

Mayor and Cabinet		
Report Title	Mayor of London's 'London Infrastructure Plan 2050' Consultation Response	
Key Decision	Yes	Item No.
Ward	All	
Contributors	Executive Directors of Resources and Regeneration and Customer Services	
Class	Part 1	Date: 22 October 2014

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Mayor of London is consulting on London's Infrastructure needs over the period to 2050. This is the first time anyone has tried to identify and cost the infrastructure needed to maintain London as a leading world City. This is an ambitious undertaking and a great many questions remain unanswered. However, the plan should be seen as a start on a difficult journey and not the end. As well as identifying infrastructure projects new arrangements for delivery are suggested. Many of these will require legislative as well as cultural changes for delivery.
- 1.2 The report summarises some of the infrastructure needed as grouped under the headings of: transport; green infrastructure; digital connectivity; affordable energy and water and waste. This list does not include social infrastructure such as health and this will need to be considered in the future.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 The Mayor of London has published a consultation document entitled 'London Infrastructure Plan 2050'. This report provides a summary of the content, sets out some of the implications for Lewisham and provides a response to the consultation.
- 2.2 This current report also seeks to provide an answer to the questions posed by the Mayor of London as part of the consultation. These are set out in appendix 1 to this report.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Mayor is recommended to send the contents of this report to the Mayor of London as the official response to the consultation.
- 3.2 The Mayor is recommended to delegate authority to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to make final changes to the consultation response prior to the closing date of 31st October 2014.

4. Policy Context

- 4.1 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.

5. Background

- 5.1 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.
- 5.2 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.
- 5.3 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.
- 5.4 The LIP 2050 definition of infrastructure is broad but does not include some key social infrastructure such as health, housing, schools, or cultural infrastructure. If London is to be a sustainable City social infrastructure needs to also be considered. The omission of social infrastructure from the Plan is considered a serious weakness and should be addressed in future updates as a matter of urgency.

6. Summary of Infrastructure Proposals

6.1 Transport

- 6.1.1 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

- 6.1.2 The LIP 2050 identifies a range of rail and road-based measures which will support London and the UK's economy. 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.
- 6.1.3 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. Given the criticality of the proposal to sustaining future growth in south east London, every effort should be made to bring forward the delivery of the project to the earliest possible date, targeting 2030 rather than the 2040s.
- 6.1.4 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.
- 6.1.5 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 welcome 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. Areas such as Downham and Whitefoot are poorly served by buses, and attempts to extend services such as the 225 have not been brought forward. LB Lewisham would also encourage increased investment in the bus fleet, and would stress the importance of a higher proportion of modern hybrid buses at similar levels as in central London, to improve air quality.
- 6.1.6 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.
- 6.1.7 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. The plan also proposes a new world class four-runway **hub airport to the east of London**. However, the government's Airports Commission recently announced that the Thames Estuary Airport had been ruled out. LB Lewisham has significant concerns about the environmental impact of expansion at Heathrow, and the direction is unclear on a new airport, which would have required a great deal of further

investigation of the opportunities and risks for the borough and the wider sub-region.

2 Serve a growing population

- 6.1.8 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.
- 6.1.9 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.
- 6.1.10 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.
- 6.1.11 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.
- 6.1.12 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.
- 6.1.13 The Catford Loop line does not have sufficient frequency of trains, sufficient carriage length of trains and the rolling stock is poor. Plans to improve this service should be prioritised, and direct services to St Pancras should be extended to weekends. The increased service and train capacities are necessary both now and to future-proof the service as the population and demand increases. It is extremely disappointing that the recent Thameslink re-franchise is set to fail to deliver this much needed frequency improvement on this under-utilised infrastructure and the Council would recommend an urgent re-consideration.

6.1.14 However, the general improved level of service envisaged by a South London Metro is compatible with the Bakerloo Line Extension, which would unlock capacity on the rail network.

6.1.15 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 Dutch-style cycling and walking infrastructure (LB Lewisham would welcome further roll-out of TfL funded Cycling Quietways) 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.

6.1.16 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

6.1.17 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. . LB Lewisham would urge that every opportunity is taken to stretch the target so that all journeys are step-free before 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. LB Lewisham would encourage discussions about a wider zone across the London area.
- **'Minimal impact freight'**, including out of hours, consolidation, last mile bike freight and zero-emission vehicles as the norm.

6.1.18 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.

6.2 Green Infrastructure

6.2.1 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.

- 6.2.2 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.
- 6.2.3 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.
- 6.2.4 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.

6.3 Digital connectivity

- 6.3.1 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.
- 6.3.2 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. A world class city needs world class connectivity; the Mayor of London should lobby for this and should provide financial support if necessary to ensure top speed access.
- 6.3.3 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.
- 6.3.4 The Mayor should push to ensure that Broadband providers and other infrastructure providers work more closely together and regulations should be changed to make it easier for people to change broadband provider. Our railway infrastructure is an important element of this and we believe that free broadband should be provided on all railway services and built into the franchise agreements.

- 6.3.5 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.
- 6.3.6 The Mayor of London should also push all providers to work together to provide proper access for those potentially digitally excluded through poverty with the security built in to ensure that the people who use it are identifiable. In addition all people being able to access digital service should be a priority and should be considered as part of new developments, with roll out to properties not just areas.
- 6.3.7 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.
- 6.3.8 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. If high speed broadband is to be considered as a 'fourth utility' then VAT should also be added to the cost.

6.5 Resilient, secure water

- 6.5.1 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.
- 6.5.2 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 fixing/developing a sustainable drainage action plan

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

- working with water companies to encourage them to develop longer-term plans for the sustainable supply of water and also in relation to drainage
- 6.5.3 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.
- 6.6 Moving from waste to reuse**
- 6.6.1 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. It should be noted however, that this transition to a circular economy isn’t without risk and relies upon there being realistic markets for the materials collected for recycling. The LIP states that this will also require working with London waste authorities to introduce more consistent collection and recycling.
- 6.6.2 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. Further information is required to comment on this. There is little information as to whether this is to target existing waste streams or be more ambitious and target newer waste streams and local schemes such as turning used cooking oil into biodiesel. The Plan makes no reference to Energy from Waste (EfW) and the role that that has to play in managing London’s growing waste nor the role that EfW can play in providing energy to homes and the potential for district heating.
- 6.6.3 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.
- 6.6.4 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, but also with thinking about waste prevention. Many incentive schemes have been tried and tested with varying degrees of

success, but these are often costly and the cost often does not correspond with the often little gain.

6.6.5 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, socio-demographic considerations and governance. This has been looked at and debated in the past, and there is no concrete evidence that a pan-London approach would actually achieve higher recycling and composting rates. That is not to say that there are no opportunities for providing cross borough services, and Lewisham for example, has led on the procurement of textile recycling at bring banks for 11 London authorities.

7. Governance arrangements, finance & other issues

7.1 The LIP2050 report states the Mayor of London will establish a 'London Infrastructure Delivery Board' composed of senior representatives from all the main infrastructure providers. There is very little detail in the report on the status, role or function of this board.

7.2 London Councils in their response to the consultation have asked that the London Boroughs are appropriately represented on the Board, reflecting their position in London government. They raise the issue of how the proposed board will fit alongside related forums such as the Homes for London Board and the London Waste and Recycling Board and others and how any disputes might be addressed. They also raise the issue of delivery requiring the proposed board to sit alongside arrangements for devolved decisions to be made by boroughs and groups of boroughs. Finally they ask for serious consideration to be given to establishing the Board on a statutory basis. It is recommended that the Mayor of Lewisham support London Councils on these issues.

7.3 The estimated cost of delivery of the infrastructure needs are £1.3 trillion between 2016 and 2050. This figure includes capital costs as well as maintenance cost. Assuming that existing funding arrangements continue there is a projected £4.5 bn annual average funding gap for public sector funding. It is noted that the cost does include a substantial element related to housing and yet this does not appear in the main report. The LIP 2050 therefore argues that to meet London's infrastructure needs funding arrangements will need to change. The Plan suggests:

- Fiscal devolutions set out in the London finance Commission, including retaining business rates and some property taxes;
- Greater use of private sector sponsorship and institutional investors;
- Change arrangements so some projects can sit outside the public sector's balance sheet and removal of borrowing caps;
- Exploring new sources of local funding including regional or London income tax and other taxes.

7.4 The LIP 2050 is an ambitious project that raises a number of important issues for the Capital. However, there is an issue about simply generating projects

rather than see how various infrastructure might work together. While the LIP 2050 stresses the importance of integrated delivery of infrastructure, the needs are still presented in silos with little reference between the different types of infrastructure. For example, the plan refers to how transport can open up opportunities for housing growth but there is limited discussion in the transport section on how this integrated approach might work. Various boards and governance structures are proposed without any detail of the remit, membership and responsibilities. Further detail is needed on all these issues.

8. Consultation Questions

- 8.1 As part of the consultation the Mayor of London has asked 26 questions. The Lewisham response to these is set out at appendix 1 to this report. Given the complex nature of supplying infrastructure and the lack of detail at this stage it is not always possible to give an answer to the consultation questions.

9. Comments from Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 9.1 At their meeting held on 29th September 2014, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, considered and discussed a report on the LIP 2050 consultation. The committee made a number of points and suggestions for inclusion in the report to Mayor and Cabinet. Officers have now included these comments in this report.

- 9.2 A summary of the main issues raised by Overview and Scrutiny Committee are set out below:

General

The lack of any detailed mention of social infrastructure such as schools and health facilities is a serious omission and should be corrected;

The governance arrangements for the Delivery Board need to be clearly set out and include Local authority involvement at every level;

Meaningful, detailed consultation with local people should take place at an appropriate early stage in the development of all infrastructure improvement projects;

Transport

Bakerloo Line Extension to Lewisham is very welcome but should be a priority and brought forward;

Catford Loop line does not have sufficient frequency of trains, sufficient carriage length of trains and the rolling stock is poor;

further detail should be sought on plan to extend a new rail route from Waterloo to Heathrow;

Step free access to stations needs to be a priority and brought forward in the plan;

SE London and south Lewisham in particular are poorly served by buses routes and this should be addressed in the plan;

There are too few hybrid buses in Lewisham;

Further information is needed about cycle route options.

Digital Connectivity

A world class city needs world class connectivity; the Mayor of London should lobby for this;

This section of the plan needs to also consider digital inclusion;
Broadband providers and other infrastructure providers need to work more closely together;
Free broadband should be provided on all railway services;
If high speed broadband is to be considered as a utility, then VAT should be added to the cost.

Energy, water & Waste

The fact that demand for water in London is set to outstrip supply in less than 2 years is extremely concerning. The Mayor London needs to do more to address this as an urgent priority;

Aged water and sewage infrastructure also needs to be replaced by Thames water as a matter of urgency;

Thames Water need to be forced to deal with leaks and infrastructure issues effectively;

Fuel poverty needs to be addressed;

More should be done to encourage local energy production.

10. Legal Implications

- 10.1 There are no specific legal implications arising from this report. The Mayor of London is suggesting a number of options for funding the infrastructure needs of London and many of these suggestions will require legal changes. If they are taken forward there will be consultation and the Council will be able to respond at the appropriate time.
- 10.2 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 10.3 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 10.4 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 10.5 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code

of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

10.6 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

10.7 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

11. Financial Implications

11.1 There are no specific financial implications arising from this report.

12 Crime and disorder implications

12.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications from this report.

13. Equalities implications

13.1 This is a consultation about ensuring that London has the infrastructure it needs to remain one of the best cities in the world to live, work and do business.

13.2 *Shaping our future*, Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy for 2008-2020, sets out a vision for Lewisham;-

“Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn.”

This is underpinned by hard-edged principles for:

- **reducing inequality** – narrowing the gap in outcomes for citizens

- **delivering together efficiently, effectively and equitably** - ensuring that all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality local services

13.3 The Council's Comprehensive Equality Scheme for 2012-16 provides an overarching framework and focus for the Council's work on equalities to support the Sustainable Community Strategy and to ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010.

14. Environmental implications

14.1 There are no specific environmental implications from this report.

15. Conclusion

15.1 The LIP 2050 is an ambitious plan that raises important questions for London's future. The scale of infrastructure need and the projected cost are at such a level that new governance arrangements will be required for successful implementation. The consultation is a start on the issues that need to be addressed and it is acknowledged that more work is required. Not least on the serious omission of social infrastructure from the Plan. The Mayor of Lewisham welcomes the plan as a start on a difficult journey and considers that the Mayor of London should continue to involve the London boroughs as the Plan develops.

Background documents

Short Title Document	Date	File Location	File Reference	Contact Officer	Exempt
London Infrastructure Plan 2050	2014	Laurence House	Planning Policy	Brian Regan	No

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Brian Regan, Planning Policy, 3rd floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, Catford SE6 4RU – telephone 020 8314 8774.

Appendix 1: Mayor of London's 'London Infrastructure Plan 2050' 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 over the short to medium term, which impacts on the ability to invest locally, and cultural infrastructure alongside wider social infrastructure is an essential part of making a city liveable.

Additional and or replacement flood defence will be needed in the period up to 2050 and this issue should be addressed.

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?***

We note the menu of funding options set out in the consultation document and would welcome the use of any funding surplus arising after Crossrail 1 has been paid for. It should be noted however, that there is little detail in the plan on the role and function of the various boards proposed and the legislative changes needed to address the funding issue. More detail of the menu of options available is needed to ensure that local authorities are put in the best position possible to take a considered view. It should be noted that Lewisham along with London local authorities more generally, are facing significant budget pressures over the short to medium term. This is further compounded by the fact that local authorities are now placed in a position where there is a need to grow their local business infrastructure to support their funding positions going forward. It is important that the devolving of national taxes to the region or locally carefully considers equity issues. Local authorities like Lewisham which have a relatively low business rate base could be adversely affected.

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?***

The spatial strategy relies heavily on that proposed in the London Plan. While this may work for certain types of infrastructure it would not be suitable for all. For example, flood alleviation infrastructure needs to be located where it is needed and digital connectivity needs to consider the needs of the poor as well as that of business.

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 overcrowding 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?*

Housing is a good example of the need to consider social infrastructure in the Plan. Schools, health facilities and leisure facilities are all essential for a sustainable city and their omission from the Plan is a serious weakness.

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 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.

In Lewisham almost all waste is disposed of through the facility at South East London Combined Heat and Power (SELCHP) helping to deliver energy and carbon benefits and significantly reducing the environmental impact of waste disposal. More focus should be made on use of waste for energy generation, including anaerobic digesters.

In Lewisham almost all waste is disposed of through the facility at South East London Combined Heat and Power (SELCHP) helping to deliver energy and carbon benefits and

significantly reducing the environmental impact of waste disposal. More focus should be made on use of waste for energy generation, including anaerobic digesters.

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 rental sector and take up retrofit works.

There should be a stronger push for proven technologies such as solar photovoltaics that work well in urban built up areas like London. In particular area and stock-wide schemes should be supported where they create opportunities to support residents at risk of fuel poverty.

There should be a stronger push for proven technologies such as solar photovoltaics that work well in urban built up areas like London. In particular area and stock-wide schemes should be supported where they create opportunities to support residents at risk of fuel poverty

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.

Lewisham council, along with a number of other local authorities and others have established highly effective delivery mechanisms for retrofit works. The GLA could assist this by pressing Government to address the current problems with energy obligations that are restricting funding particularly in relation to work for vulnerable residents at risk of fuel poverty. With the energy obligation contributing very little, the level of Government support on fuel poverty is insufficient.

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. In particular the threat of a lack of supply of water as demand exceeds supply should be given the strongest possible priority. More needs to be done to address this threat with resources identified to ensure Londoners continue to have access to water.

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. The authority cannot think of an alternative, and if it is

to be widely accepted maybe focus groups could be run to identify an appropriate name, or failing that, the Mayor should lead on a publicity campaign to aid the better understanding of the terminology to householders and businesses.

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

The authority agrees with the proposed approach, however, there are a number of points that should also be considered.

Whilst waste and other materials have to be managed there should also be an emphasis on waste prevention, which sits at the top of the EU Waste Hierarchy, and is not mentioned as part of the approach taken. This should be the adopted approach along with the Circular Economy.

Further, for this approach to work, there needs to be leadership from a national as well as regional level. There has been a lack of leadership on waste issues recently from Defra, and the Mayor should call upon Government to review this decision. Given the involvement of the private sector to lead on this change, then it may be prudent to look at involvement from BIS as well as Defra.

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. Packaging should be considered to follow a similar model to WEEE whereby the Producer Pays, and to ensure future recycling schemes success this approach should be seriously considered.

Finally, it is important that individuals and organisations are brought along together to ensure behaviour change is embedded into society as a whole and waste prevention sits at the top as priority.

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

There is no one size fits all approach to this and often schemes have to be targeted to particular audiences.

The authority has run a number of campaigns and initiatives to encourage behaviour change with varying degrees of success. The Love Food Hate Waste campaign is a scheme which can show the financial benefits of reducing food waste to householders. Real Nappy voucher schemes on the other hand, often only favour those that can afford an upfront investment rather than people on lower incomes, who in the longer term would benefit from the use of real nappies but can't afford the upfront investment.

Finally, consideration should be given to the Defra interim report on incentives and the effectiveness or otherwise of different types of schemes.