development of a London Passenger Pier Strategy which will contribute to the development of river services to provide increased capacity to meet the demands from housing and employment growth at key sites such as Charlton Riverside, Thamesmead, Erith, Rainham and Newham. We also strongly support policies to promote the use of the Thames and indeed other rivers and canals for freight use.

**Freight Routes:** We support the lobbying of the DfT necessary to achieve the upgrades to the rail freight routes outside London which are necessary in order to route non-London freight around London and free up train paths on the Barking – Gospel Oak and C2C lines for much needed additional passenger services. Rail routes through Bexley could be relieved by Network Rail's proposal for a west-facing spur to serve Angerstein Wharf.

**Air Quality:** Poor air quality is a challenge right across the Local London area; both along the highway network and in town centres. We support the aspiration of the Mayor in meeting this challenge. We consider the proposal for an inner London Zone based on boundaries around the north and south circulars is inequitable for local residents in the areas affected and does not meet the needs of residents in outer London.

**Long term Planning and Ambition:** Notwithstanding our very serious concerns about the deliverability and particularly funding the proposals in this draft MTS we are conscious that the very long lead times for the development and then delivery of major transport infrastructure mean that collectively we should be considering the next set of major schemes to address needs post 2041. TfL and the Local London boroughs should enter into dialogue now about which new schemes such as a Crossrail 3 and outer London 'orbital' rail are required.



**Working Together:** We noted in our introduction to this response that the Local London Boroughs have come together to collaborate on their shared objectives for delivering sustainable housing and economic growth. Our sub-region does not match the current configuration of the sub-regions which are used by TfL officers to have an on on-going dialogue boroughs in East and South East London. Given the opportunities that our relatively new Partnership offers for collaboration we would like to invite TfL to meet with us on a regular basis about transport policy, infrastructure policies and developments which have a sub-regional/multi-borough implications and impacts.