Overview and Scrutiny Committee			
Title	Mayor of London's 'London Infrastructure Plan 2050'	**Item No**	4
Contributors	Executive Directors of Resources and Regeneration and Customer Services		
Class	Part 1	**Date**	29th September 2014

Reasons for Lateness and Urgency

This report was not available for the original dispatch because of the need to compile responses from a number of different Council departments and the short timetable available for response. The report is urgent cannot wait until the next meeting because the final consultation response must be submitted by 31 October 2014.

Where a report is received less than 5 clear days before the date of the meeting at which the matter is being considered, then under the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100(b)(4) the Chair of the Committee can take the matter as a matter of urgency if he is satisfied that there are special circumstances requiring it to be treated as a matter of urgency. These special circumstances have to be specified in the minutes of the meeting.

1. Purpose

1.1 The Mayor of London has published a consultation document entitled 'London Infrastructure Plan 2050'. This report provides a summary of the content and sets out some of the implications for Lewisham.

1.2 This current report also seeks to provide an initial answer to the questions posed by the Mayor of London as part of the consultation.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Committee is recommended to:
   a) note the content of this report
   b) note the proposed response to the consultation on the Mayor of London's draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050
   c) consider whether it wishes to make any further comments about the proposed response, ahead of consideration of this report and draft response by Mayor and Cabinet on 23 October 2014

3. Policy context

3.1 The Mayor of London has certain statutory functions including to produce a spatial strategy for London that he calls the London Plan. There have been various versions of the London Plan but none have ever been accompanied by a document that sets out the infrastructure needed in the future to deliver the spatial strategy. The London Infrastructure Plan 2050 (LIP 2050) is the first ever strategic attempt to state exactly what infrastructure London needs, roughly how much it will cost and how it can be delivered.

3.2 The Lewisham Core Strategy, adopted by the Council in June 2011, is the spatial strategy for development in Lewisham. The Core Strategy is supported by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) published in August 2010. The IDP set out the infrastructure necessary to deliver the vision and policies in the Core Strategy over a 15 year period.

3.3 Following government planning guidance the IDP identifies and costs the needed infrastructure as 'physical infrastructure', that is, transport, utilities, waste management, flood defence; 'social infrastructure', that is, education, health, community, leisure, estate renewal and emergency services and finally 'green infrastructure' that is open spaces. The IDP relates to infrastructure necessary for Lewisham and does not identify London wide strategic infrastructure.

4. Background

4.1 The LIP 2050 consultation period ends 31st October 2014. The aim of the LIP 2050 is to better prepare for London's population growth which is based on the assumption that the population of London will grow by 3.1 million people between 2011 and 2050.

4.2 The LIP 2050 is structured as follows: It is divided into 7 sections. Section A (chapters 1-5) sets the context and provides the population growth assumptions. Section B (chapters 6-8) deals with the impact of technology. Section C (chapters 9-13) deals with the factors necessary to deliver the infrastructure including political and regulatory changes. Section D (chapters 14-19) sets out the strategic infrastructure needed, including chapters on transport, green infrastructure, digital connectivity, affordably and sustainable energy supply, water and waste. Section E (chapters 20-21) deals with the spatial pattern of growth across the city and the impact on the wider south east. Section F (chapters 22-24) sets out estimates of the cost, the funding gap and options for finding the money needed. Section G (chapters 25-26) sets out the consultation questions and next steps.

4.3 The LIP 2050 sets out a range of measures to meet demand across each of the infrastructure types listed in Section D. However, the plans for transport are the most comprehensive and include key projects and proposals, while those for other forms of infrastructure focus more on the approach to infrastructure planning.

4.4 The LIP 2050 does not cover housing, schools, health or cultural infrastructure.

4.5 It is the intention of officers to report to the Mayor and Cabinet in October with a full response to the LIP 2050.

5. Summary of infrastructure proposals

5.1 Transport
5.1.1 The LIP 2050 sets out three overarching objectives for long-term strategic transport investments for the capital, to:

1 support London and the UK's economy
2 serve a growing population
3 make London more liveable.

1 Support London and the UK's economy
5.1.2 The LIP 2050 identifies a range of rail and road-based measures which will support London and the UK's economy.

5.1.3 The rail measures focus on providing high-capacity radial public transport, such as Crossrail and the Bakerloo Line Extension, and calls for a modernisation of the existing tube and rail network, as well as main interchange stations.

5.1.4 LB Lewisham would welcome such measures, and it is particularly encouraging to see the strong references to the **Bakerloo Line Extension**, which will transform the connectivity of this area of South London. LB Lewisham will be providing a full and detailed response to TfL's forthcoming public consultation with its support for the proposals.

5.1.5 There are a broad range of road-based measures proposed in the plan. This includes improvements in traffic signal technology and predictive traffic management which together with a re-design of London's major junctions and pinchpoints, would tackle **congestion**. LB Lewisham would encourage this kind of investment and, through the Road's Task Force, has identified opportunities for improvement of TfL's network in the borough.

5.1.6 There is also a proposal to enhance the **bus network**, including increased priority, new links to growth areas, and expanded capacity to serve the growing population. LB Lewisham would welcomes further investment in bus services, but in addition to serving growth areas, would urge a renewed focus on those areas that still suffer from poor levels of accessibility, such as in the south of the borough.

5.1.7 The plan recommends a series of new **river crossings** in East London (in addition to the proposed Silvertown tunnel) to overcome the major barrier effect of the Thames. This is the subject of another TfL consultation and the Council will be responding in support of the principle of increasing capacity across the river to unlock economic potential in south-east London.

5.1.8 One of the more eye-catching proposals is a **new inner orbital tolled road tunnel** that would reduce congestion and improve the environment in central London. It should be noted that this refers to the city centre and is not a proposal for the South Circular.

2   Serve a growing population

5.1.9 The LIP 2050 identifies a range of interventions aimed at addressing the predicted growth in the capital's population, and providing the transport infrastructure needed to support areas of intensified development.

5.1.10 Extensions to the existing rail network would provide connections to areas with major development potential. Again the plan highlights the potential of the **Bakerloo Line Extension** which could support the regeneration of areas such as Old Kent Road, New Cross, Lewisham, Catford and other locations on the existing Hayes rail line, as well as supporting development in Outer London locations. As part of LB Lewisham's response to TfL's forthcoming consultation on the extension, the Council will be commenting on the resulting development opportunities in the borough.

5.1.11 The proposal for new and improved stations to act as **focal points for development** is of interest to LB Lewisham. The stations in Lewisham and Catford have a variety of design and functionality issues and fail to enhance the public realm in the town centres. The opportunity to remodel these stations, potentially as part of a Bakerloo Line Extension, is something that will be considered as part of our response to the consultation.

5.1.12 Following the success of London Overground, **further devolution of suburban rail routes into London** is recommended to improve services and fully integrate journey planning and ticketing systems. LB Lewisham has benefitted from the East London Line and would be supportive of proposals for further devolution, in particular an extension of the London Overground from New Cross to Bromley via Hither Green.

5.1.13 For those lines which are retained as National Rail, a **South London Metro** service is proposed to ensure that no area of London is without fast, frequent and high quality metro-style services. By 2030, around three quarters of rail stations in the capital should offer a service running at least every ten minutes during peak hours. This would be greatly welcomed, especially where current frequencies are very poor, such as the Catford Loop Line, or where capacities are inadequate particularly in the peak periods. Furthermore, this improved level of service is compatible with the Bakerloo Line Extension, which would unlock capacity on the rail network.

5.1.14 In order to support the densification of existing suburbs, **enhancements in public transport accessibility** would be proposed alongside the embedding of more sustainable travel options such as **cycling and walking**. The kind of enhancements required would include further bus priority and capacity (much needed in the south of Lewisham), a major expansion of cycling and walking infrastructure (LB Lewisham would welcome this on the Quietways model) and capacity enhancements to existing rail services such as an upgrade of the Overground to six cars (much needed on the East London Line). The suggestion of additional orbital rail connections in outer London, where feasible, is a topic on which we would welcome further discussion.

5.1.15 In order to support more intense **development in town centres**, the report proposes a programme of targeted investments to help town centres adapt to their changing role as locations for city living, including improved stations, gyratory removal, improved public spaces and high streets. Further to the regeneration of Lewisham Town Centre and major transport scheme in Deptford High Street, this is likely to include a review of the south circular in Catford, which TfL are currently reviewing, in consultation with the Council.

3   Make London more liveable

5.1.16 The LIP 2050 also aims to improve quality of life for residents and visitors to London through a range of measures including:

- enhanced **accessibility programmes** to meet the needs of older and younger people, with two thirds of public transport journeys to be step free by 2050.
- a comprehensive **network of cycle routes** for all types of journey and cyclist, including 200 kilometres of new Dutch-style cycle highways
- A pollution-free transport system, including **an Ultra-Low Emission Zone** supported by incentives for the uptake of ultra-low emission vehicles, based on electricity, hydrogen and other technologies
- **'Minimal impact freight'**, including out of hours, consolidation, last mile bike freight and zero-emission vehicles as the norm.

5.1.17 And finally, the LIP 2050 targets at least **an 80% reduction in fatal and serious accidents** on London's road network by 2040, moving towards the elimination of all such accidents. LB Lewisham is supportive of all these proposals.

5.2   **Green Infrastructure**

5.2.1 The Plan highlights the importance of green infrastructure in making London a 'liveable' city and 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.

5.2.2   It sets out the importance of access for Londoners to high-quality green spaces even as the city increases in density in the future. To keep pace with the projected population increase, the equivalent of an additional 9000 ha of accessible green space will need to be created to meet existing standards.

5.2.3   The plan argues for better co-ordination and use of green space, with the Mayor of London establishing a Green Infrastructure Task Force to consider new options for governance and funding for green spaces in London. This could have significant implications for London boroughs, given they are major funders and managers of green space. Further details regarding the potential membership and terms of reference is needed and serious consideration needs to be given to the impact of funding pressures on Lewisham's budget.

5.2.4   In line with these principles, Lewisham has undertaken a significant amount of work already, including working with other boroughs over many years on the south-east London Green Chain, working with the Environment Agency on Waterlink Way, and working on the North Lewisham Links programme of work to enhance open spaces and connectivity for walking and cycling.

5.3   Digital connectivity

5.3.1   The plan states that broadband is now considered a 'fourth utility' and is vital for London's economic competitiveness. However, parts of London still have no or poor internet connectivity. The Plan suggests the following to improve digital connectivity in London:
   - establishing a Connectivity Advisory Group to oversee city-wide mapping of high-speed connectivity, and identify ways to improve connectivity in the short term
   - improving the regulatory environment around communications, including bringing planning applications for communications infrastructure within the Mayor's strategic responsibility and encouraging London boroughs to have planning rules that support improving connectivity.

5.3.2   Lewisham supports the priority given to digital connectivity and the establishment of a Connectivity Advisory Group to oversee the city-wide mapping of high speed connectivity. As a borough with a large number of micro-enterprises, improving digital connectivity and access will facilitate an expanded market place for these groups and in turn help strengthen the local economy.

5.3.3   While supporting the improvement in speed of digital connectivity, this must be coupled with an acknowledgement that certain groups are currently more likely to be digitally excluded, this includes elderly residents and those from lower incomes.[1] While the level of digital exclusion is reducing over time, any improvements must recognise this exclusion and mitigating actions put in place. In helping to reduce this exclusion and achieve universal digital connectivity the plan should recognise the role of the voluntary and community sector in supporting many digitally excluded citizens.

5.3.4   The Council recognises the importance of Open Data and the London Data Store for bringing together information that can help to shape the delivery of public and voluntary sector services.   Alongside the range of data an equal emphasis must be

---

[1] National Statistics – Office of National Statistics, Internet Access Quarterly Update.

placed on how this information is presented. The use of new technologies such as geomapping and data visualisation tools to present information should be promoted to ensure data is easily accessible to a wide audience.

5.3.5   While the Council appreciates the need to keep pace with technological advances, there must be recognition that there are significant cost implications and that role of Local Authorities in this development will be impacted by current reductions in funding.

5.4   Secure, affordable and sustainable energy

5.4.1   The plan describes the potential near future threat that energy demand will exceed supply. The report proposes three interconnected objectives to respond to this:
- Security and reliability of supply
- Affordability of energy
- Demand reduction (framed as the Mayor's 80% reduction in CO_2 emissions by 2050)

5.4.2   There are three main ways the GLA propose to achieve these:
1. New investment in substations and associated infrastructure, in particular through reducing delays and costs to developers arising from the regulatory framework. The consultation also proposes that local authorities could take on risk from developers where the cost of additional infrastructure for developments is overestimated.
2. The consultation advocates promotion of local energy production, particularly combined heat and power and heat networks. It also presses for greater access to local energy supply markets for local energy generators.
3. Reducing energy demand through retrofit of London's ageing building stock and the roll out of smart grid/ smart meter technology.

5.5   Resilient, secure water

5.5.1   Demand for water in London is predicted to exceed supply by 2016. 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 of London 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.

5.5.2   The Plan sets out a number of actions that need to be taken by water companies and central government as well as by the GLA:
- improving the water efficiency of existing developments
- incentivising people to become more water efficient through the use of tariffs and measures
- encouraging leakage detection and fixingdeveloping a sustainable drainage action plan
- working with water companies to encourage them to develop longer-term plans for the sustainable supply of water and also in relation to drainage

5.5.3   The plan proposes a sustainable drainage action plan for London and further information and clarity is required regarding its connection to existing proposals by the Drain London Board and the plans and responsibilities of individual boroughs.

5.6   Moving from waste to reuse

5.6.1   The Mayor of London anticipates an increase in the reuse and recycling of materials, both domestically and in the economy. The plan sets out measures to encourage

better resource management – in particular, encouraging the development of a 'circular economy' using London's waste. A circular economy is described as being where goods are designed in order to be reused or recycled. This means that waste is designed out of products, which are made to be disassembled and reused with the minimum of effort and energy. This will also require working with London waste authorities to introduce more consistent collection and recycling.

5.6.2 The LIP 2050 states that there is likely to be around 40 new facilities to help reuse and recycle materials, however the report does not detail the size, location, material streams needed or the cost of these facilities.

5.6.3 The LIP 2050 states that improved waste collection is needed both under the current system and to support the circular economy. However, there are costs associated with provision of 'additional' services. Whilst a move to the circular economy is commendable, the approach needs to be clear as to the role that local authorities will play. Local authorities collect the waste / resource that householders, and in some instances businesses, throw away. There are costs to this and if local authorities are the ones collecting this resource, then the financial costs associated with the collection needs to be passed to local authorities. Lewisham has in the past looked, and continues to look at the feasibility of reuse projects and services. As of yet, whilst having numerous social and environmental benefits, the financial case has not stacked up.

5.6.4 Further, consideration will have to be given to the role of behaviour change and getting householders and businesses to alter habits and participate in services provided.

5.6.5 For many years, the way that waste and recycling collection services have operated have been through identifying the needs of the householder at a local level. There are a number of factors that would need to be considered for a consistent pan-London approach including political will, financial constraints, existing contracts, collection and disposal infrastructure and governance. That is not to say that there are no opportunities for providing cross borough services, and Lewisham has led on the procurement of textile recycling at bring banks for 11 London authorities.

6. Consultation Questions

1. ***Do you agree with the need for an infrastructure plan for the capital? Do you support our approach? If not, why?***
Yes, a coordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure for London is needed.

2. ***Is any of the infrastructure identified unnecessary – if so why? What (if any) infrastructure do you think London will need in addition to what we have identified? Why?***
It is acknowledged that, given the uncertainty around health care provision, it is difficult to plan for future need. Whatever arises will require close working between the NHS, GLA and local authorities and is of sufficient strategic importance to London to merit consideration as part of this Infrastructure Plan.

Delivering school places to meet demand is critical and should be addressed at a regional level, across London. It should form part of London's infrastructure planning.

The Plan should give more consideration to cultural infrastructure. Lewisham's budgets face significant financial pressure, which impacts on the ability to invest

locally, and cultural infrastructure alongside wider social infrastructure is an essential part of making a city liveable.

3. ***We have identified a significant funding gap with regard to the infrastructure that we think London will need. We have also set out a menu of options to help close the gap. Which of these should we pursue and why? Which not and why? Are there other options we haven't considered which you think need to be addressed?***
No comment at this stage

4. ***Will the London Infrastructure Delivery Board be enough to ensure best-practice joined-up delivery of infrastructure in London? What more could the Mayor do?***
Further information is needed about the Board, particularly in terms of Borough's representation and how the Board will fit with other existing forums.

5. ***Where do you think London's growth would be best accommodated (please explain why)? Are there alternative spatial scenarios we need to analyse?***
No comment at this stage

6. ***Do you agree that incentives on utility providers should be amended to enable investment costs for growth to be shared more widely? How practically can this be achieved? If not, why?***
Further explanatory detail is needed to understand the implications for moving risk from developers to local authorities in relation to the cost of new energy infrastructure.

7. ***Regarding technological change, do you agree with the proposed approach? What technological advances should London be taking account of or be leading?***
No comment at this stage

8. ***How can we change behaviours to reduce demand for key infrastructure? To what extent could demand side changes affect, for example, our energy needs or over-crowding on London's transport?***
Although reducing demand for energy is identified in the consultation there is little reference to the planning system and the potential role this has to play for new developments. In relation to existing properties there is a gap between ambitions for home retrofit and the resources to deliver and the proposals do not explain how this work is going to be resourced.

Specific questions:
Housing
9. ***Do you have other suggestions for how we could more effectively unlock housing sites with the help of infrastructure?***
No comment at this stage

Transport
10. ***Are there any other strategic projects we have not considered?***
No comment at this stage

11. ***Given funding constraints, what projects do you think we need to prioritise?***

The LIP 2050 is right to emphasise the importance of high-capacity, high-frequency radial links, and highlights the Bakerloo Line Extension as a leading option to deliver such enhancements. The BLE would provide a new strategic corridor from north-west to south-east London. This would also free up capacity on the rail network, and utilise the spare capacity on the existing section of the Bakerloo Line. This makes the BLE excellent value for money, and one of the most deliverable major rail schemes in London. LB Lewisham therefore strongly urges that the BLE is developed and delivered as one of the highest priority schemes.

12. *Which transport innovations do you think will have the most impact and why? How can we encourage their development?*

Electric vehicles offer great potential for improved air quality, reduced carbon emissions, and improved health. The development and implementation of charging points is a complex matter which requires a London-wide approach.

13. *How clear is our approach to tackling road congestion? How significant do you think promoting walking and cycling could be as part of the solution?*

Cycling and walking is absolutely essential to tackling road congestion, as well for as the many other positive outcomes for the environment and public realm. LB Lewisham supports the provision of well-considered purpose built cycle routes, particularly the wider roll-out of the Quietways model, which need to be well-designed and integrated with the public realm.

14. *What do you think of the vision for increasing step-free access on public transport?*

Step-free access must be an essential element of design and infrastructure planning. While it is understood that making two thirds of public transport journeys step-free is ambitious, LB Lewisham would urge that every opportunity is taken to stretch the target so that all journeys are step-free by 2050.

Green infrastructure

15. *Are there strategic green infrastructure objectives that should be prioritised? If so, are there any specific initiatives needed?*

No comment at this stage

16. *What are the key issues that the proposed Green Infrastructure Task Force need to consider?*

This could have significant implications for London boroughs, given they are major funders and managers of green space. Further details regarding the potential membership and terms of reference is needed and serious consideration needs to be given to the impact of funding pressures on Lewisham's budget.

Digital

17. *What else can we do to ensure we achieve universal digital connectivity?*

While supporting the improvement in speed of digital connectivity, this must be coupled with an acknowledgement that certain groups are currently more likely to be digitally excluded, this includes elderly residents and those from lower incomes. While the level of digital exclusion is reducing over time, any improvements must recognise this exclusion and mitigating actions put in place. In helping to reduce this exclusion and achieve universal digital connectivity the plan should recognise the role of the voluntary and community sector in supporting many digitally excluded citizens.

The Council recognises the importance of Open Data and the London Data Store for bringing together information that can help to shape the delivery of public and voluntary sector services.   Alongside the range of data an equal emphasis must be placed on how this information is presented. The use of new technologies such as geomapping and data visualisation tools to present information should be promoted to ensure data is easily accessible to a wide audience.

While the Council appreciates the need to keep pace with technological advances, there must be recognition that there are significant cost implications and that role of Local Authorities in this development will be impacted by current reductions in funding.

18. ***Are you able to suggest examples of alternative ways of providing digital connectivity to local areas with poor or no broadband provision?***
No comment at this stage

Energy

19. ***Do you agree with our approach in stimulating locally produced energy? If not, why?***
Proposals to stimulate locally produced energy should be supported but more that could be done, including better integration of housing and planning policies to reinforce energy generation and demand reduction objectives.

Lewisham's Housing Select Committee is to undertake a scrutiny review of communal heating in 2014/15. The outcome of this review will help shape the Council's approach to communal heating going forward.

In particular the GLA are well positioned to drive the development of higher energy efficiency standards across London. The latest definition of 'zero carbon' will see lower carbon reduction levels on-site than are currently being delivered so there is clearly scope for the standards to be met within technical and financial viability considerations. The development of 'Allowable Solutions' funding where sites cannot meet standard should be retained by the local authorities and used to support delivery of energy efficiency measures. In particular this has the potential to connect energy generation and supply at a local level.

20. ***What else should we consider to ensure London's energy supply is affordable, sustainable and secure?***
The proposals should state more clearly the inter-relationship between housing and energy infrastructure and the role of planning to deliver policy objectives. These issues need greater consistency in the way planning applications are dealt with on a local and regional basis. A strongly enforced policy would send a clear message to developers that they need to ensure policy compliance as a minimum for any proposals they are developing.

More detail is needed on proposals to deliver energy efficiency retrofitting measures across London on existing properties in both the residential and commercial sectors.

The Landlords Accreditation Scheme could be used to drive standards in the private renal sector and take up retrofit works.

Put in place 'green leases' for all rental properties the GLA and other organisations the Mayor has responsibility for such as TfL. This would be a way of encouraging organisations to reduce their energy demand and also send out a strong signal to the

market in relation to the increasing importance of energy demand reduction and the role of tenants and landlords in delivering reductions in energy consumption.

Link together mitigation and adaptation work more cohesively throughout the document and plans. There is a concern that there is going to be an increased energy demand to cool buildings so they can adapt to increased temperatures as well as more energy for desalination processes to supply water at the same time as there will be pressure to reduce energy demand.

Water

21. ***Have we identified the correct water management challenges? How do you feel they rank against the other issues in the London Infrastructure Plan 2050?***

Lewisham has a number of areas which have been classified as facing a high flood risk and proposals to work with central government and water companies to address this are welcomed.

The water management issues that have been identified are correct, however we would suggest some others too, some of which have been picked up as challenges more generally elsewhere within the document:

- The issues around water management are not contained within geographical, sector or administrative boundaries. Many organisations are involved in addressing the challenges and responding when issues arise but this creates many gaps in cover and accountability
- Allied to the above, there is a lack of clarity in relation to roles and responsibilities – eg the role of local authorities as lead local authority for flood management has still not been fully clarified, particularly in relation to their role around SUDS
- A general lack of awareness of the issues and challenges London faces in relation to water management

Access to a safe and consistent supply of water and energy underpins all of the other elements of the Plan and these two items are closely linked, particularly in relation to mitigation and adaptation issues and should be considered of fundamental importance.

22. ***How do you think water supply and demand should be balanced?***

- Increased water efficiency standards in new build properties
- Water efficiency ratings for properties with requirements to increase the water efficiency ratings
- Better value for money delivery by water companies to drive a higher level of upgrades and maintenance from the funding they already receive
- Year on year targets for water companies to reduce the amount of water lost through leakages in the supply system
- Smarter tariffs which incentivise water saving measures
- Integration of water saving measures into the specifications for home retrofit schemes

23. ***Do you think enough is being done to protect London from flooding?***

No.

There is a need for a more visible priority given to flooding risk at the very highest levels in organisations at a regional and local level.

More action is needed in the following areas:

- Addressing climate change risks so as to reduce the likelihood of extreme weather events creating the circumstances for flooding to happen
- Assessing the impact of extreme weather events on critical infrastructure such as schools, hospitals etc and ensuring they are built and maintained so as to enable them to mitigate and adapt to risks
- Understanding vulnerability of different communities and targeting resources accordingly
- Higher water efficiency standards in new build properties – both in terms of water consumption and also SUDS
- Better understanding of the interaction between different stands– eg one way to address the gap between supply and demand is through the use of energy intensive water desalination which is counter-productive to mitigation measures in that sphere

Waste

24. *Do you think the name 'circular economy' is best to describe the approach or will it confuse consumers and businesses? Can you suggest other names?*

Circular Economy is an industry term, and may need to be adapted to enable consumers and businesses to understand its ideology. If it is to be widely accepted maybe focus groups could be run to identify an appropriate name, or a logo that people could instantly recognise.

25. *Do you agree with our proposed approach? If not, why?*

Local authorities should also be considered as a key partner, as it is often left to local authorities to provide services to householders and in some case businesses, often with no additional funding or not a sufficient economic model to implement such schemes.

26. **How can we incentive businesses and households to reuse and recycle more?**

No comment at this stage

Background Documents:

London Infrastructure Plan 2050:
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/London%20Infrastructure%20Plan%202050%20Consultation.pdf