

**Committee:** Local Plan Working Group

**Agenda Item**

**Date:** 21<sup>st</sup> October 2014

**8**

**Title:** London Infrastructure Plan 2050 – A draft for consultation

**Author:** Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /  
Development Management Liaison Officer

---

## Summary

1. This report is about the consultation on the London Infrastructure Plan 2050. The report explains what the plan is and summarises its main points. The report recommends how the Council should respond to the consultation.

## Recommendations

2. That the Council responds to the consultation as set out in Paragraph 21 of this report.

## Financial Implications

3. None.

## Background Papers

4. None.

## Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The draft plan is out on consultation until 31 <sup>st</sup> October 2014
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	District wide
Workforce/Workplace	Officer time in preparing this report

## Situation

### The draft London Infrastructure Plan 2050

6. This draft plan has been prepared by the Mayor of London (Greater London Authority, GLA) to cover the period up to 2050 and details a range of infrastructure requirements to support London's growth, the estimated costs and how it can be funded and delivered.
7. The draft plan discusses future locations for growth within and beyond London. The draft plan:
  - i) anticipates new technologies and innovations that will change how infrastructure is provided,
  - ii) discusses delivery mechanisms to ensure integration and efficiency
  - iii) details the infrastructure needed to meet demand, focussing on transport, green issues, digital connectivity, energy, water and waste,
  - iv) discusses the spatial implications of growth, both within and beyond London including the wider south east, and
  - v) details costs (estimated at £1.3 trillion from 2016 to 2050) and calls for fiscal devolution to incentivise growth, provide a revenue stream and enable London government to manage and integrate infrastructure investment.
8. Six supporting documents have been published alongside the draft plan which include:
  - i) population and employment projections;
  - ii) improving the delivery of infrastructure;
  - iii) transport supporting paper;
  - iv) raising high speed connectivity;
  - v) green, energy, water and waste infrastructure; and
  - vi) the costs and funding of all London's infrastructure needs.
9. The draft plan is out for consultation from 20<sup>th</sup> July to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014. Following a review of consultation responses the GLA intends to complete the plan by the winter of 2014/15, where it will form part of an evidence base to inform a full review of the London Plan post 2016.

### What the Plan says

10. A summary of the draft plan is attached as Appendix 1 at the end of this report.

### The District Council's response

#### *Aviation policy*

11. The draft plan is based on the assumption that there will be a four runway hub airport at the Isle of Grain in the Inner Thames Estuary (ITE). Last month, the Airports Commission declined to shortlist an ITE hub for a number of reasons. In its conclusions in its Summary and Decision Paper (Paragraph 4.3), the

Commission said:

*“The Commission has concluded that the proposal for a new ITE airport has substantial disadvantages that collectively outweigh its potential benefits. Cumulative obstacles to delivery, high costs and uncertainties in relation to its economic and strategic benefits contribute to an assessment that an ITE airport proposal does not represent a credible option for shortlisting”.*

12. The Commission is currently working on its final report, and will proceed to consultation on the 3 currently shortlisted options later this year, (2 options for a third runway at Heathrow and 1 option for a third runway at Gatwick). Whilst it is accepted that a future Government could still postpone a decision about airport expansion in the south east, it is considered that it is premature at this stage to be considering London’s infrastructure requirements to 2050 pending at least the Commission’s final recommendation being known.

*Accommodating London’s future housing growth*

13. The draft plan sets out a number of scenarios for accommodating London’s housing requirements. A number of these are set out in Chapter 20 *“Possibilities for growth across the city”* and presume the retention of the Metropolitan Green Belt. These scenarios are:

i) brownfield land (*“Opportunity Areas”*), which have significant capacity to accommodate new housing, commercial and other development linked to existing or future improvements to public transport accessibility,

ii) *“Intensification Areas”*, which are built-up areas with good existing or potential public transport accessibility which can support redevelopment at high densities,

iii) town centre intensification, where high density residential-led, mixed use redevelopment could replace underused or vacant retail and office floorspace, and

iv) *“densification”* of the suburbs, which may require further public transport improvements to support large scale population growth in Outer London.

14. London’s population in 2050 is estimated in the draft plan to be 11.27m, with a high estimate of 13.38m and a low estimate of 9.51m. The implication from the draft plan is that a mix of these scenarios could accommodate the 2050 mid-range population estimate.

15. In Chapter 21 *“Impact on the wider South East”* the draft plan states:

*“Independently of the impacts of a new airport to the east of London, outside London we are likely to see planned new developments or additional densification of existing town centres. These developments would most likely occur on existing or planned transport corridors, where growth could most sensibly be accommodated, and it may occur naturally as people choose to move out of London.*

*We have analysed the potential for increased densities in urban areas in the South East where current residential densities are low, even near public transport or in established town centres, particularly focusing on more deprived areas. We have also considered the role that new towns and urban extensions can play in areas beyond the Green Belt, particularly in areas where there is scope to increase rail commuting. HS2 in particular will relieve existing main lines to the north of London, allowing commuter services on these lines to be intensified.*

*By increasing densities in such areas to 100 dwellings per hectare, our initial analysis demonstrates the potential for a population increase of around one million in the areas surrounding London”.*

16. The draft plan includes a diagram (Figure 3) showing the impact that the special distribution referred to in Paragraph 14 of this report would have on rail requirements. Figure 3 (although rather ambiguously drawn it seems) shows major growth potential north of London where relief would be provided by HS2 and connectivity would be improved by East-West Rail, the first section of which from Bedford to Aylesbury and Oxford is committed and funded. In the transport supporting paper, this area (which extends west from Cambridge) is referred to as the “Arc of Prosperity”. More locally, the supporting paper refers to the area around the M11 and East as:

*“Large are (sic) of relatively unconstrained land, some growth planned. Limited transport opportunities”*

Figure 3 nonetheless seems to imply some potential for growth to the north east of London where relief would be provided by Crossrail and Crossrail 2.

17. On responding to the issue of London’s housing growth, the Council should make the following points:
- a) This draft plan is not a statutory land use plan, and this is acknowledged by the Mayor in his introduction. The London Plan is the main vehicle for seeking a consensus on how London should grow, and the next review of the London Plan will not be completed until 2019/20. Should there be a need for the wider south east to make a contribution to meeting London’s growth, the process should be managed through the statutory planning process. The District Council is currently planning in detail for growth up to 2031.
  - b) The draft plan is making some quite specific assumptions about potential growth beyond London without the involvement of the relevant local authorities. Whilst the draft plan acknowledges that the likely outcome will be a mixture of all the scenarios considered, it does acknowledge in Chapter 21 that growth outside London is “*generally less sustainable*”. All references in the draft plan to specific locations beyond London should be omitted in future versions. In any case, it seems from what the draft plan says that mid-range growth can be accommodated within London using the range of scenarios set out earlier.

c) The extent or timescale of future investment in the West Anglia Main Line (WAML) is by no means certain, and neither is the final route of Crossrail 2. The Council took part in a “mini consultation” on Crossrail 2 earlier this year, and a response to issues document is expected to be published early next year. The Council is campaigning as part of the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium for WAML improvements, but this investment is required to meet the needs of the London Stansted Cambridge corridor itself. Accommodating part of London’s growth up to 2050 should not be a price to pay for WAML improvements.

d) Chapter 21 of the draft plan does not make any reference to the effect on the strategic road network.

e) Densities of 100 dwellings per hectare are inappropriate beyond major conurbations.

#### *General issues*

18. The principle of a forward-looking infrastructure plan for London up to 2050 is to be supported, but it must evolve from collaboration with all affected or potentially affected local authorities beyond London. This has not occurred up to now. Chapter 5 “*Approach*” acknowledges that the 2050 timeframe may appear deceptively remote but states that:

*“given its long term nature, many infrastructure investments will remain active well beyond 2050, so it is a realistic window for good forward planning”.*

19. The Mayor is establishing a London Infrastructure Delivery Board (LIDB) to create links across all sectors and to utilise their expertise on best-practice delivery. The draft plan comments that current arrangements do not support integrated delivery and there are obvious lessons to be learned from how the Olympics were delivered. In particular, the draft plan says in Chapter 11 “*integrated best-practice delivery*”:

*“While the GLA’s statutory planning document, the London Plan, sets out growth forecasts for London, many of the bodies above who actually shape and deliver infrastructure do not need to plan on the same basis and are subject to a range of different drivers and planning frameworks”.*

20. The LIDB is something that the Council should support as best-practice.

#### **Summary**

21. The Council’s response should include:

a) Support for the principle of a 2050 infrastructure plan provided it evolves via collaboration with all affected or potentially affected local authorities beyond London. This has not occurred up to now.

b) A comment that the plan is premature pending at least a final

recommendation from the Airports Commission.

c) For the reasons set out in Paragraph 17, an objection to the plan referring to a housing growth strategy beyond London.

d) Support for sensible measures to deliver planned growth such as the LIDB.

## Risk Analysis

22.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the District Council has to plan for some of London's overspill housing growth.	2. The draft plan considers the role that the wider South East could play in accommodating London overspill.	3. The District Council is planning for growth up to 2031, which does not include infrastructure for London overspill.	Respond to the draft plan consultation, and continue to work with other local authorities on developing shared concerns and arguments against accommodating London overspill.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.